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ABSTRACT

This dissertation investigates interactions between local and global forces using the example of Māori responses to the introduction of global industrial forestry to Aotearoa/New Zealand. It follows the shifting relationships between Indigenous peoples, whose are place-based, and Pakeha from initial contact to the contemporary era. It charts how Māori have lost majority control over land and resources during that time. It also documents how the importation of European sensibilities regarding legibility, order, and productivity have impacted upon economic opportunities and forestry management. This work, however, is grounded in the argument that global projects are not simply imposed on locales. Māori have not been passive; they have made, and continue to make, choices from positions that reflect cultural, social, political, economic, and ecological concerns and these decisions have influenced the practice of forestry. They have embraced different opportunities presented by the introduction of European ideas, technologies, lifeforms, and a market-based system, and they have incorporated these into their own systems of meaning and value. The integration of New Zealand into the world economy has not obliterated Māori relationships with land and place, but added new layers of interest and opportunity. Further, they are not monolithic; their decisions reflect diversity within and between any tribal grouping. This research is centered on a set of interviews conducted with selected Native participants from two regions in North Island, New Zealand: Te Urewera-Kaingaroa and Te Tairāwhiti. Using quotes from these conversations, this dissertation will show that while Māori are keenly aware of the ways in which trees shape their experiences of place, exotic trees do not diminish their very real connections to land, the ways in which their identities are grounded in those
territories, nor their desire for self-determination. In general, the participants all highighted the importance of maintaining their Māori cultural and social values. These excerpts show, however, that people have a variety of different perspectives towards exotic forestry and how it is calculated into goals of cultural economic advancement. Thus, while they participate in the global forestry industry they continue to draw meaning from local experience.
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CHAPTER 1

This dissertation addresses the interconnections of Māori, place, political autonomy, economic development, and globalization through the lens of industrial forestry. It draws upon conversations with selected individuals about their perceptions of forestry and its impact on connections to place. These interviews were conducted in two case study regions; Te Urewera-Kaingaroa and Te Tairāwhiti, which are both located in the North Island of Aotearoa/New Zealand. It addresses the experiences of these people prior to the 2008 Treelords settlement.

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The idea for this project began during a Master’s research reconnaissance trip to New Zealand in 2001. During that trip, I drove through Kaingaroa Forest, which is one of the largest human-made plantations in the world and is mainly composed of exotic Monterey pine (Pinus radiata) from California. Monterey Pine plays a significant part of the New Zealand forestry sector, which is one of the four most important industries to New Zealand’s overall economy. Forestry is largely centered on the production of exotic plantations. These plantations are unusual in that many of the plantings are on Māori land. Further, the ownership of much of the Kaingaroa lands has been an issue of dispute between various Māori tribes and the Crown.

The introduction of these timber trees was part of the development of an industry that had been initiated largely by the state and involved the creation of many new jobs, movements of people to new job centers, and reorganization of land and transportation
This resulted in massive economic, cultural, and social changes for many Māori. For example, many of them became employed in the forestry industry as either tree planters or loggers. These new employment opportunities were often the first introduction to market economies for Māori. Other people have documented the history of these changes, including the 1980s privatization of the forestry system and attendant rise in unemployment among forestry workers. The restructuring had a negative impact on Māori.

This led to a series of questions: How did Monterey Pine get to New Zealand? What was it doing there? Who was involved with the process? What has happened to them since? Māori, like other Indigenous people, have close connections to forests, trees, and land. What then did the presence of these vast plantations entail for Native peoples in terms of access to land and its utilization and possibilities for economic development?

### 1.2 PRE-EUROPEAN FORESTS AND MĀORI

Prior to the arrival of humans in Aotearoa/New Zealand vegetation had developed for millions of years in relative isolation. New Zealand comprises two large islands and several smaller islands; in total it occupies 104,454 square miles and features over 3700 miles of coastline. The islands extend for thirteen degrees of latitude from 34°30’ S to 47°30’30” S. The country features a series of mountains running southwest to northeast.

---


that block the frequent westerlies. This creates drier conditions in the eastern portions of the country. Most of these mountains rise to over 5000 feet in elevation, with 223 peaks in the Southern Alps that are in excess of 8500 feet. Roughly three-quarters of New Zealand is either hill or mountain and above 650 feet. Thus, while New Zealand is dominated by a maritime climate, there are significant variations from west to east, north to south, and low to high elevations in terms of average annual temperature, climate, rainfall, and humidity. The northern area is subtropical, the southernmost portion is temperate, and the mountains feature alpine conditions.\(^4\)

As a result of its isolation, ninety percent of the species found there are unique to New Zealand. A lack of browsing animals,\(^5\) with the exception of the moa, or ungulates meant that the forests developed fairly dense and closed structures. Forests were extensive, with the exception of some of the snow and ice covered alpine areas (primarily on South Island), the drier eastern side of the South Island, and parts of the Central North Island that had been covered in ash during past volcanic eruptions.\(^6\)

There are two main native forest types: conifer-hardwood and beech. There are three families of conifers: Araucariaceae, Cupressaceae, and Podocarpaceae. The

---


\(^5\) When describing herbivores, browsing is used to refer to animals that feed on the leaves, twigs, and tissue of shrubs and trees while grazing refers to animals that feed on grasses and plants that are low to the ground. Note that the moa was a browsing bird, but aside from it there were no browsing mammals.

majority of conifers are podocarps which include: totara, matai, kahikatea (white pine),
miro, kaikawaka (cedar), rimu, silver pine, yellow silver pine, toatoa, tanehaha, and kauri.
Primary hardwoods, also known as broadleaved trees, are taraire, tawa, rata, kamahi,
hinu, northern rata, black maire, puriri, rewarewa, pukatea, and several species of
southern beech. The composition of the forests is determined by latitude, elevation, and
soil conditions. Native forests have a great variety of smaller trees, shrubs, and plants
throughout different levels of the forest architecture (Figure 1). The species range,
however, is not as diverse as a tropical rainforest. In general, western portions of the
country are moister than eastern portions. More tree ferns are in the west and more shrub
and scrub type vegetation are in the east. Also, the understory vegetation is not nearly as
diverse in beech forests as compared to conifer-broadleaf forests.7

Podocarp-hardwood forests were commonly found throughout the North Island
lowlands and in the mountains in pre-colonial times. These forests were usually mixed
and frequently dominated by one tree species though pure stands existed in some
restricted areas. Kahikatea and southern beech each grew in exclusive tracts. In addition,
though kauri was often interspersed with other species such as taraire and tawa, it did
grow in pure patches. Both it and tawa were spatially restricted to areas north of 38° S
and found under mesic conditions. Kauri thrived on well-drained soils, especially along
ridges, while tawa was dominant in valleys. The latter was found at lower elevations up
to 2000 feet.8

7 Fleet, 5-11; Grey, 76-77; McKinnon, Bradley, and Kirkpatrick, Plate 8; Graeme Wynn, "Destruction
under the Guise of Improvement? The Forest, 1840-1920," in Environmental Histories of New Zealand, ed.
Eric Pawson and Tom Brooking(South Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 2002), 103-104.
8 Fleet, 5-11; Grey, 76-77; McKinnon, Bradley, and Kirkpatrick, Plate 8.
Throughout the rest of North Island, the forest profile was as follows. Kahikatea forests were found on the swampy lowlands, since they favored “poorly drained soils.” These forests were usually bordered by rimu-dominated woodlands. Rimu favored more mesic conditions and could be found at higher elevations. As one ascended in elevation the conditions became more xeric and harsh. Totara was the next dominant forest type followed by mountain cedar, which was the primary tree in the subalpine region. Higher elevations were occupied by beech, which favors poorer soils, with an intermediate zone.

---

of transition in between. Beech forests, however, were absent from mountains that experienced damp, cloudy summers.\textsuperscript{10}

At varying locations, there were a few other types of forests that favored more extreme conditions. There were the wetlands forests of yellow silver pine and, at higher elevations, forests composed of mountain cedar, toatoa, and Dacrydium. Coastal areas were characterized by harsh conditions. Species adapted to the coast included pohutukawa, puriri, ngaio, southern rata, and kohekohe. Usually these forests were of mixed composition, though sometimes there were pure stands.\textsuperscript{11}

On the South Island, mixed podocarp-hardwood forests were restricted to the eastern and southeastern portion of the island along with a narrow strip of the central west coast. The variety of podocarp-hardwood species decreases dramatically south of 42° S. In these forests, rimu podocarp-hardwood forests dominated the well-drained areas, kahikatea existed in hydric conditions, and southern rata dominated the higher elevations, especially above 1500 feet. Beech could be found at lower elevations, especially along the northern and southern portions of the west coast of South Island; it was frequently interspersed among the podocarp-hardwood forests. More commonly, however, it occurred at higher altitudes and under more xeric conditions. As previously mentioned, beech also existed in pure stands. Whenever there were both conifer-hardwood and beech forests there was a zone of transition in between.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{10} Fleet, 5-11; Grey, 76-77; McKinnon, Bradley, and Kirkpatrick, Plate 8; Wynn, 103-104.
\textsuperscript{11} Fleet, 5-11.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid; Grey, 76-77; McKinnon, Bradley, and Kirkpatrick, Plate 8.
1.2.1 TANGATA WHENUA

The Polynesians settled Aotearoa/Te Wahi Pounamu (these are, respectively, the Māori terms for the North and South Islands of New Zealand) in a series of migrations.\(^{13}\) The orthodox view is that these migrations started around 1200 years ago at roughly 800 A.D., however, new evidence has shown that Polynesians arrived to New Zealand much later at approximately 1280 A.D.\(^ {14}\) Polynesians spread out on the islands and formed into *iwi* (tribes) and *hapu* (sub-tribes). These formed the earliest Māori societies.\(^ {15}\)

Māori lived in villages, most of which were located near “forest or fernland” and water. In particular, they enjoyed the coastal lowlands and were rarely near cultivable fields. Park notes that Māori exploited several different resources “zones.”\(^ {16}\) Cassell identifies nine such zones.\(^ {17}\) As key resources could be found throughout all ecosystems, Māori exploited extensive areas of land, rather than only intensively cultivating limited sites. Specifically, Māori utilized what Park describes as “edges” or ecotones. These were places between different ecosystems. Such “edges” had more diverse resources. Living near the edges was an important strategy to minimize effort.

Belich describes Polynesian settlement in a different way. He notes that the latitudinal spread of the islands, changes in elevation, heavily dissected coastline, and numerous rivers all contribute to a diversity of environments, some of which were more

---

\(^{13}\) Another name for the North Island is Te Ika-a-Maui.


\(^{15}\) Fleet, 11-2.

\(^{16}\) Park, 39-48.

\(^{17}\) Cited in Ibid., 46-47.
resource rich than others.\(^{18}\) Belich refers to these areas of plenty as being “resource islands.” He identifies them by dominant type of economic activity. They include: “gathering;” “wood;” “fishing;” “stone;” “garden;” and “game islands.” He argues that the spatial distribution of these “islands” would have required Māori to strategically move to exploit them.\(^{19}\)

The extent of forest cover upon the arrival of Polynesians has been difficult to determine, but one estimate places it at roughly three-quarters of the land. Polynesians were responsible for reducing forest cover, either through burning portions of the forests (accidentally or intentionally) or direct felling (though this was minor). Burning may have been employed to extend grasslands for hunting purposes. Māori, however, recognized that the forests were important sources of food, materials, and medicine and developed close cultural and spiritual affinities for trees. This, and their minimal technology, may account for their relatively limited impact on the forests. While they did clear forests, these changes took place over several centuries and were rather slow in comparison with the pace of Pakeha-led deforestation during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The combination of Māori activities, climate change, and volcanic activity resulted in reduction of forests from three quarters to about half of the total area of Aotearoa/Te Wahi Pounamu by the year 1840. The majority of the forests were on North Island (sixty-six percent) as compared to South Island (twenty-five to thirty percent). Despite these changes to the land, when Europeans arrived there were extensive forests with abundant wood.\(^{20}\)

\(^{18}\) Belich, 41-50.
\(^{19}\) See also Grey, 38-41.
\(^{20}\) Fleet, 11-12; Wynn, 105.
The Māori worldview is characterized as integrative and holistic. It includes all entities, inanimate and animate, and combines the physical and spiritual realm. All beings have a place within the same system, thus placing everything in context relative to one another and laying out the order of the universe. In the Māori worldview all things flow out of the same primal, divine origin from which emerged the universe and the Supreme Being, Io. It is Io who calls the world into being and then creates the first gods, Papatuanuku and Rangiawatea, who are respectively Earth-Mother and Sky-Father, and who produce the gods who then aid them in completing the creation of the world.21

*Tane* is one of these first gods. It is he who is responsible for having created the forests and human life. One of his first acts was to produce the different tree species to clothe the body of his mother, Papatuanuku. “After creating the forest, Tane, a male celestial being, went in search of the human principle.”22 The first human being, Hine-ahu-one, is the female offspring of *Tane* and his union with a female celestial being, Kurawaka. This first woman was created from a mound of earth. Thus, she represents the combination of spiritual and earthly realms. As a result, humans are the “younger siblings of the trees and the birds.”23 Therefore, according to the Māori worldview, not only are


23 Ibid. Wiri draws from Pahiri Matekaure and Peter Buck.
humans related to all entities in the universe, but they are especially close to trees and forest dwellers.\(^{24}\)

The Māori worldview, like that of other indigenous peoples, is based in a direct bodily immersion in the world. For them, knowledge is acquired through experience in the world via the sensing body. They view themselves a part of the world and, conversely, the world as an extension of themselves. Their intersubjectivity is predicated on psychological, physical, and cultural connections to the land. This approach is similar to phenomenological understandings of the world.\(^{25}\)

The forests were also essential to survival.\(^{26}\) The forests, along with the sea, were the main sources of food. In places that were relatively isolated from the ocean except through trade with neighbors, the significance of the forests to Māori was even greater. In addition to food, the forests provided materials for “canoes, houses, defensive stockades, and a great variety of implements.”\(^{27}\)

Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne discuss Māori relationships to the forests as of the mid-1980s where, in the Te Urewera region, the indigenous forests continue to be an integral part of lifestyle.\(^{28}\) They note that many Māori use the forests for pig and deer hunting for personal or commercial use, fishing, collecting plant material for food,

\(^{24}\) Elsdon Best, *Forest Lore of the Maori: with methods of snaring, trapping, and preserving birds and rats, uses of berries, roots, fern-root, and forest products, with mythological notes on origins, karakia used etc.*, (Wellington, New Zealand: E.C. Keating, 1977), 3; Marsden, 130-33; Murton, "Embedded in Place: “Mirror Knowledge” and “Simultaneous Landscapes” Among Maori.”; Murton, "Being in the Place World: Towards a Maori ‘Geographical Self.’"

\(^{25}\) Murton, "Embedded in Place: “Mirror Knowledge” and “Simultaneous Landscapes” Among Maori.”; Murton, "Being in the Place World: Towards a Maori ‘Geographical Self.’"


\(^{27}\) Ibid., 6. Note that the majority of Forest Lore is dedicated to describing the various forest products and their uses.

\(^{28}\) Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne.
medicinal and herbal uses, and weaving. Māori have also established trekking and tour companies. Stokes et al. qualify the meaning of ‘traditional.’ They write

Any discussion of traditional uses must also define the use of the term ‘traditional.’ To suggest traditional means only pre-European contact is an academic and largely irrelevant distinction. Potatoes and pigs have been an integral part of the forest economy since the 1840s. Horses have been a significant form of transport since the 1860s. Use of metal tools obtained by barter from other tribes pre-dated other effective European contact…what is significant is the continuity of cultural attitudes and identity with a forest region. Introduced animals, plants and technology were absorbed into an ongoing social and economic organisation among the clans of Tuhoe. As is done in many cultures, deliberate choices were made by Tuhoe to take advantage of beneficial innovations offered by the immigrant culture, but these were incorporated into a viable, cohesive existing social structure. Even the poverty, death and disruption caused by the military campaigns of the late 1860s…did not destroy traditional Tuhoe culture. If anything, all this guerrilla warfare made Tuhoe even more determined to protect their forest home land, and lifestyle, which was governed so much by their forest environment.29

John Patterson notes that this recognition of the multiple uses of forests forms the basis for the Māori attitude towards trees and forests.30 Māori do not view trees and forests from the utilitarian perspective which is common in Western societies, but see value in all entities on earth. Not only do Māori recognize the close genealogical connections between trees and humans, but also they understand that forests provide such things as medicine and foods, protect the soil, and affect climate. The issue is not whether or not a tree is used, but whether its use is worthy. This does not preclude an entire forest from being cut down, it just raises the question of how that forest will be used. Patterson argues that because of the scarcity of kauri, felling an entire kauri forest is unlikely to ever be considered acceptable. Felling a pine forest for certain uses, however, Patterson gives the example of a school or hospital, would be reasonable. It is in this way that some

29 Ibid., 27-28.
people have brought attention to the fact that though the pine trees may have a variety of negative impacts (see Chapter Seven for a fuller discussion of the contested values of pine), they do provide an alternative to cutting down native forests.

In discussing the forests, Hohepa Kereopa, a tohunga (a cultural expert or skilled leader), describes the sacred character of the trees. They are the hair of the land. And hair is sacred, in the sense that each tree has mana and each tree is tapu. Each is a strand of hair, no matter what the species. We believe that the hair is the cushion of the spiritual things inside each of us.

He goes on to say that different parts of the forests have different energies and that there are still places...where people have never been before. They are kept that way because the old tohunga wanted to make sure that the spirit of the forest would always have some place for itself.

Another reason why the forests are so significant to Tūhoe specifically, or to Māori in general, is that they contain wahi tapu (sacred sites). These include ancient battle grounds and sites where sacred rituals were carried out. Wahi tapu are also the repository of the blood and bones of the people, in the form of urupa (burial sites). Harrison argues

———

32 Quoted in Ibid., 143. Note that while all forms of life, trees and birds included, are instilled with a life force or mauri, this is not the same as an animistic spirit. Elsdon Best, Forest Lore of the Maori: With Methods of Snaring, Trapping, and Preserving Birds and Rats, Uses of Berries, Roots, Fern-Root, and Forest Products, with Mythological Notes on Origins, Karakia Used Etc. (Wellington, New Zealand: E.C. Keating, 1977), 6. However, there is the exception of the tipua, which is a spirit that takes the form of a tree or rock and must be accorded respect. For more information see Elsdon Best, Maori Religion and Mythology: Being an Account of the Cosmogony, Anthropogony, Religious Beliefs and Rites, Magic and Folklore of the Maori Folk of New Zealand Part 2, Dominion Museum Bulletin No. 11 (Wellington, New Zealand: P.D. Hasselberg, 1982), 521-532; Evelyn Stokes, J. Wharehuia Milroy, and Hirini Melbourne, Te Urewera Nga Iwi Te Whenua Te Ngahere: People, Land and Forests of Te Urewera (Hamilton: University of Waikato, 1986), 22.
33 Moon, 137.
34 Ibid., 144, 148; Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne, 12; Robert K.J. Wiri, “The Prophecies of the Great Canyon of Toi: A History of Te Wh¯Aiti-Nui-a-Toi in the Western Urewera Mountains of New Zealand” (Ph.D., University of Auckland, 2001), 172.
that burial ceremonies are a means to connect the “essence of humanity” within the soil.\(^{35}\) It is through the burial of their dead that people can claim dominion over the land “where wooden graveposts mark the presence of [their] ancestors in the ground.”\(^{36}\) It is important to note that the land does not belong to people, instead people are a part of the land and they are obligated to care for the land as *kaitiaki* (guardians).\(^{37}\)

1.3 THE LAND BASE AND ITS MEANING TO MĀORI

*Tangata whenua* cultural norms regarding land (*whenua*) encompassed a variety of relationships.\(^{38}\) Not only was land essential in terms of economic survival, but it was also the basis for *iwi* and *hapu* identity, relationships between peoples, connections to the spiritual realm, and the means for survival of future generations. Customary tenure has been described as “an ancestral trust estate of indefinite magnitude vested in *hapu* but with internal use rights distributed among such ancestral descendants and incorporated outsiders who used them.”\(^{39}\) Generally, land was held in collective with rights distributed to *hapu* and families. There were a variety of different ways in which Māori title was defined; however, the essential point is that Māori understandings of land were not based in the sense of land as property, but as a system of “defining relationships between
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\(^{36}\) Robert Pogue Harrison, *Forests: The Shadow of Civilization* (Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), 6-8. Note that ‘wooden graveposts’ refer to European tradition. Among Maori, graves were not marked in the same fashion for the purpose of protecting sites from desecration, yet they still connect people to place.

\(^{37}\) Moon, 139-141.


\(^{39}\) Ibid., 116. This idea was developed by the Chief Judge of the Maori Land Court, E.T. Durie.
people. In contrast, the European settlers who colonized Aotearoa/New Zealand brought a different understanding of land tenure. Their view was premised on land as alienable, based on individuated ownership, and defined by its market value as opposed to its cultural and spiritual import.

1.3.1 LAND LOSS

In the interface between Māori and European cultures, the latter gained ascendancy in the matter of land. In 1840, representatives of several iwi and the British Crown signed the Treaty of Waitangi. The treaty was supposed to set the terms for subsequent relationships between Crown and tangata whenua. In exchange for ceding sovereignty to the Crown, Māori would retain their lands and resources, gain the protection of the Crown, and land sales would be regulated. There were two key discrepancies between the English and Māori language versions of the treaty: whether or not Māori were giving up sovereignty in exchange for “undisturbed possession” of their resources, as was stated in English, versus the right to govern in exchange for “full authority” over their lands and assets, as was stated in Māori. This in itself is a source of a great deal of conflict. In addition to that, there is the issue of whether or not Māori interests were protected by the Crown. Ward argues that the intent was to build a new nation based on a partnership between the Crown and the chiefs of each of the tribes, but a relationship in which the former held overarching authority. This concept of partnership has been a basic concept of Treaty issues. The Crown, however, frequently
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40 Ibid., 117.
acted in such a way as to marginalize Māori. These actions are considered breaches of this treaty and they had destructive results for Māori, particularly in terms of loss of land and access to resources, and thus the means to support themselves.

Through a variety of policies, practices, and means the Crown wrested control of the majority of lands from Māori by 1919. The state usually targeted those lands that had the most resources, whether it was prime arable land, or had some timber or mineral value. The Crown used three basic means to secure land: confiscation, Crown land purchases, and the rulings of the Native Land Court. The *raupatu* (confiscations) were ostensibly a punishment that was levied against certain tribes or sub-tribes on the basis of treason against the Crown. But, those constituted a minority of the land acquisitions. In most cases, alienation was achieved through a combination of direct and indirect economic pressures by Crown agents or the State apparatus of the Native Land Court. Several authors argue that the intentions of the Crown were clear: it desired to separate Māori from their land regardless of whether *iwi* had been ‘loyal’ to the Crown during land wars or not. Partially this was to facilitate settlement of Europeans, but also, as Nuttall explains, the existence of a landed peasantry constituted a powerful barrier to the expansion of capitalism. Many Māori had eagerly begun the shift from a subsistence-based economy to one oriented towards the production of surplus for market. This gave few opportunities for Europeans to acquire either land or labor. Forced dispossession was
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42 Ruth Nuttall, “Land for the Forests: A Shadow for the People” (University of Auckland, 1980), 119; Durie, 115-116. By 1919, Māori retained only 5 million acres of the 66 million acres that comprise New Zealand’s total land mass. By 1977 only 4.9 percent of all lands continued to be under Māori ownership.
44 Nuttall, 5-6.
one means to destroy their control over economic production. Māori land ownership decreased from 66,400,000 acres in 1840 to 11,079,486 acres at the end of the nineteenth century, and to 4,028,903 acres by 1939. Further losses happened throughout the twentieth century.

Only in the last two decades has Māori land ownership increased, though it is still below 1939 levels. Prior to the Treelords Settlement, Māori owned approximately six percent of all lands in New Zealand. The 2008 Treelords Settlement involves a further 434,905 acres (176,000 hectares), which equates to a little over a half of one percent increase of the total land base.

The Treelords Settlement is an agreement between the Crown and several Māori groups of the Te Urewera-Kaingaroa region that involves the transfer of Kaingaroa and associated tree assets to those Māori interests. This makes it the largest Waitangi claims settlement to date. This deal was signed into law in September 2008 as the Central North Island Forests Land Collective Settlement Bill. This legislation addresses a combined claims settlement that is worth NZ$195.7 million of land, NZ$223 million in accumulated rentals, and an annual income of NZ$13 million. The land in question totals 434,900 acres (176,000 hectares). Not only is this the largest deal to date, but it addresses

45 Durie, 115-148.
46 Ibid; Ministry of Treaty of Waitangi Negotiations and Ministry of Maori Affairs, Deed of Settlement of the Historical Claims of CNI (Central North Island) Forests Iwi Collective to the Central North Island Forests Land 2008; Ministry of Treaty of Waitangi Negotiations and Ministry of Maori Affairs, Summary of Deed of Settlement of the Historical Claims of CNI (Central North Island) Forests Iwi Collective to the Central North Island Forests Land 2008.
48 Affairs, Deed of Settlement of the Historical Claims of CNI (Central North Island) Forests Iwi Collective to the Central North Island Forests Land; Affairs, Summary of Deed of Settlement of the Historical Claims of CNI (Central North Island) Forests Iwi Collective to the Central North Island Forests Land; CNI Iwi Holdings Ltd., "Central North Island Iwi Collective" http://www.cniiwiholdingsltd.co.nz/ (accessed August 4, 2010 2010).
the claims of eight different *iwi* who include: Ngai Tūhoe, Ngati Tuwharetoa, Ngati Whakaue, Ngati Whare, Ngati Manawa, Raukawa, Ngati Rangitihi, and the Affiliate Te Arawa *iwi* and *Hapu*. Together, these *iwi* have over 100,000 members. Again, this dissertation relates to the experiences of people prior to that settlement.

1.3.2 IMPACTS OF LAND LOSS

The processes of land loss had severe impacts on native communities. The mechanism of the Native Land Court was usually time-consuming, expensive, and extremely disruptive to subsistence systems. Hapu and whanau (families) would have to be on the road for weeks at a time to attend court, which frequently sat at inconvenient distances. Left untended, many Māori crops failed, leading to widespread food shortages, distress, and in many cases, famine. Many Māori adopted European-style agricultural practices. But, the successes of all land management practices were limited by the fact that the portions of land that tangata whenua retained were often of marginal quality, fragmented, and were frequently inaccessible. Interactions with the Crown and changes to land tenure disrupted the inter- and intra-tribal and hapu networks that formed broader regional economies and underwrote the survival of kin-based units.

The problems of land management were frequently compounded by structural limitations. Native communities suffered from labor shortages. The loss of their lands forced many people to seek wage employment. This often necessitated extensive
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50 Bird, 29-33; Durie, 115-148; Hutton and Neumann, 178-81; Boast, 133, 146.
absences from their communities, which limited the amount of labor available for developing those remaining portions of land.

Another serious issue was a lack of capital to finance the development of their lands. The complicated renderings of title made it extremely difficult for Māori to get loans. In addition, the government took the position that assistance to Māori would only lead to their dependency. One of the few ways of raising money was the sale of land, but so little remained that tangata whenua did all they could to avoid that option. The other option was to lease it to Pakeha. Nuttall notes that “significant amounts of ‘Maori’ land have always been effectively removed from Maori control and use, through leases to Europeans and development schemes.” She notes that by 1950 only 17 percent of all usable Māori land was being utilized by Māori owners; this comprised only 12.5 percent of all Māori holdings. She goes on to argue that legislation and policy regarding Native land facilitated further alienations instead of assisting tangata whenua owners to develop their lands. The end result was that Māori owners often became wage workers for their lessees on their own lands.

After Ngata became Native Minister in 1928, he pursued different development strategies that focused on improving the economic base at the community level rather than at the level of the individual person. But, he faced a great deal of opposition from other members of government and his policies were undermined after 1945. As a result of this, a significant amount of Māori land remained under native vegetation, secondary regrowth, or was otherwise not converted to agricultural production.
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51 Nuttall, 199-120; Durie.
52 Nuttall, 199-20.
53 Bird, 29-33; Durie, 115-148; Hutton and Neumann, 178-81; Boast, 133, 146.
1.3.3 NEW ECONOMIC DIRECTIONS: FORESTRY

In contrast to Māori conceptions of the meaning and uses of land, Pakeha attitudes towards land and its use were predominantly utilitarian.\(^54\) For the young colony, agricultural production held primacy (This idea is elaborated in Chapter Four). Because of the above limitations, there was a widespread perception among Pakeha that Māori were incapable of managing their lands and, because those lands were not actively being used for economic gain, they were going to waste.

The lands which had not been leased from Māori tended to be marginal for agricultural or settlement purposes. After the development of new forestry technologies, however, these remaining lands became valuable from a forestry development perspective.\(^55\)

At the end of the nineteenth century, the state became involved in managing forests. In the early twentieth century, the government pursued a policy of afforestation of tree plantations. Initial successes led forestry officials to press for more lands. Walzl notes that the perception that Māori lands were underutilized led many forestry officials to press for further alienation from Māori.\(^56\) Crown officials used a variety of methods, some of which were coercive, to get Māori to part with their lands.\(^57\)

The practice of purchasing Māori land for afforestation continued into the 1960s, at which time a new method of acquiring land was created: the long-term lease. This enabled the state to acquire land for forestry while allowing Māori to retain ownership,

\(^{54}\) Michael Roche, "The New Zealand Timber Economy, 1840-1935," *Journal of Historical Geography* 16, no. 3 (1990); Roche, "The State as Conservationist, 1920-60: 'Wise Use' of Forests, Lands, and Water."

\(^{55}\) Nuttall, 119-152.

\(^{56}\) Walzl, 901.

\(^{57}\) Bird, 29-33; Roche, *History of Forestry*; Walzl, 901; Durie, 115-148; Hutton and Neumann, 178-81; Boast, 133, 146.
which was, and remains, an issue of great importance. This also generated a modest income, and thus became a means for Māori to utilize their lands to support themselves.\footnote{BBFZ 4945 25c, Afforestation of Maori Land, 1960-1983; Alan Ward, The Rangahaua Whanui National Overview Report, volume iii (Wellington: Waitangi Tribunal, 1997),}

Under the lease system, Māori owners retain ownership of their lands while private companies or the New Zealand Forest Service, who were lessees, pay the owners for the use of those lands to produce tree plantations. Typically, these initial leases granted no management powers to land owners. Furthermore, given the amount of time necessary to produce a tree crop (the plantations are predominantly \textit{Pinus radiata}), a minimum of thirty years, the leases were long-term. Early leases were commonly three rotations at thirty-three years each, for a total of ninety-nine years. In return for these leases, landowners could either get an annual fee or rental for the use of their lands, or they could get a stumpage fee, a share of the proceeds generated from the sale of the sawn timber. Sometimes owners would get a mixture of the two.\footnote{BBFZ 4945 25c; Ward, The Rangahaua Whanui National Overview Report, volume iii,}

These leases tended to be exploitative in that the majority of economic returns from the planting and harvesting of trees went to the lessees rather than the owners and that the owners had no say in how their lands were managed. A serious concern is that the vast majority of exotic forests on Māori land have been produced by lessees rather than the owners. Furthermore, some people have questioned the local benefits of forestry plantations compared with other types of land development, particularly when the former does not directly involve the owners in management.\footnote{Nuttall, iii; Hutton and Neumann, 569-599; Walzl, 700, 727.}
Much private Māori land has been leased by private forestry corporations for exotic plantations. These forests were developed in different stages, places, and times throughout the twentieth century and involve many different iwi and hapu (sub-tribe). The lease terms are just as varied, with more culturally specific provisions included in later leases. What is common, however, is the long growth time of the trees. So, while there is a great deal of diversity to Māori experience with exotic forestry, one common aspect is that it is a long-term commitment. While Māori land accounts for 588,100 acres (238,000 hectares) or thirteen percent of the total exotic forests, prior to Treelords, they only owned 49,420 acres (20,000 hectares) of forests, or one percent of the total estate.

The extraordinary loss of lands described above was devastating to the complex socio-cultural systems of tangata whenua. Throughout the entire process, tangata whenua used different strategies to resist these changes. Over the ensuing years, Māori repeatedly contested these Treaty breaches through a variety of avenues, but it was not until 1975 that legislation was enacted that gave Māori a legal way to seek redress. The Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975 established a judicial means to address grievances through the creation of the Waitangi Tribunal. This Tribunal, along with affiliated systems and bodies, established a permanent forum for inquiry into claims regarding the Crown’s actions. The actual process of preparing and then submitting a claim, however, can be incredibly formidable, costly, and time-consuming. One of the chief areas of dispute was the extensive alienation of land from Māori, many of whom sought redress through the restoration of their lands or other compensation. The Crown was not prepared to return

61 Walzl, 544; 25c; Robert Miller, Yvette Dickinson, and Alan Reid, *Maori Connections to Forestry in New Zealand* (Brisbane, Australia: Fenner School of Environment & Society, ANU College of Science, 2007),
62 Miller, Dickinson, and Reid, *This information is based on a Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry survey, which was conducted in 2000.*
any lands that had shifted to private ownership, but was willing to discuss the possibility of return of some of its public land holdings.⁶³

Among many of these disputed lands were areas of extensive exotic tree plantations. With the introduction of the neoliberal Labour party government of 1984, there was a policy shift towards the privatization of much of the Crown’s assets, including the attempted sale of the State’s exotic forests. This was met with a great outcry from Māori, many of whom still disputed the Crown’s claim to ownership of said lands. Court action against the Crown resulted in Crown Forest Assets Act 1989, which allowed the Crown to continue to sell forest licenses, but prevented the sale of lands until the Waitangi Tribunal could ascertain ownership. The Act also provided for the establishment of an organization, the Crown Forestry Rental Trust to hold the proceeds from rentals of Crown lands. The Trust is charged with assisting Māori in investigating and presenting claims regarding forested lands before the Tribunal as well as the documentation of such findings in reports. In some cases, these reports are directly commissioned or produced by Māori communities. Several of these reports, as well as additional scholarly research, detail the ways by which these disputed lands were alienated from Māori.⁶⁴ The actual transfers of ownership are contextualized in wider
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relationships of Māori to land, Crown relationships with Māori, and the shifting economic and political climate. This is dealt with more fully in Chapter Three.⁶⁵

1.4 THE GLOBAL AND THE LOCAL: INTRODUCING THEORY

Globalization is a reality that demands attention. Often research on globalization is done at a regional or global scale. But what about the local impacts of globalization? What about the experiences of the people who are dealing with such changes? I wanted to find out how the global industry of timber production was experienced by Māori, and, in doing so, I was hoping to show the diversity of experiences and perspectives of contemporary Māori. Why Māori? Because they are tangata whenua, which translates as ‘the people of the land.’ They tend to place a great deal of importance on their connections to their lands. It follows that changes to their land and the introductions of new ways of relating to their land must also be important. Prior to contact with Europeans they had a mixture of spiritual, cultural, tribal, and economic connections to land. Forestry introduced additional economic and legal connections. Contemporary Māori participate in a market economy; however, this does not make them less authentic.

Indigenous peoples are often depicted as a monolithic entity with the same priorities and interests and are temporally fixed and therefore excluded from the modern, global world. It is not so much that they are written about as all being the same, but that there is little mention of the great diversity within an indigenous grouping. The Māori of New Zealand are no exception. Indeed, the word Māori is a generic term for the indigenous peoples of Aotearoa/New Zealand. Durie notes that prior to the colonial

encounter, the word meant “normal or usual.” Often, the peoples who could be called Māori prefer to be identified by the name of their *iwi* or *hapu*. In regard to their historic experiences, the details have frequently been glossed over, yet scholarship now recognizes that the colonial encounter varies spatially and temporally. Additionally, the historic context informs current conditions and opportunities, thus it is important to study. Temporal fixing not only creates a reified and circumscribed identity, but it denies indigenous peoples from full participation in the modern world, for to do so would result in a loss of so-called authenticity. In order to move beyond such problematic constructions and emphasize cotemporaneity one must acknowledge ongoing change as well as attend to “fully contemporary circumstances” and issues in terms of interconnections with global material economies. Indigenous peoples are like all peoples, they are culturally dynamic. Māori participate in the modern global world and their traditions and cultures continue to be important.

Tsing and Marcus each highlight the tension between studying overarching social structures, i.e. globalization and studying a locale. Both employ different ethnographic
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tools, but each contends that the emphasis on globalization requires new ways of thinking about fieldwork. Marcus argues that the ways in which research is designed and carried out need to be reworked. He proposes a multi-sited research imaginary, which involves focusing on different concepts in addition to different places; he uses, as an example, separately examining dynastic families and their wealth. Rather than an in-depth ethnographic study that is located in a single place, Marcus suggests instead that research focus on different social, political, and economic relationships. This could mean studying a phenomenon at different scales, or tracing, for example, a commodity, through various stages of its production, consumption, and change. Thus, it draws in a temporal and spatial dimension to such analyses.

Tsing’s work is helpful by outlining ways in which different and often divergent social interactions at multiple scales are played out. In contrast to the idea of a “clash” of cultures or the imposition of capitalism or globalization on place, Tsing uses the metaphor of “friction” to highlight the ways in which ideas, people, technologies, entities, and economies are brought into uneasy contact with one another to create unpredictable trajectories and outcomes, thus drawing attention to the many different actors involved. She argues that the particularities of the interactions are important to shaping their outcome. Tsing argues that it is not practical to conduct a full ethnography at each point along the local to global trajectory, but, by examining different places and social groups it is possible to come across “odd connections.” Here the key is looking at the ways in which different people, technologies, ideas, and organisms are brought together in unique
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ways over time. Thus, the emphasis is on the linkages or the changing networks in what Tsing refers to as “an ethnography of global connection.”73

In many ways Māori lives and the planted forests have become deeply enmeshed. This changing relationship signals the dynamism of trees and of Māori culture, and also the significance of place to Māori lives. Henare notes that self-conscious reflection upon one’s culture is not the sole prerogative of Western societies.74 Mary Louise Pratt refers to this as transculturation, “a phenomenon of the contact zone” in which indigenous peoples selectively collaborate with and appropriate different concepts introduced by the colonial encounter.75

What I decided to do was focus on some of the ways in which the Māori relationships to trees and places have changed through interactions between the local and global. Trees are a way of approaching some of the relationships between traditional and modern Māori. This is not about Māori forgetting the past, nor about them maintaining some temporally fixed identity, but about adding new layers of interest and ways of interacting.

In order to accomplish this I felt the best approach would involve multi-sited research by which I would be able to compare and contrast the historic and recent experiences of Māori from several different backgrounds and iwi. This also works to overcome the reduction of Māori to a monolithic culture by attending to aspects of their

73 Ibid., ix.
significant diversity. I decided to study two different geographic communities and focus on their interconnections with *Pinus radiata*.

### 1.5 KEY QUESTIONS

In this dissertation, I examine the historic relationships between place-based *tangata whenua* and globalizing European (primarily British) peoples and then address the ways in which these interactions affected economic practices, land rights, and environmental use patterns. I follow this with an exploration of some of the diversity that characterizes Māori concerns regarding land, economy, and society. Specifically, I will analyze some of the interplay between afforestation, tribal income, land development and management at the local, regional, national, and international levels, and how these shape relationships between people and land. While I will draw out differences between Western rational scientific forestry and place-based understandings of land, I will argue that these two approaches are not entirely oppositional and that many Māori have a mixture of responses to, or understandings and attitudes about forestry. As with all people, Māori should not be generalized except to say that they display significant diversity. The goal is to question some of the social constructions of nature and to show that the New Zealand State’s introduction of industrial forestry did not replace Māori interactions with forests, trees, and lands, but overlaid them with new relationships of economic, and educational concerns. Thus, this is an exploration of the dynamic relationships between people and place. Furthermore, I will show that globalization is not something that is happening to Māori, but is something *with which* many actively engage.
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This research focuses on the experiences of people prior to the Treelords Settlement and will fill in some gaps in scholarship in terms of analyzing the relationships between Māori and exotic forestry, particularly with regard to connectivity to place.\textsuperscript{77}

The key questions that guide my work include:

**Local and Global:**

1) How did Aotearoa/New Zealand become integrated into the world economy? How did the introduction of spatializing strategies associated with European systems of governance and a capitalistic economic system affect land use and economic opportunities? How did Māori react to these changes?

In order to answer these questions, I will discuss the colonial encounter and the ways in which this led to changing property rights, land use, and economic options. I will also address the impacts on resource consumption patterns. Finally, I will discuss the different ways in which Māori participated in the developing economy.

**Scientific forestry**

2) What were the conditions that led to the formation of large-scale industrial forestry? From where did forestry technologies and ideas originate? What were characteristics of this approach to forestry as it was practiced in New Zealand?

These questions require a review of forest management practices as they emerged in Germany and Great Britain and the particular cultural perspectives associated with such approaches. The importation of these ideas into New Zealand, however, was not a simple

\textsuperscript{77} John Hutton. 2006. Personal Communication. Auckland. 8/31/06,
transmission from one place to the next. Specific aspects of New Zealand shaped the ways in which forestry developed in that country. One of the outcomes was that an imported tree, *Pinus radiata* (Monterey Pine), became the main species of an exotic plantation system.

3) How did *Pinus radiata* (Monterey Pine) get to New Zealand? Who was involved in the process?

This will require an analysis of some of the specific factors, including the characteristics of *radiata*, that led to its adoption as the main tree species of industrial forestry. The reliance on an exotic tree species had important ramifications for the directions in which forestry went. Thus, this address aspects of tree agency.

Māori and forestry:

4) What was the impact of the new forestry on Māori? What are some the ways in which Māori relate to the new forests?

The rise and subsequent restructuring of industrial forestry has been documented in various ways. This dissertation will review how this affected Māori communities including their economic opportunities and land use. Through my own research into communities I will demonstrate some of the ways in which the industry intersected with and shaped Māori efforts to retain and/or recover their *rangatiratanga* (autonomy). This work will also draw attention to some of the diverse ways in which Māori participate in the forestry sector.
5) What do Māori think about these forests? How do they feel about Monterey Pine?

This dissertation highlights diversity among contemporary Māori. Thus, it draws from discussions conducted with a variety of people who represent two different geographic areas. It will also show that the meanings people draw from forests are contingent on many different factors that include cultural, social, environmental, and economic. This has at least two implications: first, people have different perspectives and values; and second, meanings of forests are not defined solely by capitalism.

Māori and Globalization:

6) How have Māori engaged with different processes of globalization, as viewed through the lens of exotic forestry? How have Māori influenced the practice of forestry at different scales?

Exotic forestry has created certain opportunities and blocked others. This dissertation is based on the recognition that Māori have been actively engaged with forestry at a variety of scales. Different examples of such interactions are discussed. The goal is to show that Māori are neither passive nor temporally fixed. The incorporation of new ideas and technologies into New Zealand has meant that Māori have added additional layers of economic, educational, and political interests to their ways of life, but Māori have also actively shaped the ways in which forestry is practiced around the world.

Māori and place:

7) How has forestry shaped place? How does it affect Māori relationships with place? How do Māori shape place?
Māori culture has evolved around close connections between people and their lands. The long growing cycle of trees raises the question of whether or not *Pinus radiata* plantations affect Māori relationships with their lands and, if so, to what extent. This dissertation will also look at how Māori participate in producing places.

1.6 HOW I DID THE WORK

For the purposes of this dissertation multi-sited research is a means to study how indigenous peoples interact with the global world and how these interactions have developed over time. It is a means to show their diversity by comparing the experiences of Māori from different geographic regions. This approach also enables one to focus on *Pinus radiata* itself and pull in elements of its complex histories. Thus, this research enables attention to the agency of trees. In order to draw attention to these different elements, this work approaches the topic from several different directions. Focusing on the different aspects of the interactions between Māori, the Crown, and forestry make it possible to highlight the contingent qualities of these relationships.

This dissertation is built on a theoretical framework that incorporates the interactions between the global and the local. This necessitated research into what is meant by the term global and how it has been theorized in academia. I conducted an analysis of how place is understood within Māori culture, broadly, and then how place, or the local, has been addressed within geography. I followed these with a literature review of scholars have sought to bridge Indigenous with Western analyses of place. Finally, I explored some of the new literature about resolving the tensions between the local and the global and the importance of such research.
I then conducted research into some of the many different components that inform the New Zealand system of scientific forestry. Analyzing it from multiple angles drew attention to the ways in which individual people, things, technologies, and circumstances at different scales influenced the development of forest management.

This theoretical section is followed by a review of the Aotearoa/New Zealand colonial encounter in terms of how it shaped property rights. This includes an historic treatment of the interactions between Māori and foreigners in terms of the varying ways in which a private property regime was introduced and Native land was alienated.

The focus then shifts to an overview of the ways in which changes to property rights affected environmental transformation and resource use as well as a discussion of the initial integration of New Zealand into an emerging global economy. Attention is directed towards forest consumption and land conversion to pastoral uses as well as the ways in which Māori participated in these activities. The chapter also includes an overview of the ways in which such changes were made manifest in the two study areas. This is followed by a discussion of how such commoditization of land and forest resources fits within broader colonial attitudes and practices.

The next section moves beyond New Zealand to analyze how forest consumption patterns combined with cultural and political developments and led to the organized management of forests and how that influenced power relations between state and citizenry. While Germany and England independently developed scientific forestry, both systems were closely tied to the rise of the modern state and its new methods of managing and controlling population, resources, and territory. Moreover, these ideas were then transported to other parts of the world.
The subsequent chapter is a discussion of how these ideas about forests and state power filtered through global networks to eventually influence New Zealand, and how those practices actually took shape in the specificity of the local context. It was at that point that Māori rights, lands, and labor are again influenced by state policies. A lack of sufficient options had virtually excluded them from meaningful participation with the developing economy in New Zealand. Despite Native interests, under scientific forestry their roles in forestry were again circumscribed. The chapter continues with a look at how the conditions of forestry changed during the neoliberal period and then shifts to a theoretical investigation of the relationship between trees, place, and people. It addresses the ways in which *Pinus radiata* insinuated itself into the development of the New Zealand industry. Various characteristics made it an ideal candidate for large-scale afforestation. Thus, the chapter also analyzes tree agency.

The succeeding portion is a discussion of the interviews. I talked to Māori from a range of different *iwi* affiliations and socio-economic backgrounds. Rather than generalizing, I wanted to show that connections and interactions with forestry could vary by *iwi*, experience, occupation, and other social factors. I am not necessarily drawing correlations, just demonstrating that there is a great deal of variety, complexity, and even ambivalence to such relationships. I note that all research is partial and is going to be influenced by the different people that participate. If I had asked those same people the same questions at another time, they might not have responded in the same way.
1.6.1 AREA AND ENVIRONMENT

This dissertation draws on research conducted in two case study areas: Te Urewera-Kaingaroa and Te Tairāwhiti (Figure 2). The former location is ideal because it is the site of the world’s second-largest, human-made forest: Kaingaroa. The second location was chosen because it represents a departure from the dominant forestry paradigm of New Zealand, which is production based, in that afforestation was initially pursued for erosion control purposes, so it was therefore, at least initially, partially a protection-oriented program.

1.6.1.1 TE UREWERA-KAINGAROA

The region of Te Urewera-Kaingaroa, which encompasses Lake Taupo and the Rotorua lakes area north to the Bay of Plenty, comprises about 3,511,773 acres (see Figure 3). Starting at Mount Ruapehu and moving north to Ngakuru then through the Pureora Forest and the Rotorua lakes area, the district border continues along the Kaituna River to Maketu at the coast. The lands of Ngati Awa and Ngai Te Rangi are a part of a separate district, which comprise the northern boundary for the volcanic plateau. To the east, the district includes the Kaingaroa forest. The research area extends east to include


Figure 2. Map of the Study Areas
Figure 3. Location map of Te Urewera-Kaingaroa
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the Te Urewera region, which includes Te Whaiti and Minginui in the Whirinaki Valley as well as Lake Waikaremoana. The Kaimanawa Range, along with the Whanganui River catchment and the peoples of that district, comprise the southern border. The western border is defined as the tribal boundary between Te Arawa and Ngati Tuwharetoa, which are included, and Ngati Raukawa and Tainui iwi, which lie outside of the district.78

The volcanic plateau, or Kaingaroa Plain, (as distinct from the Forest) is dominated by volcanic features, dissected by rivers and deep flat-bottomed gullies, and surrounded by mountain ranges. The terrain is relatively flat and easy, and it is largely covered in volcanic pumice from earlier eruptions. The climate in the region is fairly harsh with cold winters and frosts occasionally occurring into summer. The vegetation prior to the establishment of the pine forest comprised monoao, manuka, fern, and coarse grasses with some stands of native forests. At various times, buried totara logs have been unearthed, which suggests that the area had been previously covered in forests. Native rats, eels, and birds lived in the area.79

Current volcanic activity is located in the Taupo Volcanic Zone, which starts offshore beyond White Island and moves southwest to Tongariro. This zone encompasses Rotorua and Okataina in the northeast and, as one moves progressively southwest, Maroa and Taupo. This stretch of land lies alongside a zone of subduction.80

Volcanoes have shaped the geology of the region. Eruptions have deposited tephra and ignimbrites. The soils are primarily pumice, which are light and permeable,

78 Bryan J. Bargh, Rangahaua Whanui District 7: The Volcanic Plateau (Wellington: Waitangi Tribunal Division, 1995), 1-2; Ward, The Rangahaua Whanui National Overview Report, volume iii, 57, 119-120. Note that the Waitangi Tribunal defines Te Urewera and Kaingaroa separately, but, for the purposes of this research, they have been combined.
80 Bargh, 7.
however, they lack the mineral cobalt, the absence of which caused stock to die. By the end of the 1890s, Pakeha settlers were aware of the problem, but it took until the 1930s to determine the cause and then a cure for this “bush sickness.”

This region features Kaingaroa Forest, which occupies a broad swath that lies to the east of Taupo and, moving northeast, between the Rotorua lakes on the west and Te Urewera mountains on the east. The forest itself largely occupies the plain, although it is also on gentle foothills as well as steep hills.

Boyd credits the name of Kaingaroa, meaning ‘the long meal’ to the story of ‘The Curse of Manaia.’ She writes:

The meal was eaten by Haungaroa who came to New Zealand from Hawaiiki seeking Ngatoroirangi, a powerful tohunga, who had earlier travelled from Hawaiiki in the Arawa canoe. After Ngatiroirangi left Hawaiiki his sister Kuiwai, who remained behind, offended her tohunga husband, Manaia.

In his fury Manaia put a curse on Ngatoroirangi. Kuiwai then sent her daughter, her sister Haungaroa, and three other women to New Zealand to warn Ngatoroirangi of the curse. They travelled inland from the coast to a place where they had a good view over the plain and there stopped to eat, but Haungaroa continued eating so long that two of her companions teased her about her ‘long meal.’ Ever since the plain has been called Kaingaroa or Kaingaroa–Haungaroa – the Long Meal of Haungaroa.

According to the legend, Haungaroa was also responsible for two special cabbage trees that grew on the plain. Angry at being teased over the time she took to eat, Haungaroa struck the two women on the face. They ran from her and she went in pursuit, but she could not catch them and they would not come back so she changed them in to two cabbage trees which were said to stand and wait until travellers got near and then they would move away.

The Te Urewera region is mostly mountainous and covered in beech forests, though there are some flatter areas, such as the Galatea Basin and the northern portion
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81 Ibid., 7-8; Boyd, 9-10.
82 Boyd, 1.
83 Ibid., 4-.
towards the coast. In the mountains, the climate tends to be harsh; the area is subject to frequent frosts, which make agriculture difficult. This area is drained by the Whirinaki, Whakatane, and Waimana Rivers.

1.6.1.2 TE TAIRĀWHITI

The Te Tairāwhiti region is located on the northeast corner of the North Island (Figure 4). The Waitangi Tribunal defines this area as Gisborne and the East Coast, but I will primarily use the name Te Tairāwhiti. Gisborne is also known as the Poverty Bay area, both of which are European names for what tangata whenua call Turanganui-a-Kiwa. Ward’s National Overview report describes the area as follows:

The boundaries of this district run from a point just east of Cape Runaway southwest through the Raukumara and Huiaaru Ranges before turning south-east between the Ruakituri and Hangaroa Rivers and out to the coast just north of the Mahia Peninsula. The Gisborne sub-district coastal boundary between Ngati Porou to the north and Rongowhakata, Aitanga-a-Mahaki, and Ngai Tamanuhiri to the south was near the mouth of the Turanganui River (at the present location of the port of Gisborne), but is more indeterminate in the high country.84

The region, which is ninety miles long and thirty miles wide and is heavily mountainous, includes approximately 2,119,172 acres. Only nine percent of the land is flat while twelve percent can be described as “rolling” and seventy-nine percent “moderately – steep to steep.” The region’s coastline is deeply indented with a number of bays. This coastal strip, as well as the few level plains, have historically hosted Māori settlements. In terms of primary forms of economic development, the uplands are used

Figure 4. Location map of Te Tairāwhiti

Figure 4. Location Map of Te Tairāwhiti. Map by K. Harris. Scale: 1:830,000.

for ranching, wool production, and forestry while the flat lands have been used for dairy, market crops, and wine production.\(^85\)

The region contains two major river systems: the Waipaoa and the Waiapu. The Waipaoa is within the Gisborne region, which is also known as Cook County. It drains an area of 535,000 acres and enters the ocean in Poverty Bay. The Waiapu is within the East Coast region, which was originally a part of Waiapu county, but is now in Gisborne District. This area is the rohe (territory) of Ngati Porou. The Waiapu catchment contains 424,500 acres. This river flows northeast past Ruatoria and drains into the Pacific near Ruatukia. Together the watersheds of these rivers constitute two-thirds of the region.\(^86\)

This region is extremely prone to erosion, being among the most vulnerable regions to erosion in the world. Phillips and Marden note that while the Te Tairāwhiti region only comprises 7.8 percent of the North Island, it accounts for 26 percent of the severely eroded lands.\(^87\) Put another way, 57 percent of Te Tairāwhiti is “severely erodible.” The Waiapu has the dubious distinction of carrying one of highest sediment loads in the southern hemisphere. It carries three times the sediment of the Waipaoa.\(^88\)

The underlying geology is comprised primarily of older rocks (argillites, greywackes, and basalts) in the north and west while the southern and eastern portions are dominated by younger rocks (mudstones, sandstones, and limestones). The argillites and mudstones tend to be unconsolidated and, therefore, unstable. The area is also known
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\(^{86}\) Taylor, 4.


for significant tectonic activity, which has facilitated uplift and the formation of crush zones. This has further destabilized the two main rock types. In areas displaying low or moderate slopes, erosion is typically limited to the soil horizon. In steep areas where the underlying rock is unstable, however, erosion may involve more extensive failure of the substrate through slumps or large-scale downslope movements.\(^89\)

Rock structure and relief are not the only causes of high levels of erosion. Climate is also crucial. This region is characterized by a high variability of rainfall as compared with the rest of the country. In a year the weather may alternate between the extremes of heavy, intense rain (one hundred inches per year in the Raukumara Range) and extended dry periods. Both argillite and mudstone form “swelling clays” which greatly expand and contract, thus weakening the soil and facilitating downslope movement. Because of the intensity and concentrated timing of rain events, flooding is common and can be severe. Extreme weather such as storms and infrequent cyclones are also a problem for this area. Such events have led to twenty-nine different severe floods since the turn of the twentieth century.\(^90\) The last significant storm was the 1988 Cyclone Bola, which caused substantial damage throughout the region. Though there have been subsequent severe storms, they have not had the flooding impact of Bola. In addition, the area is frequently subject to powerful earthquakes, which also contribute to erosion.\(^91\)

Vegetative cover also plays a role. The presence of vegetation acts as a stabilizing force upon soil and rock hydrologically and mechanically. With regard to the former, vegetation serves to intercept precipitation and to transpire moisture back into the atmosphere. Mechanically, vegetation minimizes soil mobility through the root

\(^89\) Coombes, 43; Taylor, 4-5; Phillips and Marden, 524-528.  
\(^90\) Phillips and Marden, 524-528.  
\(^91\) Coombes, 43; Taylor, 4-5.
structures, which bind soil particles together and, in some circumstances, to the bedrock. Generally, closed canopy forests offer greater protection against erosion compared to grasses. There are exceptions; when a tree falls, it tends to rip out the surrounding soils and rocks. The native vegetation type for this region was beech forests in the higher elevations and broadleaf podocarps below 600 meters. However, this region has been extensively deforested, which has compounded the natural occurring processes that make this region highly susceptible to erosion.92

1.6.2 HISTORIC OCCUPATION

1.6.2.1 TE UREWERA-KAINGAROA93

Several iwi (tribes) and hapu (sub-tribes) have long-standing land rights in the Te Urewera-Kaingaroa region. Ward points out that frequent intermarriage and political alliances led to a complex network of tribal interconnections and boundaries (see Figure 5).94 Furthermore, the people themselves tended to move around and share one another’s territory. Thus, it is better to conceive of boundaries as being flexible and fluid. The tribes also shared economic relationships with one another, frequently exchanging goods. So, while there were independent entities, they were interdependently connected as part of a large regional economy. There were roughly 4000 to 5000 tangata whenua living in the Te Urewera-Kaingaroa in 1840. It is important to point out that people had different habitation patterns and would move back and forth over variable stretches of time.

92 Phillips and Marden, 517-524; Taylor, 4-5; Coombes, 18, 47.
93 The following section is drawn from Bargh, 1-2; Ward, The Rangahaua Whanui National Overview Report, volume iii, 120-122; Armstrong, 8; Peter McBurney, Ngati Manawa & the Crown 1840-1927 (Auckland: Crown Forestry Rental Trust, 2004), 16, 64-65.
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Ngati Manawa traditionally occupied that portion of the plain where Kaingaroa Forest now exists. Their eastern boundary was shared with Ngati Whare and Patuheaheu, who occupied the foothills and the Whirinaki Valley. Ngati Manawa, Ngati Whare, and Patuheaheu controlled the gateway between the Kaingaroa and Te Urewera (Note that the rohe of Ngati Manawa and Ngati Whare have a significant amount of overlap; however, there are core areas that are undisputed and which do not overlap. The former is represented with cross-hatching). Te Urewera is rough mountain country, which continues to be the home of Tūhoe. To the west of Ngati Manawa are Te Arawa and Ngati Tuwhareroa lands. Starting from Ngakuru, Te Arawa occupied the lands to the north through the Rotorua lakes and down the Kaituna River towards Maketu at the coast while Ngati Tuwhareroa occupied lands to the south, encompassing Lake Taupo. Between them, Ngati Tahu were a kind of buffer, occupying the lands around Lake Rotokawa and along the Waikato River. At the lakes themselves, several iwi had territory:

The principal iwi of Lake Rotorua were Ngati Whakaue (the western lake area); Ngati Rangiwehehi (from Awahou to Mourea); Ngati Pikiao (from Mourea east to Lakes Rotoiti, Rotoehu, and Rotoma); Ngati Rangiteaorere and Ngati Uenukukopako (from Mourea to the south-west); and Tuhourangi (to the south of the lake).\textsuperscript{95}

To the north and east, Ngati Awa occupied lands from Lake Rotoma north and east towards the coast. They share flexible borders with Te Arawa and are adjacent to Ngati Manawa in the south.

\textsuperscript{95} Ibid.,
1.6.2.2 TE TAIRĀWHITI

Traditional tribal boundaries in the region were fluid owing to the complexity of intermarriage and alliances between various *iwi* and *hapu*. In 1840, the native population was roughly 9000 to 10,000 people. Interaction with Europeans initiated a steep decline in the Māori population to 3526 in 1891, but this was followed by a robust increase to 8449 in 1936. The main *iwi* in the region include Ngati Porou, Te Aitanga-a-Mahaki, Rongowhakata, and Ngai Tamanuhiri. There was, however, a great deal of movement of various *hapu*, which led to “the evolution of larger tribal groupings in Poverty Bay by 1840.” The boundaries between tribal groupings was not always fixed or sharply defined; there were areas of overlapping land claims (see Figure 6).

Ngati Porou historically occupied the northeastern portion of Te Tairāwhiti. Ward describes their lands as follows:

The boundaries of Ngati Porou’s land, as laid down by the Native Land Court, run from Potikirua on the coastline between Cape Runaway and East Cape and Te Toka a Taiau (a rock in the mouth of the Turanganui a Kiwa River...). The inland boundary is marked to the west by the Raukumara Range and to the south by the Waipaoa and Waimata Rivers.  

Te Aitanga-a-Mahaki, Rongowhakata, and Ngai Tamanuhiri’s individual rohe (areas of interest and rights) have significant amounts of overlap as outlined below:

About 1840, Te Aitanga-a-Mahaki were bordered to the north by the Waimata River (with interests beyond it); to the west by Arowhana; to the south-east (meeting Tuhoe interests) by the Huiaa Range and Maungapohatu; and to the south (with Rongowhakata) at Repongaere and Tangihana.
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Figure 6. Map of Areas of Historic Occupation by Iwi in Te Tairāwhiti
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Rongowhakata met with Aitanga-a-Mahaki as described above, and also with Ngai Tamanuhiri at Muriwai. To the south and south-east, Rongowhakata interests met with those of Ngati Kahungunu, while to the west and south-west, at Te Reinga-Ruakituri, they met Ngati Kahungunu-Ngati Ruapani of Waikaremoana.

Ngai Tamanuhiri (formally known by the tribal name Ngai Tahupo) are of Kahungunu descent and also share connections with Ngai Tahu, prior to that iwi’s migration south. At 1840, this group continued to occupy the Muriwai area and south to Paritu, including Te Kuri o Pawa (Young Nick’s Head), neighbouring the interests of Rongowhakata and Ngati Kahungunu.98

These tribal boundaries are depicted on the map. Currently, Ngati Porou comprise roughly eighty-five percent of the Māori population of this region.

1.6.3 METHODS

1.6.3.1 LITERATURE REVIEW

This dissertation emerged out of research on how the colonial encounter influenced interactions between people and their environments in terms of use of nature, rates of such use, and general attitudes about the physical world. The initial stages of this dissertation involved an extensive literature review of the colonial encounter in different parts of the world and, in particular, how colonial agents sought to convert places into locations of resources that could be appropriated. These types of studies included environmental histories and analyzes of the emergence of concepts including preservation, conservation, national parks, and forest management. The background reading also addressed relationships between colonial and indigenous forces and how these interactions were tied into struggles over resources.

98 Ibid., 86.
1.6.3.2 WAITANGI REPORTS, LIBRARY, AND ARCHIVAL DATA

The next step was to establish the New Zealand context of the interactions between Māori, Crown, land, and forests. Three different sources of literature have been important in this regard and include Waitangi reports, library resources, and archival records. In addition to providing background information on the history of Crown and Māori relationships in the area, these data have been essential for providing an overview of the ways in which forestry had been implemented as well as ongoing forestry projects. The literature also provided some nuance about the individual areas in terms of legislative barriers to land development, future possibilities for land use, and various additional perspectives on exotic forestry.

As mentioned above, Waitangi reports by community researchers or through Crown Forestry Rental Trust have been essential for setting up an historical framework for land dispossessions and relationships between Māori and the Crown. These were valuable for establishing a time line of events, for looking at the general pattern of interactions, and determining the specific histories in each of the case studies. Several people had individual reports, which they loaned to me for copying purposes. I also spoke with people at Crown Forestry Rental Trust who were willing to provide me with bound copies of certain reports. Some reports required the permission of the relevant communities before I could use them.

Library data was important for research that has already been done on this topic and identifying the ways in which, as well as the extent to which, the relationships between Māori and forestry have been studied. I visited University of Waikato’s library and The National Forestry Library at Scion, in Rotorua, which “contains one of the
largest collections of forestry, forest products, and pulp and paper literature in the Southern Hemisphere.”\textsuperscript{99} Library material also provided more of background information on the history of scientific forestry as it is practiced in New Zealand. I looked for historic data on how Māori relate to the forests in order to develop a picture of the temporal diversity and consistency of such relationships. There was not much information on this subject. There was, however, a lot of information on promoting afforestation on Māori land. I used this to establish some of the climate in which Māori had been encouraged to go ahead with afforestation. This is interesting in contrast to research that analyzes Native land development and why it has been circumscribed. There is one case study of Māori perspectives on forestry in the East Coast, but it is fairly limited in what it covers.\textsuperscript{100}

One of the reasons that I have looked into archival materials is to find lease agreements for lands planted in exotic trees. This has been important for identifying the major concerns land owners had regarding the long term leasing of their lands. I also wanted to see how the leases vary spatially and temporally. In a few conversations, I asked people how the leases were crafted and if the experiences of Māori from other iwi who had already gotten into forestry have affected the framework of their own leases. They denied that such experience would have influenced their own decisions. It almost seemed as though they wanted no credit to go to anyone else for what they decided to do. But, perhaps this had more to do with a lack of communication between the people of different regions. A few people did say that when there were a series of leases that were

developed in their own areas, the *hapu* elders in charge of the leases would get better and better at writing to the benefit of their own sub-tribe.

One of the things that I noticed when I was looking through the archives was a significant presence of data about aerial spraying or pesticide treatment of the pines. This would seem to indicate that the emphasis in official forestry communications was management of forests at certain stages rather than development of new resources or owner concerns.

### 1.6.3.3 MODERN PERSPECTIVES: COMMUNITY-ORIENTED RESEARCH

To build a sense of some of the modern perspectives on these changes, it was necessary to conduct some in-depth interviews. In formulating the doctoral research, I looked at different models for working with communities. I incorporated the ethical perspectives that inform such critical ethnography approaches as collaborative or participatory study. To that end, I worked to be open and clear with the participants about what my research meant, to be aware of power issues, to pay attention to the process, and to focus on building relationships.

A mistake that has been, and continues to be, made by researchers is acting in a disrespectful manner towards the peoples with whom they conduct their work. Sometimes this results from cultural biases, such as the concept of objectivity or cultural hierarchy, but other times it is out of ignorance of cultural protocol; neither is acceptable.¹⁰¹ There are a variety of suggestions that I tried, and continue to try, to keep
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in mind. Scholars offer additional suggestions about how research should be done. Light and Kleiber direct the academic to ask whom the research is for and remind the researcher that the burden is upon them to seek feedback. They also stress the need to be open with people and to constantly seek feedback. Hume and Mulcock argue for the need for constant reflexivity in qualitative fieldwork. Cayan points out the need for appropriate protocol. Harvey suggests that rather than operating as a participant observer, researchers consider the position of guests. He writes “guesthood demands that researchers seek a common ground that recognizes the priority and even the prestige of local hosts.” Losch reminds scholars to give credit to the communities for their hospitality and help. Cauchois points out that Native researchers do not have the luxury to turn their backs on the field. O’Nell points out that you can never repay the communities. One step towards giving back is to develop a long-term relationship with the communities, though this is even more complicated when it comes to maintaining
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contact with disparate individuals in different locations. It is also important to emphasize process over product.

It is the responsibility of the researcher to carefully prepare for the field in all ways, this includes learning appropriate protocol. Drawing from the ethical procedures that Smith outlines I kept in mind the following protocol:

- Aroha ki te tangata (a respect for the people).
- Kanohi kitea (the seen face, that is present yourself to people face to face).
- Tiriti, whakarongo...korero (look, listen...speak).
- Manaaki ki te tangata (share and host people, be generous).
- Kia tupato (be cautious).
- Kaua e takahia te mana o te tangata (do not trample over the mana of people).
- Kaua e mahaki (don’t flaunt your knowledge).^{110}

Because of time and financial constraints, I felt that a judicious approach would be to visit New Zealand for reconnaissance. I spent three weeks there in July 2006. I went there to determine whether or not my project was feasible. In order to do that, I sought out several people who were connected to forestry to get their feedback on my research plans. While there, I talked to some different people about my ideas and decided that I wanted to build the work around individual conversations with people and that I wanted to include their words in the text, to let them speak for themselves. I followed this visit up with five and a half months of fieldwork from November 2006 to mid-April 2007.

I loosely identified two regions where I wanted to work. In choosing field locations I based my decision on some practical considerations. I wanted to work in two different places in order to draw comparisons within and between communities. I needed places where there were extensive exotic forests in order to find enough impact on the wider communities from which I would draw participants. I also wanted areas that had

^{110} Smith, 120.
different histories of forestry development. While there are exotic forest estates on both the North and South Islands of New Zealand, distance, time, and cost were considerations. I also felt it was practical to work in areas where I already had some local contacts with which to build a network of participants.

The areas where I did my research are: Te Urewera-Kaingaroa and Te Tairāwhiti. I generally followed the geographic designations that were assigned by the Waitangi Tribunal for treaty claims. Numerous iwi and hapu have affiliations in these regions, though they are not necessarily exclusive to the specific zones. Te Urewera-Kaingaroa includes the lands of Ngati Manawa, Ngati Whare, Tūhoe, Ngati Awa, and Te Arawa. Te Tairāwhiti includes the traditional lands of Ngati Porou and Te Aitanga-a-Mahaki.

1.6.3.4 SELECTING PARTICIPANTS

In choosing the people with whom I spoke I used a qualitative method known as purposeful sampling. Drawing on Patton’s work on sampling, Bradshaw and Stratford outline different types of purposeful sampling. Since I planned to work intensively with a small number of people in each area and for a limited amount of time, I felt that the best approach would be “snowball” or “chain sampling.” These techniques involve identifying key informants and asking them to recommend other relevant people. I used these methods to meet or get in contact with roughly forty individuals out of whom I selected nineteen interviewees. I chose the final selection because they represent the breadth of relationships to forestry. The group includes forestry workers, managers, former State Forestry Service employees, the chair of a tribal land trust, and people who

---

own shares in land leased by forestry companies. Some of the people are younger (ranging in age from their mid-twenties to forties) and some are nearer to retirement (they are in their fifties to sixties and up). The industry is fairly close-knit. Many of the interviewees knew, or at least had heard of, one another. Several of the people are quite prominent in their communities. These are the participants with whom I conducted in-depth conversations.

Once I returned to New Zealand in November, I re-established contact with the people and sought additional participants. I met most people through informal connections via their friends or relatives; they referred me. This ended up being productive. People were fairly willing to talk to me because I had been vetted in that manner. This approach was highly subjective, but my intent was not to create a representative view of North Island Māori, only a cross-section.

1.6.3.5 THE PEOPLE

The selection of people I interviewed have different interests in forestry. I spoke with people who primarily represent Ngati Manawa, Ngati Whare, Tūhoe, Ngati Pikiao, and Te Arawa groups from the Kaingaroa-Te Urewera region and with people who are Ngati Porou and one man who is Te Aitanga-a-Mahaki from the Te Tairāwhiti area (see Table 1). Some of the people have connections beyond those iwi.

The people with whom I spoke represent different tribal connections in the area and they are all related to forestry in some way. Renee is a Ngati Whare and Ngati Manawa woman who is in her thirties. She is the daughter of a forestry worker and a department of conservation employee. She grew up in a forestry town. Renee and her
father were involved in conducting research for her hapu’s Waitangi Tribunal claim. Renee is in the process of finishing a law degree at Waikato.

Anaru is a librarian in Rotorua, who is in his sixties. He describes himself thus: “I am part Ngati Whare, Te Arawa, Tūhoe, Tuwharetoa. Ngati Manawa directly.” He owns more land in native forest than in exotic; the latter has been leased out for afforestation purposes. He serves as the chair for the trust that manages that particular land. Based on the growing cycle of pines, leases are negotiated for thirty-year sets. When I spoke with him, he was in the process of renegotiating the leases for his trust to reduce the time from a total of ninety years down to sixty.\textsuperscript{112}

Rapata was a lecturer at Waikato University and is now at Te Whare Wānanga of te Awanuiārangi. His people are Tūhoe, from the Te Urewera region to the east of Kaingarooa, and he is from Ngāti Ruapani and Te Arawa, but he grew up surrounded by the planted forests and has shares in a trust, which pays out dividends based on the money received from forestry leases. He is in his late thirties/early forties.

Maurice is Ngati Manawa and is in his sixties. He owns shares in land that has been leased for forestry. He has been in the industry since 1968 and used to work as a logging contractor, but sold his contract and now is semi-retired though he continues to “do audits for forest companies,” arranges cutting jobs, and does trouble-shooting.\textsuperscript{113}

The Cairns are a multi-generation forestry family. They are from Ngati Pikiao and Tūhoe, both of which have land leased out. George and Eliza, who are in their fifties, employ several of their children in their logging company. Over the years they have been involved in various aspects of the industry including silviculture and transport. Now they

\textsuperscript{112} Anaru Te Amo. 2006. Interview by author. Rotorua. December 4, 2006,
\textsuperscript{113} Maurice Toe Toe. 2006. Interview by author. Murupara, New Zealand. Dec. 18, 2006,
have a logging crew with contracts in the area. In addition, one of the Cairns sons, Tamati, who is in his late twenties/early thirties, is in the process of completing certification and training to work in forestry management. This is significant as Māori are generally not well represented in the management structure of forestry, though this has been changing in the last few years. Eliza’s mother, Rena Marsters, who is Ngati Pikiao and is in her late sixties/early seventies, also agreed to be interviewed as did her husband’s nephew, James Kiel, who is Tūhoe and in his thirties, works at the Te Puia, the Māori Arts and Crafts Institute.

The Newtons are another logging family. Willy is the patriarch and is in his fifties; he used to work for the Forest Service and has had experience with silviculture. His son Brett, who is in his thirties, has earned credentials and works in management. They are Ngati Pikiao. Willy’s father was directly involved in negotiating the leases for Ngati Pikiao lands. Speaking about the relationship of the hapu to the pine plantations, Brett notes

But, one of the blocks they bought the trees back off it. Bought the lease back so now they own the trees, but most of them well yeah they are on leasehold to the forest companies.¹¹⁴

So, the hapu has managed to assert greater control over the management of their lands.

John Ruru is from Te Aitanga-a-Mahaki and is in his sixties. He has had extensive experience with forestry in the area and currently runs a forestry consulting firm with his partner out of the Te Tairāwhiti region. He also serves as the chair of a tribal land trust and so makes decisions about land management. He first began his career in forestry working for the New Zealand Forest Service, where he first worked in native bush:

Wasn’t until 1957 that I started working for the New Zealand Forest Service that I became very much involved with native forests only from a commercial point of view and that was assessing the value of native forests for logging. We did that on State owned forests cause most sawmill and wood coming out onto the New Zealand market was coming out of native forests, out of State forests…Here we were asked by the Māori Land Court to assess the value of those blocks of native lands, to get a value for the trees on the block. So, we did both state and Māori land. And we lived in those forests. What I mean lived…We camped out in them, and we stayed there until the job was finished. Sometimes the jobs would take us two weeks sometimes it’d take us three months, depending on how big an area we had to cover…

When I started there, we were working inland forests, this was in the Bay of Plenty Rotorua area. And most of that extended way up over here to the whole of the East Coast down towards the Hawke’s Bay and into Lake Taupo and west of there and back right up to the Mamaku Plateau, which is you know the western side of Rotorua as you climb up from Rotorua up on the plateau on top and you hit the first line of bush there well that’s known as Mamaku Plateau. So, that’s where I worked initially in all the forests, native forests there…I was the Officer in Charge of the [Mangatu] forest in 1975.115

Under the New Zealand Forest Service, he was district forest ranger. After the restructuring, John was in charge of the Gisborne portion of the Forestry Corporation, which lies within Te Tairāwhiti.116

John Kopua is Ngati Porou. He is in his sixties and is recently retired from managing at Ngati Porou Whanui Forests where he was involved early on and oversaw the plantings of roughly 10,000 hectares. He began working in forestry when he was eighteen, and spent a great deal of his career working for the New Zealand Forest Service, where among other things, he worked in logging. He describes his personal history as follows:

My background in terms of genealogy has two focuses. My mother was of English Scottish descent and her parents, my great grandparents as part of the colonization drive way back in the 1800s. My father’s surname only

115 John Ruru. 2007. Interview by author. Gisborne, N.Z. November 27,
116 John Jones, "Forestry may be down but it still has essential role in this region," Gisborne Herald, Wednesday, 1 February 2006.
comes from this place here, Tokomaru Bay. Anyone who has that surname, you know who has the name Kopua you know that they originated from here, or that name originated from here. So, and I lost my father when I was two and lived with my mother. So, basically my upbringing was in a European type world with visits back to here with my Ngati Porou side. So, my mother died when I was 9 and basically I’ve been looked after by family until I was out of the home. I got into the forestry side of things after I’d left boarding school at 18 and I was looking for a job. I was going to be a teacher of all things, but I had a second thought about that having spent such a long time in a school environment, I was looking for wider spaces…I ended up at Kaingaroa and liked the physical and the outdoor sort of environment and I thought if I’m going to do this I might as well see how far I can go within this organization. Stayed at Kaingaroa…So that’s where I worked, initially…[then] shifted to another forest basically Tauranga, 6 years there. An opportunity came back up here, shifted over here [East Coast]. Was here for a few years and then the government changed how they wanted to do things and the forest service was devolved and decided I wanted to stay here so I built this house. Then the opportunity came up with Ngati Porou Forests and further on to Ngati Porou Whanui Forests. And I was there, since ’89 to a couple of years ago I suppose. Quite major put into serving that company and making it work. That’s generally my background and where I’ve ended up now. Have two children, two grandchildren which are great. So that’s where I’m at now.\(^\text{117}\)

Christopher is also Ngati Porou and, until recently, was in charge of Ngati Porou Whanui Forests Ltd. He is in his late thirties and also entered forestry immediately after secondary school, where he worked for the Crown’s Forest Service as well as other forestry companies. While working in forestry he got his Bachelor’s and Master’s and worked his way up the management structure of the industry. Christopher describes himself as follows:

[I was] very much raised as a Māori person. On a farm around that side of the coast with my grandparents and then went off to secondary school and I actually came here and went to secondary school here in Gisborne. And then went off to work in the forest service and never went straight into university, so I went into the forestry. Not long after I started working I started university and I haven’t really stopped. So I, so I was working in a forestry business, government owned and it was principally pine trees, their interests. And they were the predominant forester if you like in new

\(^\text{117}\) John Kopua. 2007. Interview by author. Tokomaru Bay, N.Z. January 15,
Zealand. Right from essentially from the start of this industry in new Zealand was predominantly led and owned. So government if you like were the architects around the introduction of exotics into new Zealand. So I went to university and a bit of undergraduate degree at Massey university, business finance. Went on from, carried on working, went on from there and did a master’s degree in business at Waikato. From there went off and spent some time studying more business finance and strategy stuff at Harvard business school in the US and in fact spent more time there last year. Started doing a Ph.D. still doing a Ph.D…. All along though kept working in forestry type companies.118

When government restructured the forest industries he was managing Kaingaroa forests. Then he says:

[I] went off and spent some time in the US worked for Weyerhauser. I don't know if you know Weyerhauser company. [paper products and such] very big, and forests. Timberlands in the Pacific Northwest and up in British Columbia. So I spent some time in British Columbia as well, as well as in the operations down through Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and I think I spent a little bit of time in West Virginia…and then I worked for Fletcher Challenge in New Zealand.119

I also spoke with Tui, Haro, Megan, Makere, and Uncle who are Ngati Porou and who run a community trust. They are educated, professionally trained, and in their thirties and forties; Uncle is in his fifties.

He Oranga Mo Nga Uri Tuku Iho Trust (Wellbeing for Future Generations) is a charitable trust in the Ruatorea area. The Trust is a collective of Ngati Porou tribal members who are committed to:

– kaitiakitanga: protecting and sustaining natural resources and the environment;
– the preservation and use of matauranga Maori (Maori knowledge);
– advancing rangatahi (youth) education and development opportunities; and
– achieving sustainable development and tino rangatiratanga (mana motuhake).120

118 Christopher Insley. 2007. Interview by author. Gisborne, N.Z. January 15,
119 Ibid.
The information from these people will be presented in Chapter Two, Three, Four, Six, and, in particular, Chapter Seven. Quotes from conversations with them are presented in order to articulate some indigenous perspectives on the interconnections between land rights, forestry, and exotic trees.

1.6.3.6 SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

In his book *Learning to Ask*, Charles Briggs analyzes the interview process. He argues that the interview itself is an ongoing event where each person monitors and evaluates what is going on and also that the information exchanged is created right there in the context of the interview; interviewees process each question and try to determine how to answer it. Furthermore, information is just the social perception of what happened. Semi-structured interviews are defined as those which “are organised around ordered but flexible questioning.” Recognizing the problems of power inherent in the interview process, I attempted to give a brief description of the project as well as interview questions to people in advance of our talks. This allowed them the opportunity to decide whether or not the questions are appropriate and whether or not they wanted to answer them or even go through with the meetings.

In terms of how I structured the interviews, I felt that a good approach would be ‘kitchen table conversations.’ Holly Youngbear-Tibbetts describes ‘kitchen table discourse’ as a strategy for qualitative social research that focuses connecting with

---

communities and centers around dialogue.\textsuperscript{123} This respect-oriented type of research is based on reciprocity, requires that the researcher be able to listen, and is one where the researcher is most clearly in the role of guest and must therefore be aware of social protocol. This conversation-based approach was in the style of ‘kanohi kitea,’ which Linda Tuhiwai Smith describes as “the seen face, that is to present yourself to people face to face.”\textsuperscript{124}

When conducting the semi-structured interviews, I tried to provide most of the participants with the set of questions ahead of time. Either way, I always provided the interviewee(s) with a printed set to look over while we talked. I told the participants that they should treat the questions as guides for conversations and that it was not necessary to answer each one. The list was divided up into the following key topics: personal identity, land/place and relationships to it, sites of cultural significance, native forests, logging, exotic forests, and economic opportunities. The questions, as I had hoped, sparked long responses on a number of themes. When a person ran out of things to say on that issue, she or he usually turned back to the list. I found that most people read and answered every question in order unless they noticed that they had already addressed it in a previous response. After a few interviews, I found a pattern and used that to guide the rest of them. I followed an inductive process where I created categories of responses based on whatever emerged from the conversations. These include: landscape change; the tensions between income and access; Treaty settlement claims; and land as a source of identity. A few common strands tying these themes together are cultural connections to

\textsuperscript{123} Holly Youngbear-Tibbetts, “The Struggle to Preserve Turangawaewae: Symbolic Discourse in Maori Political Activism” (Ph.D., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1996), 24-25.
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place and political autonomy. These are the themes that are addressed in Chapter Seven alongside the presentation of extended quotes from these meetings.

I primarily relied on a digital recorder and took limited written notes. This was often because I was worried that writing notes would disrupt the conversational style of my interviews, which is an issue other ethnographers report.125

1.6.3.7 ADJUSTMENTS IN THE FIELD

As with anyone doing fieldwork, I encountered a number of problems, which ultimately forced changes to kinds of research I gathered. One of the problems that I dealt with was being able to meet with my various participants more than once. When I got back to New Zealand in November for the actual doctoral research I discovered that it was difficult to meet with people to interview them more than once or twice. This was a product of having three different field sites.126 I was based in Hamilton, which is relatively central to the majority of the people with whom I had initially talked. In Hamilton, I had the support of the Department of Geography, Tourism and Environmental Planning and the School of Māori and Pacific Development, both at the University of Waikato. Furthermore, one of the people on my dissertation committee, Rapata Wiri, had just joined the faculty at the School. I had thought this would be a good idea in order to be central and near some of my participants. The North Island of New Zealand, however, is big and distances are significant. Some of the people with whom I talked were as close as Rotorua or Murupara (one- and two- hours distance respectively),

---

126 Initially, I worked in three areas. But, based on time constraints, I was not able to collect enough data in the Taitokerau (Northland). So, I decided to reduce the focus to two sites.
but people in Taitokerau (Northland) or in Te Tairāwhiti were up to nine hours away. Unfortunately, most of the people with whom I spoke in July were unable to meet with me between November and April. In some cases, there were unforeseen events that restricted their time, such as Waitangi hearings. In other cases, people assumed I would be in the field indefinitely, and so felt that they could put off meetings until later. This changed the dynamic of the field for me. I had to get many more participants to make up for those that were no longer available. In the end, only one of my actual participants was anywhere near me. This severely limited my ability to develop rapport with people, though most people tended to be open to me despite this.

I also thought that I would be able to interview some of the academics affiliated with the university. Unfortunately, I did a poor job of explaining my goals; almost every single academic who I sought out to participate in the project thought that I was asking them for references, and not to partake.

Additional barriers to meeting with people included the overall length of my visit as well as the timing. I had thought that my reconnaissance would enable me to dive right into interviews upon my return and thus enable me to get a lot of work done in a short time. This was not the case. It took far longer than expected to settle in and then orient myself after arriving. Some people assumed that I would be in New Zealand indefinitely, and so felt that they could put off meetings until later. But, perhaps the biggest hurdle was the timing of the trip. Not only did the majority of my trip straddle the academic summer break for New Zealand, but also it included the longest holiday season, Christmas to New Year’s. Quite a few people were caught up in family events or holidays for a large portion of my visit.
Many of my initial contacts during my reconnaissance were women. As noted above, however, many of my original participants did not have time to work with me when I returned. This meant that I had to establish new ones. Nearly every single person that I worked with ended up being a man. This basically eliminated the possibility that I could compare the perspectives of men and women.

Due to the distance from Hamilton, I had to seek local accommodations when I stayed in different regions. Often people would open their homes or otherwise provide accommodations for me, which I often accepted. But, I was disinclined to overstay my welcome so I would occasionally stay at youth hostels, which started to stretch my budget. Because of this, I could only stay in outlying areas for limited periods of time. I often tried to coordinate meetings so that I could see several people in one area over a series of days. But, this strategy did not always work out because of the impacted nature of most people’s schedules.

This scheduling problem really had an effect on my ability to conduct follow-up interviews. Most people were incredibly busy and were only able to allocate a limited amount of time to me. I was reluctant to press anyone to meet. There were various reasons why I was less aggressive in meeting with people.

One of the main reasons I was hesitant about pushing for interviews was the extent to which people were involved in various aspects of land management. Many people were busy with Waitangi claims; this was particularly the case with peoples from Te Urewera-Kaingaroa. They were right in the thick of hearings regarding Kaingaroa Forest, the largest exotic plantation in the Southern Hemisphere and things were not going well for some of them. Again, this was recently settled with the Treelords
agreement. Tūhoe were in the middle of discussing whether or not community members would be involved in logging their lands. In Te Tairāwhiti, Ngati Porou was about to embark on planting trees for carbon credits. In several cases, I ended up speaking with people who were on opposite sides of the discussion. So, in addition to people being extremely busy, and my concern that I was asking too much from them, I was angst ridden about how to present opposing sides of a situation without distorting the debate or otherwise doing an injustice through my interpretation of the views of the participants.\textsuperscript{127}

Overall, these on the ground realities necessitated a change in the basic structure of my interview list, the amount of times I was able to interview people, and the process as a whole.

1.7 THE WAY AHEAD

Chapter Two addresses key theories beginning with a discussion of global projects and their impacts on the ways in which the local is understood and shaped. This is followed by an analysis of the connections between indigenous peoples and place in general and then Māori and place. The chapter then focuses on geography’s approach to place and ends with a discussion of new theoretical approaches to interconnections between local and global processes. These include various arguments about the salience and enduring importance of place in an increasingly globalized world. Chapter Three is a discussion of the dispossession of tangata whenua (people of the land) of Aotearoa by Europeans. This chapter tracks the various changes in political autonomy and economic power that developed between first contact and the early twentieth century. This chapter

explains why Māori entered the twentieth century with diminished political power, lands, and resources. Chapter Four addresses the integration of Aotearoa/New Zealand into the developing world economy. It also addresses how these changes as well as the introduction of spatializing strategies affected resource consumption patterns, land use, and economic options. It looks at the ways in which Māori participated and focuses on the fact that they have always been active agents. This chapter, however, notes that the impacts of land loss greatly constrained Māori economic opportunities. Chapter Five addresses the rise of German and English scientific forestry. This chapter outlines the ways in which scientific forestry is a part of the globalizing impetus of empire and the rise of spatializing strategies. It also explains how these changes affected everyday access to and use of resources for average citizens. Chapter Six is an in-depth review of scientific forestry and its role in New Zealand. This chapter demonstrates the particularities of the New Zealand context that shaped its particular forest management practices and the ways in which Pinus radiata made itself such a valuable part of the industry. It includes a review of the ways in which Māori and their lands were incorporated into the exotic forestry system. It also reviews theory about the relationships between tree and place, including the agency of trees. Chapter Seven is a discussion of the individual experiences of the participants in this research and points out the ways in which they continue to draw meaning from their relationships with land and persist in their efforts to regain political autonomy. The heart of this chapter is the extended narratives from these various people. The quotes are presented thematically alongside analyses of the ways in which these individual perspectives engage with the different discourses that have emerged out of the theoretical discussions presented in Chapters
Two, Five, and Six, namely interactions between local and global, place relationships,
Māori autonomy, the global and local, scientific forestry, and connections to trees.
Chapter Eight is the concluding chapter in which I summarize and discuss the
dissertation.
CHAPTER 2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: GLOBAL & LOCAL

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The theory informing my focus on Māori interaction with forests, the trees comprising them and the land on which they grow, and the way in which this reflects the tensions between global forces and locales, is multi-faceted. It derives from the ways in which Māori continue to use place-based consciousness and imagination as a base in their contemporary struggles about identity, land, political autonomy, and their own views of development.¹

2.2 THE GLOBAL AND THE LOCAL

One of the shared characteristics of global capitalism and European modernity is the attitude that the world and nature are objects of human concern rather than the places in which we live. This view and the systems which promote it are becoming increasingly untenable; many challenge the validity of these ways of being in the world and argue that we must seek engaged and involved ways of living in addition to economic systems that recognize people as being a part of the planet rather than living and acting on it. Places are important means to resist global capitalism as well as to find alternatives to it. Although the global and the local are not equal in power, the global is not simply imposed on the local. The value of places does not solely emanate from their

relationships with the global nor are the use-meanings attached to entities and nature within a place determined only within a capitalist framework.  

This raises the question of what actually happens on the ground when global projects enroll places or its inhabitants. Tsing looks at interconnections between the global and the local and argues that these interactions are ongoing, contingent, and messy, and that the outcomes of these connections may lead to new, unexpected trajectories and developments. Thus, it is important to look at the “specificity of global connections” where the particularities of place influence how globalizing project are produced. This, in turn, requires a close examination of the actual engagement between local and global at different locations and scales of the encounter.

Global projects, such as capitalism, have been successful at the global scale because they have elements of universal appeal. Universals are concepts that can mobilize people and entities across great distances, through time and space. Universals have a powerful allure; they appeal to so many, which gives them an advantage in being applicable through space and time and thus enables them to gather significant support. It is, however, in that widespread appeal that their messiness is created, because those who have been excluded and exploited also want to benefit from the message of the universal.

---
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The hegemony of the universal is always contested. This contributes to an endless dance of advance and co-optation where different factions struggle over the meaning of the universal and the ways in which it is deployed. Thus it is important to unravel what the universal means and how it operates in different places. For Māori, the ideas of prosperity, knowledge, and freedom translate as how Māori make a living, how they define knowledge and who has a right to it, and how Māori want to control their own destiny.6

These discussions of the globalization of modernity and capitalism matter because they have led to the spread and imposition of particular ideas about place and, perhaps more importantly, about the meaning of people, land, and other entities in place. These include that idea that communities and ecosystems can be disaggregated from one another and commodified and also that value and meaning are primarily established by systems of capitalist exchange. This is a significant issue because, despite the fact that they are presented as otherwise, capitalism and modernity are the not sole or even primary systems of signification.7

The ways in which land is understood are varied. For many indigenous peoples, including tangata whenua, land is inextricable from life. In addition to utilizing it for basic sustenance and material needs, there are a host of other relationships that encompass spiritual, cultural, and identity connections. It is the source of identity, essential to regulating social relationships, and is something to which native peoples belong. They perceive themselves to be a part of the place. From this perspective, land is not alienable nor a commodity. The specificity of the place matters. There is growing

6 Ibid.
7 Ibid; Escobar, "Culture sits in places: reflections on globalism and subaltern strategies of localization."; Escobar, "Place, Economy, and Culture in a Postdevelopment Era."; Dirlik; Ingold, 215.
evidence that land as place and place as essential to life is a basic aspect of human existence. Ingold argues that land and people (along with other entities) mutually co-constitute each other. Land is not an inert thing upon which we live, it is something with which we interact and, further, this ongoing interaction is the means by which life is sustained, knowledge is developed, and identity forms. It is the basic interaction with place that is the means by which Tsing’s universals are achieved. In moving through and interacting with the world, peoples’ lives unfold.

2.3 THE GLOBAL

Global is used to refer to a phenomenon that transcends the realm of the state and is often associated with “space, capitalism, history, and agency” and power. The global is a process, not just a scale. It does not mean the entire world but denotes ways in which some networks and practices draw different parts of the planet together. Capitalism produces and deploys an abstract sense of space, time, and power. Since it is commonly thought to be associated with globalism, the latter is now increasingly defined as beyond space and time. Another point is that the spread of capitalism is only the latest phase of globalization. Global connections have existed in varying ways throughout human history. Tsing discusses the concept of ‘universals,’ which she categorizes as prosperity,

---
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knowledge, and freedom.\textsuperscript{12} She argues that these three projects are what have driven linkages between people, nature, and ideas in disparate places.\textsuperscript{13}

Universals are historically and socially contingent, thus they emerge out of specific places. But, what makes them significant is that they move, engage, and connect people across many different locations. The problem is that the ways in which prosperity, knowledge, and freedom are defined and how they are achieved are variable and contradictory. They are never-ending, elusive projects that are always changing. Just when it seems that a universal has been achieved, the ways in which it is understood change. Throughout the process, others contest the ways in which it is defined. Who or what is entitled to particular rights and included in certain universals is an issue of deep contention. Tsing reminds us that there are many other people, and entities, such as nature, plants, and animals.\textsuperscript{14} She raises the question: who speaks for them? A universal can be a tool to secure the interests of the powerful by justifying exploitation or it can be a means to liberate those who are oppressed by inspiring “insurrection.”

In this sense, the globalization of capitalism is the success of that economic system at appealing to a sense of the universal. It has been able to become portable and connect people across space and time. The need for ceaseless accumulation drives it in search of more and cheaper inputs, technology, capital, markets, and so forth. Belief in the inherent superiority of the capitalist system has justified its expansion at the expense of the sovereignty and economic systems of various peoples around the world. The same

\textsuperscript{12} Tsing, 1-18.
\textsuperscript{13} Escobar, "Culture sits in places: reflections on globalism and subaltern strategies of localization."
\textsuperscript{14} Tsing, 1-18.
is true for the ideas of the Enlightenment and of Western science. There is a certainty that these systems contain universal truths and are applicable to all situations.¹⁵

Various developments in technology, transportation, communications, intellectual ideas, and science give the illusion that the projects of modernity, science, and capitalism are off the ground, unmoored, and can be everywhere at once. These projects are presented as a vertical integration of places in a hierarchy of power where components are plucked from their existence on earth and fitted into the framework as needed. But, because these globalizing systems are created by people they also products of interactions with the world. Further, the universal aspects of capitalism must occur in grounded, everyday activities. Some level of negotiation must occur because ideas are not simply imposed everywhere at once and in the same way; they are historically and socially contingent. It is in the specificity of this encounter that places put their own influences into how such projects are translated into practice; this is what Tsing calls “friction.”¹⁶

Harvey’s theory of time-space compression is a critical analysis of postmodernism.¹⁷ It is a metaphor about how changes in transportation, communication, and aesthetics affect the way we understand the world. He argues that it is a creation of modern global capitalism. There are two interconnected elements: a dramatic alteration of the ways we both experience the world and represent it to ourselves on the one hand and a radical change to systems of capital accumulation on the other. The stress is on the intensity and rapidity with which these interactions take place, which yield more

¹⁵Ibid; Escobar, "Culture sits in places: reflections on globalism and subaltern strategies of localization."; Escobar, "Place, Economy, and Culture in a Postdevelopment Era."; Dirlik.
powerfully creative and destructive forces. This affects everyday life where people increasingly perceive that they are disconnected from active involvement in the world. Time-space compression is implicated in the reformulation of social relationships at various scales and is connected to the spread of European-based hegemony. This change in the way that Europeans represent the world and understand their relationships to it is rooted in various developments including the emergence of the concept of landscape.

Landscape is a particularly European way of looking at the world, seeing it as a totality or more than its individual parts. There is a close connection between the art of landscape painting and how Europeans culturally view landscape. The idea of landscape is based on the concept of perspective and assumes that the viewer is outside the frame. Looking at the land as landscape also tends to promote the mastery of the viewer over the subject. This is closely associated with the eighteenth century emergence of modernity. Martin Jay argues that this period was one dominated by the sense of sight, which he calls ocularcentrism.18

Timothy Mitchell argues that this preoccupation with the visual is the result of the European metaphysical belief in an underlying world order and in a singular reality that could be known.19 He bases his work on Martin Heidegger’s concept of “the world as picture.”20 A way of describing this concept is through the metaphor of enframing. According to this idea, the world is set up as a systematic totality, there is a difference

between signifier and signified, the world is structured by a neutral framework of space in which different components are placed, and the viewer must stand apart from this framework in order to understand it. This describes the approach to the world in which Europeans expect the world to be structured to convey its meaning.

One of the major developments in terms of enframing was what Mary Louise Pratt describes as the rise of ‘European planetary consciousness,’ wherein the goal was to discover nature’s plan or the underlying order to the universe. This required a narrowing of vision in which different objects were treated individually. Pratt calls this quest for knowledge the natural history project. This was aided by the development and popularization of the Linnaean system of classification, which was primarily based on visual characteristics of plants and was gradually expanded to include all forms of life. An important point about the organization of life was that it was based on innate qualities rather than contextual relationships in the world. Life forms were visually isolated from their surroundings, plucked out of the chaos as Pratt writes, carefully observed, described and then inserted into the neutral grid of knowledge.

For Europeans this was thought to be the beginning of a new subjectivity, one in which there was individual consciousness and in which man was conceived of as rational and objective and as a being that knows. Man was also conceived of as an object subjected to the control of others. This begins to establish a difference between mind and body as well as between human and nature. The world was perceived as something
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separate and not as something in which we live. This distance is necessary to see the order in the world.\textsuperscript{22}

But, Europeans did not just passively wait to see underlying truth, they also reconfigured the world to make better reflect the order which they believed existed. Timothy Mitchell notes that one of the distinctions of the modern state is its use of spatializing mechanisms as a means to impose and maintain order within society.\textsuperscript{23} Using the ideas of Heidegger, Derrida, and Foucault, Mitchell argues that for the modern state, the creation of neutral space and its manipulation allows the rational management of people and resources which then makes the nation and its territory legible. Space is re-organized in such a way as to make it appear as though truth is revealed rather than produced and that all things stand for or represent something else.\textsuperscript{24} It appears then as though the framework is order itself, or order revealed, when in fact it is imposed. These means by which Europeans imposed their order on the world have been described as spatializing strategies and were important to the rise of modern systems of political governance.

James Scott details the links between the rise of the modern state and its increasing development of systems of knowledge and institutions that were critical to its exercise of power.\textsuperscript{25} Scott describes the basic functions of governance as “taxation, conscription, and prevention of rebellion.”\textsuperscript{26} A key difference between pre-modern and modern states is that the former had very little information about people, land, and

\textsuperscript{22} Hubert L. Dreyfus, Paul Rabinow, and Michel Foucault, \textit{Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics}, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).
\textsuperscript{23} Mitchell, \textit{Colonising Egypt.}, 12-14, 69; Mitchell, \textit{Questions of Modernity.}
\textsuperscript{24} See also Gregory, \textit{Geographical Imaginations}, 173-174.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 1.
environment and was mainly focused on keeping the status quo. In comparison, the latter is looking to develop all resources of society in order to facilitate ongoing development and progress of the society as a whole. So the latter needs more information about specific aspects of the country. Thus, one of the central problems of the modern state is legibility: knowing about its subjects, their wealth and holdings, and the state’s lands and assets. The goal of legibility is to standardize and organize information to make governance easier.

One of the critical features of the modern state was that its bureaucratic system depended on simplified and generalized knowledge. As with the natural history project, this kind of knowledge required a narrowing of vision. Codified land tenure systems and cadastral maps are examples of the kinds of spatializing systems developed by the modern state. These were created to manage taxation and conscription. Only information that was directly related to the overall productive capacity of people was required. A lack of accurate data meant that local bureaucrats could underreport population and profits. Having this knowledge was key to the centralization of power. Customary land tenure, however, was characterized by incredible diversity, in which there were many different regimes, and flexibility, though contestation did exist. Common property systems were unknowable to the state and impossible to survey or map. Cadastral mapping and the creation of private property regimes were about creating systems that would benefit the government.27

The shift away from diverse property regimes was closely aligned with the rise of capitalism and changing socio-economic relationships. There was widespread resistance

27 Ibid., 36-37, 44-52.
to codifying the various ways by which property and social relations were managed as that would eliminate flexibility and might be for the benefit of landowners while peasants would be exploited. There did, however, exist differences between property rights as recorded on paper and as they were practice in reality. In Europe, where people spoke the same language as people within central administration, the unfamiliar new systems were difficult to navigate, but nonetheless manageable. But, in the case of the colonies, the impact was more disruptive. Many people lost out on traditional forms of access to lands and resources.  

In addition to legibility and order, the state is concerned with productivity. This reflects an instrumentalist attitude towards the world. Productivity is defined from a capitalist viewpoint, which replaces a tribute mode of production or kin-based mode of production. This, therefore, justifies draining swamps and converting complex ecosystems into farms. Pastoral and agricultural landscapes become signs of the successful exploitation and rational control over the world, and of world order. Scott argues that scientific forestry is one example of the state’s effort to produce legibility, order, and productivity through spatializing mechanisms. This idea will be discussed in greater detail in Chapters Five and Six.
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30 Scott, 2-14.
2.3.1 CRITICISMS

New technologies were necessary to producing new systems of knowledge. Harvey notes that changes in technologies not only change the way we do things, but also change the ways we know and the ways we interact with the world. These technologies included map-making, surveying, planning, and drawing. These technologies and techniques were closely linked with sight. Thus, there were close links between artistic developments in perspective and in those aforementioned fields related to the management of property.31

Scientific forestry, private property regimes, and cadastral maps are examples of ways to confront the multiplicity and complexity of different places and to reduce such variety to a manageable set of variables. The goal of such changes was to create a standardized system that could be easily applied to nearly any circumstance. This also entailed the conversion of Nature as habitat to being a source of economic value and ‘natural resources’ and a change from people to taxable citizens. This involved abstraction from context and a reduction to productive units. This does not necessarily mean that state systems are not complex, for they are, but they are narrow in scope and only attend to the kinds of data that facilitate the state’s needs. Because these systems were standardized, they could be applied to many different situations; they were portable and thus appeared to be universal. These were, however, specific local knowledge

systems that were moveable. These systems contain limited information; they are partial and incomplete.\textsuperscript{32}

A problem was that as the systems became more abstract, that meant that were greater levels of distortion when they were applied to the reality of different places. They became uncompromising because the tools could be used from further away. They appear to be complete and neutral, but are not. Maps are an important example. What is not on the map is as important as what is on it. Such tools are drawn from the perspective of the mapmaker. Building on the work done by Bruno Latour, Michael Goodchild, and Denis Cosgrove, Harvey draws attention to the importance of maps to imperialism.\textsuperscript{33} Maps serve to encode knowledge in a portable medium that enables governance to be achieved at a distance from the state’s object of interest. Thus, maps are a means to extend power over greater extents of space.\textsuperscript{34}

These systems do not just convey information for management, they change the structure of political economic relationships that exist within society. Order imposed through urban design, factory production, and school classrooms not only makes it easier to observe and control things and people, but also serves as evidence of governance, of society’s control over territory. While people held up the idea that they were revealing order, they were in fact imposing a particular kind of logic and worldview upon a place. Thus, these systems forced changes to social relations. This is significant because the act


\textsuperscript{33} Harvey, 537-538.

\textsuperscript{34} Ibid; Scott, 52; Park, 98-102.
of organizing land as space within the nation’s purview dispossesses that land as place from individuals, families, tribes, and all other entities.\(^{35}\)

One of the outcomes of these practices was that visible signs of legibility and order became a powerful aesthetic. This is also relevant to the colonial contexts, for these systems were exported all over the world and carried a particular kind of worldview. Grey notes that British settlers to places like Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the United States “saw the natural world not simply as the supplier of their sustenance but as a source of monetary wealth.”\(^ {36}\) This served to justify the dispossession of native people. Landscapes were ordered up and reconfigured to fit European capitalist systems and then became a validation of European colonial activities.\(^ {37}\)

2.4 THE LOCAL

Land is essential to life and the relationships between people, land, and other entities are integral to indigenous peoples. The idea that land is not inert, but an active force in one’s life requires a change in which the way it is understood in western culture. From a local perspective, it is the interactions of various entities with each other and with the land that create the specificity of place. This begins to shift attention away from an anthropocentric approach wherein people, resources, and land are alienable commodities and instead emphasizes the ways in which these ongoing relationships are the basis of life and sustain place. For indigenous peoples, these interactions in place are the means by which their culture, lives, and history unfold. More specifically, they believe that all
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\(^{35}\) Gregory, Geographical Imaginations, 173-174; Mitchell, Colonising Egypt., 12-13, 69.


aspects of existence, from thoughts, emotions, and life itself, emerge from their
interconnections with all beings and with land, both in the phenomenal and supernatural
worlds.\textsuperscript{38}

These views about land resonate for Māori. Durie argues that, for Māori, land and
place are essential to “defining relationships between people.”\textsuperscript{39} In the Māori worldview,
place is where knowledge, culture, and identity are rooted. The term ‘socio-cultural
landscape’ is useful for calling attention to the uniqueness of the place-based experience
of a culture.\textsuperscript{40} This is similar to Cosgrove’s concept ‘social formation,’ which refers to
the unique combination of people and place.\textsuperscript{41} The idea of an indigenous socio-cultural
landscape is that place is the repository of human memory and thus acquires density of
meaning.

Thus among indigenous people, land as place and people are conceived of as
mutually co-constituting one another, and indigenous people often assert that they have a
creative connection with their land, “with the body seen as the source of thinking,
sensing, acting and being, and the basis of all relationships.”\textsuperscript{42} Other indigenous scholars
argue that for indigenous people the earth is a living entity, that it is in perpetual motion
of creation and destruction, and further, that it is personal and has agency.\textsuperscript{43} Most agree
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that land as place is the basis of indigenous knowledge systems and of indigenous identity, as well as providing sustenance, being a repository of one’s ancestors, and being encoded with historical and cultural meaning.

In contrast to the Western scientific paradigm, which promotes a singular, universal truth, Meyer notes that knowledge systems are subjective and culturally mediated.44 The latter are premised on ontological differences. For example, in contrast to the Cartesian sense of identity and self-awareness based on a separation of mind from body, the Hawaiian center of knowledge is the na’au or stomach, which Meyer notes is “the seat of emotion, feeling, heart, and intellect.”45 Thus, knowledge is not separate from other aspects of personhood and individual experience; but integrated into an holistic framework. David Turnbull argues that knowledge is not only specific to place, but shaped by the experience of place: it is “both situated and situating.”46 As Murton notes, greater attention to place and its value serves to highlight the local quality of all knowledge systems, including Western scientific knowledge. Native knowledge cannot be separated from its native culture.47

This argument about the place-based nature of knowledge systems rests on the body’s immersion in the world. For indigenous peoples connections to place are based on direct bodily experience of the world. This immersion is central to their worldviews. Deloria, Cajete, and Meyer argue that knowledge is experiential and that information is acquired through the entire sensing body rather than through a dispassionate, distanced

44 Meyer.
46 Turnbull, 19.
47 Murton. s.v. "Place."
These scholars contend that people are a part of nature, not apart from it. Indigenous peoples do not presume that they have zero impact, but work to maintain some level of balance with their environment.

Many indigenous peoples believe in the interrelatedness of all beings and things in the universe, though this does not necessitate causality. Kanahele uses the word “entrained”\(^\text{49}\) to describe the ways in which people are in sync with their “rhythmic environment” while Cajete uses the term “ensoulment”\(^\text{50}\) to describe the psychological relationships between indigenous peoples and their lands.\(^\text{51}\) Kanahele notes that humans are not just in the environment but “entrained” within it so that we are a part of our “rhythmic environment.” Cajete argues that “in the perception of many Native cultures, their landscapes are seen as metaphoric extensions of their bodies” where the land and sky are metaphors for earth-mother and sky-father whose coupling produced life.

There are a variety of ways in which people and place are physically connected. One of the basic ways in which this occurs is through the life-sustaining food which comes from the natural environment. For Hawaiians, the word for earth is ‘\(\text{\text{aina}}\), but the word translates literally as “that which feeds.”\(^\text{52}\) Avegalio notes that through the Samoan art of \(\text{tatau}\), ink composed of local material is literally embedded in the skin.\(^\text{53}\) Another way in which people and place are connected to one another is through the burial of the


\(^{49}\) Kanahele, 150-151.
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\(^{51}\) Kanahele, 150-151; Deloria Jr. and Wildcat; Cajete, 178-185; Meyer.

\(^{52}\) Kanahele, 184-185.

dead wherein, over time, people become part of the earth. The burial of human remains is also a powerful symbolic connection between people and place. The long-term occupancy of a place by a people meant not only were one’s ancestors buried there, but that that place was the location of one’s own birth as well as being the birthplace of all of one’s ancestors. Thus, place connects past, present, and future.\textsuperscript{54}

Cajete argues that for indigenous peoples the land is also an extension of one’s mind as it is a place that is full of encoded history and thus referents for memories.\textsuperscript{55} For many peoples, places are the repository of human memory, serving as mnemonic records of events and histories.\textsuperscript{56} Kanahele notes the great number of names for places in both Hawaiian and Māori societies and argues that this profusion of names represents close relationships with the land.\textsuperscript{57} There were different types of place names, but they were frequently used to commemorate the history of a place. Thus, Kanahele argues that knowing the names of places meant that a person would know the history of that place; presumably this would be one’s own history. Murton notes that the act of naming a place is not that of inscribing a preset idea or template, but is one of “incorporation” where there is a relationship of becoming through personal interaction in the world, thus this
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connects again with the concept of embodiment. Some sites are considered sacred. These sacred sites function as points of reflection on the relationship with land.\[^{59}\]

These connections to place are replicated through various aspects of culture. Myth, song, dance, ritual, prayer, and social structure regulated and reproduced the relationship with the land as well as history. Kanahele draws on Mircea Eliade who argues that many cultural activities, such as building a house or age-related initiation rites are replications of a creation narrative, or a “celesstial archetype” and thus are a part of the creative process.\[^{60}\] Architecture was frequently a reflection of the relationship between a people, their place, and the universe.\[^{61}\]

Language and sound are additional aspect of culture that reflect place. For many peoples, language is closely tied to the landscape. For example, the relationship between land and language to the Diné is one that emphasizes nature in a perpetual state of becoming and transforming.\[^{62}\] Several scholars argue that the spoken word itself has power, thus the acts of singing, speaking, chanting, or praying are important. One aspect of this is on the creative act of the word, this is particularly the case with place names. Separately though, the sound of voice itself also has a power.\[^{63}\]
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Together, these different aspects of knowledge systems, active engagement with the land, land as source of food, sustenance, as repository of one’s ancestors, and as encoded with historic and cultural meaning, give place powerful meanings for indigenous peoples. It becomes wrapped up in all elements of identity. This importance of place is evident in traditional Hawaiian society where a person without roots and without place was despised. Such placelessness was so dangerous that it would cast a pall over a person’s ancestors.⁶⁴

2.4.1 MĀORI: A PLACE-BASED PEOPLE

In order to begin to understand a Māori conception of place it is necessary to consider tangata whenua ways of being in the world. Kaupapa Māori is a research approach that has a western epistemological structure but uses key concepts from Māori epistemology. This enables one to meaningfully engage with Māori philosophical ideas and values as it relates to a Māori worldview.

The kaupapa Māori approach is grounded in the Māori knowledge system, matauranga Māori, which is an holistic framework for understanding the world. Matauranga Māori is composed of two realms, that of esoteric knowledge or Te Kauwae Runga (“the upper jawbone”) and that of everyday knowledge or Te Kauwae Raro (“the lower jawbone”). Marsden writes that matauranga Māori is informed by the recognition that “spiritual authority and power,” or mana, originates from the gods (atua).⁶⁵ There are three types of mana. Mana atua, which remains under the ultimate control of the deities, but may be wielded by a human acting on their behalf. There is mana tangata, which is

⁶⁴ Kanahele, 181.
the authority that a person derives from power and knowledge cultivated by people, though these are still creations of the gods. Finally, there is mana whenua, which is the power that the deities imbued into the earth, or Papatuanuku. A tribe achieves mana whenua through the act of maintaining territorial rights to an area. An important aspect of this is that mana is contingent; one must act appropriately or risk the loss of the authority and power. Mana provides the capacity to project one’s power into the world and the right to do so. 66

Shirres notes another way of looking at the concept of mana as being derived from one’s unity with the source of authority and control. 67 A person has mana tangata through being a person who is part of a greater corporate tribe as well as being connected through time to one’s ancestors. Mana whenua is strengthened by maintaining connections with one’s tribal land. “One with the people, one with the land, we also become one with the atua (gods).” 68 A person has authority and control from all three sources. But, it is the connections with those sources that result in one’s mana. These relationships are constantly reproduced through a variety of means. This collapses all three concepts together so that a person’s power, strength, and authority are derived from and situated in relationship to their social, natural, and spiritual realms.

These concepts of authority and control form that basis of the Māori knowledge system. “Thus, Māori see knowledge as involving an inseparable relationship between

67 Shirres.
68 Ibid., 57.
the world of matter and the world of spirit.”69 The ways in which Māori know and understand the world as place, how identity is constructed, and how tangata whenua relate to land are wrapped up in this holistic way of being in the world.70

2.4.2 HOW MĀORI KNOW PLACES

For Māori, there is an “inseparable relationship between the world of matter and the world of spirit, and between space and time.”71 Māori believe that at the center of existence there is neither space nor time, only a ‘singularity.’ For in the Māori worldview all things flow out of the same primal, divine origin. Past, present, and future are combined together. It is only in this plane of existence that time and space exist, though they remain closely interconnected. The perception that time and space are fluid and that an individual is connected with all elements are structured into language. Directional words are used to specify time and space relative to the speaker or the subject.

The world is understood through the concept of the double-spiral (koru) in which past, present, future, space, matter, and spirit are all intertwined.72 The center of the spiral represents the ‘singularity’ that is the center of the existence. It is from this generative source that all life and all elements of the spiritual and material worlds flow. Salmond describes this as “a double dynamism that moves into and out from a primal centre.”73 The key to this process is that the form of all things is already encoded in the cosmic
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center. Thus “all things in the phenomenal world alike unfold their nature (tipu), live (ora), and have form (ahua) and so come to possess a body (tinana), an immaterial self (wairua), an abiding place of divine power (mauri) and a characteristic vitality (hau).”

As a result, not only do all entities have a form, but they also each have a little bit of each one of the metaphysical elements. But, these entities must be placed within a wider cosmological context. They do not exist independently from one another; they are interconnected in a complex system of genealogy.

Knowledge is structured through genealogy (whakapapa). To “know” an entity is to know its historical descent. The genealogical system of whakapapa includes all entities, inanimate and animate, and combines the physical and spiritual realm. Thus all beings have a place within the same inclusive system. This not only establishes relative order in the universe, but also places all beings in context with one another. Whakapapa translates as ‘to place layers, one upon another.’ Knowledge about an entity’s genealogy only serves as the beginning. Onto this knowledge is layers additional information in terms of everyday knowledge and esoteric knowledge. By combining these different forms of knowledge to the genealogical map one achieves a comprehensive knowledge system. This information is largely maintained through narrative; these include proverbs, songs, chants, and prophetic sayings.

For Māori, thought and sound are closely linked to the dynamism of creation and of the world. Salmond notes that while there are varying traditions, generally the cosmogonic process of creation begins with thought as the first emergence of order: from
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thought proceeds “memory, the mind, and then desire.” This leads to the gradual formation of the universe and of the Supreme Being, Io, who then employs sound in creating the world. After calling the world into being out of the realm of potential being, *Te Korekore*, Io distinguished night (*Te Po*) from day (*Te Aomarama*) and created the distinct realms of sky, land, and waters and of night and day; within these last two he distinguished the different parts of night and day. He later created the first gods, *Rangi-awatea* (*watea* and *awatea* mean respectively ‘space and light’) and *Papatuanuku*, who are respectively Sky-Father and Earth-Mother, and who sired the various gods who aided *Io* in completing the departments of nature. Among these was *Tane*, who was in charge of creating the forests and birds. Thus, in general the forests are referred to as “the *wao tapu nio a Tane*, or very tapu [sacred] forests of *Tane*. Not only was *Tane* responsible for creating the forests, but he also created human life, so the origins of the two are closely tied together. In this process, an entity is called into being through the act of speaking aloud its name. Its beingness is inextricable from its name. In this sense, saying a name aloud reproduces the creative act that first generated that entity. Thus a person is repeating the act of the gods and the ancestors before.

This creation story firmly places the Māori self in a set of kinship relations with non-human entities that include fauna and flora. This has implications for cultural norms regarding human behavior. For example, since the forests are the offspring of *Tane* (as
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are humans) Māori place emphasis on appropriate observance of protocol when harvesting any forest product.\textsuperscript{80} As forests and birds were created before humans, they are considered to be the older siblings of people. Naming and speaking aloud had other roles. “Naming places must be seen as part of a broader process of naming and ordering the world.”\textsuperscript{81} The act of bestowing a name on a particular thing or place could have powerful ramifications in terms of changing the \textit{mana} or status of the thing in question or asserting control over it.

These interrelationships between people, kin groups, and land are indicative of the wider framework of Māori knowledge, which Te Maire Tau describes as “mirror knowledge.”\textsuperscript{82} He argues that \textit{tangata whenua} understand the world as a reflection of their own lives wherein all beings and entities are interconnected. Māori thought of themselves and the world around them as one and the same. There was no distance or separation between subject and object. The kinship links between person, family, and extended genealogical system are captured in the proverb, “\textit{He tangata, he tipua, he atua ranei?} (Am I man, demi-god, or God?)”\textsuperscript{83} As a product and part of the web of existence which reaches across time and space, people are all three.

For Māori, the ancestors and the past are co-present with the individual on the land through ongoing practices and through place names wherein history is reenacted and made contemporary.\textsuperscript{84} Gods are also present in the land. Māori trace their lineage from gods and ancestors horizontally rather than vertically. Further, they had different
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conceptions of time as compared with Europeans. The Māori perception of time was that it was not linear with the past behind one, but that the past was in front of the individual because it was inscribed on the very landscape and in the everyday; again through naming and being enacted in cultural practices. The past and one’s kin group were also present on the landscape in that Papatuanuku, the Earth Mother, and all other members of the extended genealogical web are immediately present. For Māori this meant that the landscape provided the context out of which to understand activities and events of the present.

As is the case with other indigenous relationships with their land and place, a Māori sense of place is predicated on a subjective immersion in place.85 This connection to the land is also articulated through the concept of ‘simultaneous landscape’ or ‘mirror landscape.’ With the recognition that people and their environments mutually shape one another in a dialectical process, the physical world is a reflection of people as are they an extension of the earth. Māori knowledge is not only encoded in whakapapa, but is encoded on the landscape through the process of naming features and linking them to events and people. These place names serve as mnemonic devices wherein the land becomes an ‘emotional landscape.’ Rangihau notes that “this is why our place names are so precious to us…It is history because it is part and parcel of our living, something which has an emotive force of its own.”86 As previously mentioned, the act of saying the name aloud reproduces the primal acts of creation. Speaking names is part of the process by which places and histories are renewed and live on in everyday life. This emphasizes

85 Roberts and Wills, 45, 49; See also Murton, "Toward an Understanding of a Maori Cultural Landscape" 13; Stewart-Harawira; Meyer.
interconnections between the world external to the body and the internal personhood. Key to this is the understanding that Māori see themselves as a part of their land; one means nothing with the other. In other words, the concept of the ‘mirror landscape’ implies that the self and the landscape are not separate.

In that the self and the world are understood as mirrors of each other, form is also important. The body is the physical expression of the self and the landscape is the physical expression of the world. The body is the vehicle through which the self interacts with the world. Through the body the individual is in a state of becoming while through landscape the world is in a state of constant process. This perception of a difference between the body, a form, and the self, or the individual, resonates with the discussion of Māori epistemology above that detailed how all entities have a nature (tipu), form (ahu), body (tinana), spirit (wairua), place of divine power (mauri), vitality (hau), and live (ora).\footnote{Murton, "Being in the Place World: Towards a Maori 'Geographical Self'," 23.}

Māori epistemology rests on an understanding that the individual is enmeshed in a complex of genealogical relationships. The landscape is also subject to intricate connections. Place names are a departure point for a whole host of narratives that tie those points into the broader web of genealogies. For Māori, to be in place is to be embraced within one’s tribal history. While the landscape is the setting in which social relationships are established and maintained, the self is defined within the context of those social relations.\footnote{Murton, "Toward an Understanding of a Maori Cultural Landscape" 8-9; Tau.}
An example of this interconnection with place can be found in certain discussions about the Tūhoe people from the region of Te Urewera. Evelyn Stokes, J. Wharehuia Milroy, and Hirini Melbourne write that

Te Urewera is the home territory, turangawaewae for more than 12,000 people of the Tuhoe tribe. Over 3,000 people, predominantly Maori, live there, and many migrants who live elsewhere to gain a livelihood acknowledge tribal identity, turangawaewae, in Te Urewera…The central concept is turangawaewae, a standing place for the feet literally, but meaning a great deal more in the sense of tribal identity and sense of belonging to a tribe, region and marae.\(^89\)

Another report entitled *Nga Taonga o Te Urewera* supports this view.\(^90\) This work was co-authored by Ngahua Te Awekotuku and Linda Waimarie Nikora who are both from Te Urewera. They write

*Nga Taonga o Te Urewera* [the treasures of Te Urewera] remain the cultural property of the Tuhoe people. Our heritage endures. This sense of ownership, of connection, is reinforced by the spiritual, psychological and cultural bonds which have persisted, despite government incursion, private purchase and attempted development.\(^91\)

They go on to argue that “the place, the people – are synonymous” as each co-constitutes and reinforces the other and that this relationship persists for all Tūhoe no matter where they live.\(^92\)

Several of the people whom I interviewed reiterated the importance of land. Eliza Cairns, a logging contractor, describes the relationship between her husband’s family and their land:

George’s father…they were brought up out there, and that place out there, Ruatahuna, meant everything to their family because that was their roots.\(^93\)

\(^89\) Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne, xiv, 10.
\(^90\) Ngahuia Te Awekotuku and Linda Waimarie Nikora, *Nga Taonga o Te Urewera* (Rotorua, 2004),
\(^91\) Ibid., 1.
\(^92\) Ibid., 1-3.
\(^93\) Eliza Cairns et al. 2007. Interview by author. Rotorua, New Zealand. January 2, 2007,
This theme of the value of land to modern Māori is explored in depth in Chapter Seven. While these few examples cannot encompass the great diversity of experience and opinion of the various Māori, they serve to highlight a particular kind of connected relationship to the land and illustrate ways in which Māori identity and place are interwoven.

### 2.4.3 MĀORI IDENTITY

In addition to being the base of knowledge, place is the source and structure of identity. Land is the foundation of identity and the social system. By virtue of birth into a particular group, a person belongs to a place. The concept *turangawaewae* describes this relationship. This specific place is the historic territory of a person’s kin group. Mead notes that the emphasis on *turangawaewae* has largely shifted to the *marae* (meeting house) as the center of identity. Tribal connections expand outward from the *marae* to incorporate the broader territorial interests of the sub-tribe or tribe. Thus, place and tribal affiliation are closely connected.

Patterson and Perrett argue that Māori societies were non-individualistic. The self was understood within the context of the larger kin or tribal group. This is evident in the proverb above where the individual is at once human, demi-god, and god. In this sense, the individual was conflated with the tribe. Identity was further contextualized within the historic actions of the tribe and the genealogy of the group. Traditions and oral

---

95 Mead, 43.
96 Roy W. Perrett and John Patterson, "Virtue Ethics and Maori Ethics," *Philosophy East & West* 41, no. 2 (1991). Note that Mead argues that the individual did have a place in society. Mead, 37. This will be discussed below.
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history provide the narratives that serve as lessons upon which to develop one’s understanding of cultural morality. One’s genealogy defined one’s social context, standing within society, was the base of belonging, and enunciated one’s rights to a particular place. Thus, the individual was placed within space, time, and a social network. As Māori genealogy incorporated all entities on the planet, including rivers and rocks as well as the larger cosmos, this structured a sense of who the person was relative to the universe.

These connections between kin networks and physical land are incorporated when Māori formally introduce themselves, which involves the recitation of a pepeha (personal introduction). In it they place themselves in a wider cultural context. Here is an example from the area Te Whaiti-nui-a-Toi:

Ko Tuwatawata te maunga  
Ko Whirinaki te awa  
Ko Ngati Whare te iwi

The mountain is Tuwatawata  
The river is Whirinaki  
The people are Ngati Whare

In reciting pepeha, people include the name of their tribe (and/or sub-tribe) and they locate themselves in place by naming various features of the physical landscape that are referents for their home territory. In some cases they include the name of the canoe upon which their ancestors first traveled to New Zealand, to that particular ancestor, or to their meeting house. Thus, “identity reflected historical, social, and geographic conditions.”

The Māori words for the various units of society are implicated in the ways in which earth, land, and people are related to each other. The Māori language is one in
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97 Wiri, 35.  
98 Durie, 53.
which words frequently have multiple meanings; these can often be overlapping. There are different layers, or what Mead calls planks, of the social system.\(^99\) These ideas emphasize the kinship bonds between people, as members must be born into the group, but they also emphasize the connections between people and their land.

Mead defines the *whanau* as the basic social unit of the Māori system.\(^100\) This can be a nuclear family or an extended group of even thousands of people. He notes that *whanau* has several definitions. In addition to referring to family and extended kin group it can mean ‘be born’ or ‘offspring,’ amongst others. The guiding principle for the *whanau* is that membership is governed by birth into the group. “The act of *whakawhanau* (giving birth) produces a newborn child, a *whenua* (placenta) and eventually a *pito* (umbilical cord).”\(^101\) Both placenta and umbilical cord are buried on the family’s land, thus establishing a physical and spiritual connection between land and baby.

At a larger scale, several connected *whanau* cohere as a *hapu*, or sub-tribe. The term also means ‘pregnant’ or ‘conceived in the womb.’ Membership is again a matter of birthright and people are tied together through kinship. Mead, citing Schwimmer, notes that the *hapu* is the main political unit for Māori.\(^102\) It was at this level that land and resources were allocated and it was generally at this level that external political issues were managed. The next layer is the *iwi*, or tribe, which is a combination of several *hapu*. The word *iwi* also means ‘bones’ or ‘relatives.’ People are again connected to the land through the act of burying the remains of one’s relatives.

\(^99\) Mead, 212-217, 270-275.  
\(^100\) Ibid., 212-217.  
\(^101\) Ibid., 213. Italics added  
\(^102\) Ibid., 212-217.
The Māori word for land or earth, *whenua*, further reinscribes these relationships. Again, this word has multiple meanings; these include: ‘placenta,’ ‘ground,’ ‘country,’ and ‘state.’ The *whenua* as placenta nourishes the fetus, then *whenua* as land is the source of nourishment through food, and finally *whenua* as ground receives the bones after death. “Thus pregnancy, birth, the placenta, the umbilical cord and the bones (hapu, whanau, pito, iwi) become enmeshed in the concept of whenua, as land,” and the interrelationships between land, family, sub-tribe, and tribe (whenua, whanau, hapu, iwi) are collapsed in upon one another *in place.*\(^\text{103}\)

While the concepts of family, sub-tribe, and tribe imply a hierarchical relationship, this is a misleading idea. The reality was that social organization involved a great deal of flexibility. Groups came together or separated as needed to reconnect or to manage major political concerns. As discussed, the family is the primary functioning unit and the sub-tribe is the main organization for political activity. The concept of tribe deals more with descent from a common ancestor than with a functional political entity. It tends, however, to be a prominent concept. An emphasis on tribal identity emerged in the latter half of the twentieth century.\(^\text{104}\) Mead and Murton argue that the prominence of the tribe is the result of Crown efforts in the late twentieth century to consolidate Māori as a corporate body politic to simplify interaction and negotiation.\(^\text{105}\) Durie notes that the development of tribal identity can also be seen as a reaction to the pan-tribal identity that was produced during nineteenth century through a combination of colonialism,

\(^{103}\) Ibid., 270. See also pages 271-275.

\(^{104}\) The emphasis on tribal identity is not without its problems. There are many Maori, approximately 29%, who do not affiliate with a specific tribe. This is most often the case with urban peoples, who lack access to cultural institutions. Durie, 52-57.

\(^{105}\) Mead, 212-217, 270-275; Murton, "Being in the Place World: Towards a Maori 'Geographical Self,'" 22-23. Murton cites Ballara.
Christianity, and widespread resistance to the erosion of Māori autonomy. In contrast, Durie argues that a sub-tribal identity had more salience prior to contact.\textsuperscript{106}

Mead agrees that identity is interconnected with wider kin relations, but adds that the individual is also a legitimate social unit.\textsuperscript{107} This is increasingly so with Western influences. But, the individual has always had a role, this is evident in the ways that particular individuals have been celebrated for their actions, especially key figures in early and recent history. Moreover, individual actions have an impact on one’s identity and personal standing in society. Therefore, even though individuals are a part of their broader kin group, they are still responsible for their behavior.

\subsection*{2.4.4 AUTHORITY OF LAND}

As discussed above, land is of great significance to Māori. It is central to identity and defines social relations; therefore it is an essential aspect of Māori society. In terms of the cultural knowledge system, power and authority are derived from maintaining and strengthening connections to land. For several reasons, however, Māori have lost direct access to much of their lands. This has come about because of colonialism and the imposition of a Western private property regime (this will be fully discussed in Chapter 5). It has also been the result of the increasing urbanization of the Māori populace.

The latter half of the twentieth century has been characterized by a significant rural to urban population shift amongst Māori. This migration largely took place after the end of WWII and involved a population shift from only ten percent urban in 1926 to approximately eighty percent by the year 2000. This has made it difficult for many
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\textsuperscript{106} Durie, 52-57.
\textsuperscript{107} Mead, 37-44.
people to maintain their relationships to land and it conflicts with the cultural concept of *ahi ka*, or the burning fire, which describes how one maintains one’s rights to territory through continuous occupation of the land and/or connections to the extended kin group. Despite this trend and the increasing mobility and global dispersals of Māori people, they continue to recognize the importance of the interrelationships between identity, land, and genealogy. Further, from the perspective that the individual is contained within the extended familiar network, this means that connections to land are being maintained by the group as a whole. Land is still wedded to *whakapapa* (genealogy), history, and culture, and it is central to the social system. As such, being able to be on the land is still of paramount importance.  

Other factors have served to marginalize Māori in their native lands. There was ongoing recruitment of European settlers throughout the latter half of the nineteenth century. This was coupled with a significant decline in the Māori population over the same period. For example, between 1845 and 1858 the Native population went from 109,550 persons to 56,049. As a result, Māori were quickly a minority on their own lands. Between 1858 and 1886 Native peoples declined from 48.5 percent of the overall population to only 6.8 percent. But, expectations that *tangata whenua* would die out were wrong. By the turn of the century, the indigenous population started to increase.

Hill analyzes the relationships between Crown and Māori and in particular addresses the structural issues that circumscribed peoples’ everyday lives. He notes
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108 Murton, "Embedded in Place: “Mirror Knowledge” and “Simultaneous Landscapes” Among Maori," 95; Mead, 271-275.
109 Grey, 164, 236-239, 298-301.
that while the Crown or state is not a monolithic entity and contains many contradictory elements, it is possible to identify a general pattern in its relationships with Māori so that even if state agents or agencies did not abide by the general pattern, the official policy still had a significant influence on tangata whenua. Māori are also not monolithic and there is quite a bit of variation in how different people define goal of autonomy and what shape they want it to take.

The Crown initially pursued a policy of total assimilation of Māori under the expectation that they would eventually abandon their culture and identity. Few people have been willing to admit the “fundamental intent of the assimilation policy, which essentially implied a strategic transfer of resources from Maori to colonisers in a way that minimalised resistance.”

Despite this approach, as well as numerical dominance and coercive power, Crown hegemony was never complete. It remained contested from official inception of the state in 1840 throughout the twentieth century. Māori would not accept the loss of their sovereignty and the state was forced to respond to different forms of Māori resistance.

The depiction of women, native peoples, colonized peoples, and other less politically powerful persons as passive and incapable of representing themselves has been a long-standing trend in academia. This then justified or necessitated those who were defined as having agency to then speak for and act for those without agency. Recent scholarship in the social sciences and the humanities has interrogated the concept of

\[\text{Hill,}\ Maori\ and\ the\ State:\ Crown-Maori\ Relations\ in\ New\ Zealand/Aotearoa\ 1950-2000,\ (Wellington:}\ Victoria\ University\ Press,\ 2009),\ 1-9,\ 275-293.\]

\[111\ \text{Hill,}\ State\ Authority,\ Indigenous\ Autonomy: Crown-Maori\ Relations\ in\ New\ Zealand/Aotearoa\ 1900-1950,\ 20.}\]

\[112\ \text{Ibid.,}\ 11-30,\ 266-272;}\ \text{Hill,}\ Maori\ and\ the\ State:\ Crown-Maori\ Relations\ in\ New\ Zealand/Aotearoa\ 1950-2000,\ 1-9,\ 275-293.\]
agency and of subjectivity.\textsuperscript{113} A broad way of defining agency is “the capacity of the agent to act in the world.”\textsuperscript{114} In terms of people, agency involves “reflexive, intentional and transformative action.”\textsuperscript{115} These ideas have emerged from feminist and post-colonial critiques as well as subaltern studies, of the privileging of white, male, Euro-American perspectives and of the ways in which structural theory has limited understandings of the capacity to act. These criticisms address the issue of subjectivity, the ability of different people to act, and to speak for themselves.\textsuperscript{116}

Māori have been no exception; in the face of a colonizing force, the issue was how to adapt but continue to nurture Māori identity and culture. Sometimes they had to hide their cultural practices, but they never stopped their efforts to regain self-determination. Māori were flexible; they operated at many levels and used different strategies and tactics. They constantly modified and altered their efforts as needed along the way. This also involved the appropriation of elements of Pakeha institutions and culture in an effort to recover their autonomy.\textsuperscript{117}


\textsuperscript{114} Murton, Clark, and Benton, "draft of The Question of Native Agency and Voice." Drawn from Wikipedia.

\textsuperscript{115} Jones and Cloke, cited in Ibid.

\textsuperscript{116} Ibid; Fadzillah; Borofsky; Chen; Gregory. s.v. "Human Agency."

These goals are encapsulated in the concept of *tino rangatiratanga*, which can be defined in many ways, but is basically about autonomy and Māori control over their own concerns. There has been much dispute within Māori society about how to achieve *rangatiratanga*, what it means, and whether or not the pursuit of it is appropriate. Self-determination does not have to mean completely separating from the Crown and its system nor does it mean “unlimited power” because in any society there are a variety of negotiations between different levels of political groupings. What is important is the recognition that Māori are “distinct people” and that they want meaningful control over their resources, culture, and future. They persevere because it is of central importance to them. Unfortunately, their efforts have been opposed by the Crown because a situation in which Māori have autonomy does not fit within the dominant paradigm of how governance should operate.\(^{118}\)

The Crown goal of total assimilation remained in place until 1970s at which point it was forced to acknowledge that Māori would never accede to assimilation. Until then both Māori and the Crown constantly adapted their efforts to achieve mutually exclusive goals. Even though there were occasional efforts to grant Māori limited power or control, Hill argues that there was no intention to do so fully, and that such steps were only limited temporary tokens to appease Māori. “For the real question is not how far the Crown went towards meeting Māori aspirations for *rangatiratanga* in the twentieth

century, but whether it was ever really concerned with doing so."\textsuperscript{119} The main point is that Crown was not truly supportive of the goal of Māori self-determination.\textsuperscript{120}

The desire for self-determination continues to be salient and is increasingly visible in the public arena. The actual form of self-determination varies as do the ways to achieve it. The government’s responses to these efforts also changes. But, there is a greater recognition that this process is not just about the past but about finding mutually agreeable ways forward.

2.5 GEOGRAPHY’S APPROACH TO PLACE

In the previous section I argued that the essence of what it means to be Māori is deeply place-oriented. In this section I will link this idea to the extensive scholarship in geography dealing with place, while trying to avoid the somewhat sterile debate in the discipline about the ways in which place and space are theoretically related. There is, as Ingold suggests, something wrong about the notion that places exist in space, although he admits that semantics play a role in the debate over what is meant by space, and for that matter place. Agnew also finds that various treatments of space and place by geographers are problematic because they focus primarily on how these concepts differ rather than on how they are connected. My own work involves various aspects drawn from a number of stances taken on space and place by geographers and others. I begin with a discussion of the way place has developed as an analytic concept in human geography. At the outset, I would like to point out that this conceptual framework has been fundamentally produced


\textsuperscript{120} Ibid., 11-30, 266-272; Hill, \textit{Maori and the State: Crown-Maori Relations in New Zealand/Aotearoa 1950-2000}, 1-9, 275-293.
within Western academia and as such represents a Western-centric interpretation of place. Initially, I outline a genealogy of place-oriented scholarship, and then focus my attention on two perspectives, that places are either socially constructed, or reflect being-in-the-world. I then examine what the literature says about globally and locally connected places.

2.5.1 PLACE IN HUMAN GEOGRAPHY

Place studies have undergone various iterations in geography. The ideas of environmental determinism, or the belief that the natural world determines human behavior, can be traced back as far as Hippocrates. Some of the more recent scholars in this tradition include Ellen Semple and Ellsworth Huntingdon, who were prominent during the early twentieth century. In the U.S., during the 1920s, Carl O. Sauer led the repudiation of environmental determinism in favor of a regional approach, though the construction of distinct regions can be traced back as far as the deterministic approach. From the early twentieth century until the 1960s, geographic analysis of place was dominated by regional studies. In addition to Sauer and Hartshorne, the French geographer Vidal de la Blache was widely influential. The regional approach emphasized the interface between culture and environment and drew attention to how the former transformed the latter. This geographic approach was descriptive, focusing on the particular and the ideographic or what characterized the different regions of the earth, and was characterized as empirical, scientific, and objective. One of the aspects of this approach was that it employed the European concept of landscape. For geographers landscape is a visual concept which is typically understood from an outsider’s
perspective, whereas place is something in which to live and in which to be. Landscape is a particular way of looking at the world where it is viewed in its totality and seen as more than the sum of its parts. Land as landscape also tends to promote the mastery of the viewer over subjects in the frame of view. The outsider’s perspective characterizes the regional approach of geography.

During the 1950s and 1960s geographic inquiry in the U.S. was influenced by the quantitative revolution with its attention to space and spatial studies. Geographers were interested in developing generalized scientific rules and laws and sought ways in which to employ theory from other disciplines. Influenced by post-enlightenment ideals, it was believed that space was universal and more theoretically challenging while place was particular and thus not as valuable. Edward Ullman, William Garrison, and Howard McCarty were all pivotal for their roles in launching this tradition.

The 1960s also witnessed the emergence of humanistic geography, though it was not until the 1970s that it attracted much attention. Humanistic geographers such as Fred Lukerman, Edward Relph, Yi-Fu Tuan, Anne Buttimer, and David Seamon, and Robert Sack began to assert the theoretical significance of place and have drawn attention to the ways in which subjectivity is produced through immersion in place. These geographers have turned to the ideas of phenomenology and the work of philosophers J.E. Malpas and Edward Casey to emphasize the ways in which place unites the social, natural, and cultural worlds. The philosophy of phenomenology, as developed by Franz Brentano and Edmund Husserl, “began as a critique of what Husserl called the ‘natural attitude,’
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that is, what is taken for granted in a culture that has been influenced predominantly by modern science." Edward Casey is a philosopher of place who has had extensive interaction with geographers and anthropologists. Following the ideas of Archytas, Aristotle, Bachelard, and Heidegger’s concept of dwelling, Casey uses the phenomenological approach to argue that it is place and the experience of it which are general, universal and a priori, while space is particular. Casey is also informed by the ideas of Maurice Merleau-Pointy, Pierre Bourdieu’s concept of habitus, and Michel de Certeau’s theories on the constant negotiation between the various structures of society and individual choices within that social grammar.

Several humanistic scholars have been dissatisfied with dwelling as it is associated with fixity and authenticity. They have sought ways to theorize the contingent and temporal nature of place as well as the ways in which it is produced through habituated everyday activities. Among others, these ideas include: place as ‘task-scapes’ (Ingold); ‘place-ballet’ (Seamon); ‘performance’ (Thrift); and ‘Thirdspace’ (Soja, who draws from Henri Lefebvre). Turning to the work of structuration theorists Anthony Giddens and Pierre Bourdieu, Pred draws attention to the ways in which places are dynamic so that they “are never ‘finished’ but always ‘becoming’.”

123 Casey, "How to Get from Space to Place in a Fairly Short Stretch of Time: Phenomenological Prolegomena," 13.
124 Ibid.
127 Cresswell, 35.
One of the significant outcomes of these various scholars and their work is an emphasis on the idea of embodiment and the combined physicality and perceptually based qualities of the human experience in place (see also Ingold). By the late 1980s, critiques of humanistic geography led to the development of new approaches to place. These new radical geographers have engaged with the ideas of Raymond Williams, Antonio Gramsci, social theory, and British Cultural Studies in order to develop critical studies of place. Marxist geographers, such as David Harvey, feminist scholars, such as Gillian Rose and bell hooks, and post-structural theorists including Doreen Massey and Allen Pred, have drawn attention to the ways in which place both produces and is produced by society and wider social processes.

2.5.2 PLACE AS SOCIALLY CONSTRUCTED AND PLACE AS BEING-IN-THE-WORLD

These involve a fundamental philosophical component. As Cresswell argues, contemporary human geography has been dominated by a social constructionist approach. From this perspective places are viewed as not natural or given but created by people. People can both create and un-create places. Both the meaning people ascribe
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to places and the material aspects of place are socially constructed. Place as being-in-the-world is theoretically grounded in the phenomenology of Martin Heidegger and Maurice Merleau-Ponty, and geographers have used their ideas to suggest that places are much more than social constructions. Cresswell suggests (using Sack and Malpas) that both of these are aspects of how we experience the world. The impacts of society and culture on place are important. Social constructionists, however, tend to give too much weight to the social. Place is treated as separate from people where it is “an inscribed surface…[where people] are disembodied, separate from the object of their intentions.” Social construction places an emphasis on the mind over the body in comparison with a phenomenological approach, which privileges the embodied experience of being in place. Instead it is place that is central in that it is the experience of being in place that gives rise to both meaning and society. Thus, while humans shape place, place is primary to our subjectivity. Ingold also supports this view of place. Referring to the social constructionist approach as the building perspective and being-in-the-world as the dwelling perspective, Ingold argues that cultural practice is constituted through the body’s immersion in place. Building is something that people undertake as they are in the process of dwelling, or interacting with place. Emphasizing process, the individual is generated through a sensual immersion in place. “Before all else, every person is a being-in-the-world, and that human conceptions of space, time, and place must begin with our own physical constitution as embodied beings with certain corporal orientations and
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sensory capacities. In other words, the individual is already being produced by an embedded interaction with the world.

The building perspective or social construction of place approach addresses the political aspects of place or place as a social construct. Scholars argue that places can be mobilized to normalize identity, to construct places of difference, or to encode social hierarchies. Cresswell notes two key elements to the place as social construction. First, according to this approach, both the meaning and physical materiality of place are socially constructed. So, social constructionists look to see the different ways in which particular places came to be and what new formations may arise. Second, Cresswell (and Escobar) notes that social constructionists focus on how changes in capitalism, globalization, and modernity have affected relationships to place. Thus, this approach looks beyond a bounded notion of culture or of place.

There are two aspects to social construction of place that are important to my work in that they draw attention to interactions between the global and particularities of place. The first, which has been developed by Harvey, addresses the ways in which power and place are interconnected with an understanding that places are formed through social and cultural conflict. This attends to ways in which places are deployed as a means to control, exploit, and subjugate. But, it can also be a means to resist. The second social construction approach, which has been developed by Massey, attends to ways in which global forces have differing effects around the world. She focuses on connections
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between the global and the local and views place as progressive and open. But, in contrast to Harvey, who largely sees the production of place as a tension between the imposition of undifferentiated global ideas onto the world and local resistance, Massey has argued that elements of positionality and identity play a role in the mobility and flows of capital, people, entities, and ideas.

The dwelling perspective/being-in-the-world approach emerges in many ways from a rejection of the positivism associated with spatial studies. Geographers informed by phenomenology have sought to bring the human element back into human geography by focusing on ways in which people form meaningful attachments to place. The preponderance of Western science and the ways in which it is organized have convinced many people that space is universal when in fact it is the product of a particular place-based cultural heritage. In contrast, humanists have argued that “ontological priority [should be] given to the human immersion in place rather than the abstractions of geometric space.” This is one of the basic oppositions between the rational Enlightenment model of knowledge and the theories advanced by phenomenologists.

Advocates of the being-in-the-world approach argue that place is central to the human experience for “to be human is to be ‘in place’.” This begins with the belief that
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the individual is first constituted through an embodied interaction with the world in place. Casey explores the notion of embodiment and place through the idea of the ‘geographical self.’\textsuperscript{141} He identifies three concepts: self, body, and landscape. Contrary to Cartesian thought, the self is integral to the body and place and self are essential to each other. Drawing on Heidegger’s concept of dwelling and Merleau-Ponty’s discussions of the body-subject, the being-in-the-world approach views the relationship between the individual and the world as a generative process. The body is the vehicle or means by which the self interacts with the place-world and it is changed through its engagement with place in that the self is constituted as a subject. The agency and identity of self are constituted in place via the body. This emphasizes incorporation instead of inscription in that the individual is not imprinted with the qualities of place. Rather, the individual self is developed and produced through the ongoing interaction between the body-subject and the world. Notably, this does not necessitate fixity, but rather the temporal and contingent quality of place along with the performative aspects that include habituated, everyday activities.\textsuperscript{142} But, it is important to note that while there is ongoing dynamism and there are changes to place what makes still distinct is that there remains an enduring aspect to it with some sense of cohesion or “a sustained narrative.”\textsuperscript{143}

But, the notion of embodiment and dwelling needs another component: the landscape. Casey then discusses landscape noting that if “the geographical self is deepened by the body – drawn down into it – then it is equally true to say that place is broadened in landscape…landscape and the body are the effective epicenters of the
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According to Casey “because we have a body and are ensconced in a landscape, place and self alike are enriched and sustained, enabling us to become enduring denizens of the place-world to which we so fatefully belong.” Tim Ingold further articulates this notion of embodiment by drawing attention to form. He writes: “the concept of landscape…puts the emphasis on form, in just the same way that the concept of the body emphasizes the form rather than the function of a living creation. If the body is the form in which a creature is present as a being-in-the-world, then the world of its being-in presents itself in the form of landscape.”

The emphasis on the relational enables attention to the ways in which non-human entities also contribute to subjective formation. Ingold writes that “all manner of elements – people, artefacts, animals, plants topography, climate, culture, economy, and history – are knotted together in a unique way to form an unfolding timespace of particular landscapes and places.

According to the dwelling approach human understandings of space, time, and place are informed by this embodied and subjective experience in place. Thus, place is foundational to our social and political formations. Place is invested with layers of meaning at the individual and culture level. Culture and place are so thoroughly enmeshed and encoded into one another that culture cannot be the same in another place; place is indispensable to the structure and form of culture. Connections to place are an
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intrinsic part of our existence. Ultimately, one understands the world through one’s emplacement within it rather than one’s presumed distance from it.

These discussions of embodiment and of form are particularly salient to Indigenous articulations about the meaning of self and relationships to place. Several Native scholars argue that the phenomenological approach resonates with Indigenous concepts of the interconnectedness of all entities.\textsuperscript{149} Among the ways in which phenomenological ideas connect with Indigenous ways of being in the world there is the attention to place as a significant aspect of humanity. Second, there is the emphasis on embodiment and the form as the vehicle through which the self interacts with the world in place. Third, there is the recognition that physical and perceptual interactions with the world produces intersubjectivity and that the self is constituted in place. Fourth, there is the inclusion of non-human entities. Fifth, is the argument that place is indispensable to culture. Sixth, that names and language are an important point of connection between people and place. Lastly, they note the repudiation of supposed objective distance from the world as implied in European landscape. Instead, the dwelling approach articulates a subjective immersion in place and the world as the basis for self, identity, and culture.

2.6 GLOBAL AND LOCAL CONNECTED PLACES

This dissertation is informed by a combination of the geographic approaches to place as outlined above. Aspects of Harvey’s and Massey’s interpretation of social constructionism are helpful for theorizing ways in which the local and the global

\textsuperscript{149} Murton, "Toward an Understanding of a Maori Cultural Landscape" 14-15. Murton identifies Cajete, Deloria and Wildcat, Little Bear, Momaday, Pihama, and Stewart-Harawira as having argued that phenomenology parallels Indigenous worldviews.
intersect. Dirlik and Escobar are also important for highlighting ways in which places matter.

Harvey attends to the ways in which powerful forces shape and influence place and the ways in which places resist.\textsuperscript{150} In his view, place is always in some state of relative flux, though it achieves a certain level of durability in its construction as a bounded entity out of the “uncontrolled vectors of spatiality.” He also attends to the tensions that exist between the mobility of capital and the relative immobility of place, thus drawing attention to how places must change to meet the demands of capital. This could theoretically lead to the reduction of the importance of place as market forces pit places against one another in bids to attract jobs and investment. But, Harvey argues that this threat from the global economy serves to magnify the importance of place as people focus on their security and local values. Also, place is political as a means of resistance to the homogenizing forces of global capitalism through communal constructions of authenticity and particularity. But, he problematizes this by noting that places are the “contested terrain of competing definitions.”\textsuperscript{151} This approach resonates with my work in that Harvey calls attention to the ways in which outside forces intrude upon and contribute to the formation of place and also because of his emphasis on the conflicts that go into producing place. There are, however, elements of Harvey’s concept of place that are problematic. He focuses too much on capitalism while ignoring other aspects of life that structure experience, such as gender, race, and socio-economic status. He gives too much weight to the outside institutions and systems and, in the sense of local agency, place is often depicted as reactionary to such forces through the production of
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exclusionary boundaries dividing “us” and “them.” Efforts to develop attachment and historic meaning do not necessarily involve being reactionary. Also, for Harvey, place is made out of the socio-political system that is associated with space whereas my work emerges from the perspective that culture and subjectivity are formed through immersion in place. Further, such an approach to place largely relies on a sense of place that contains a single, essentialized identity. Finally, it can lead to a conflation of place with community.

Massey’s work resonates in that it focuses on ways in which places are progressive, open, dynamic, networked, and different. Places are produced through particular movements of people, things, and ideas over time. Thus, place is understood as process and as a “meeting place” defined by relationships with the outside world. Massey’s theorization about the connectivity of place and wider, overlapping scales is relevant to this research. For example, Māori families are situated within a multi-scalar series of different relationships. They are a part of a sub-tribe, which is a part of a broader tribal group. But, they are also a part of historic migratory movements from Hawaiiki, and ultimately they are a part of the cosmogonic genealogy that structures the universe and links them with other entities. Yet, individuals still have very real and passionate attachments to their lands. Unlike Harvey, Massey looks beyond a uniform sense of global forces to address the “power-geometry” of a place, which is to say the ways that social categories related to identity and positionality influence human movement and experience. Further, she argues that multiple communities may live in the same place, each experiencing it in different ways. Thus, place is the “site of multiple identities and

152 Ibid., 53-79.
rather than leading necessarily to greater homogenization, this approach posits that globalization is experienced in different ways, which leads to the production of unique “locales.” In this way, there is attention to global connections and local particularity. Massey’s interpretation, however, tends to eliminate the uniqueness of individual places and also devalues the “existential rootedness” of place, which is what speaks to indigenous conceptions of place. As with Harvey, Massey gives too much credence to outside forces, thus eliminating the agency of local forces. She seems to argue that people who focus on connections to place are doing so in an exclusionary manner, but that is not always the case. Also, local forces do not solely resist global ones; some people welcome aspects of global capitalism. For example, Ngati Porou Whanui Forests Ltd. has developed a means to earn money through the carbon credit trade. Also, individual people within a place have very different understandings about what it means to be there and how that place relates to the rest of the world. Comparing Harvey and Massey in their approaches, Cresswell argues that it is, in part, the unique condition of place that informs the theoretical analysis of it; the particularities of place that shape the ways in which we study it.\textsuperscript{154}

Massey’s idea about attending to different social categories resonates with both Dirlik and Escobar who argue that it is necessary to analyze the relative power of a group.\textsuperscript{155} To dismiss this out of hand is to deny the relative agency of the politically marginalized. Escobar goes on to argue that there is also the risk that ignoring such
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categories can lead to their use as a means to exploit and to maintain the dominant power structure. Dirlik and Escobar note that the context of place influences those social categories. If researchers do not consider the origin of those categories, then discussions of identity and culture privilege the global and a hegemonic presentation of those classifications. In other words, these social formulations of identity and rank cannot be unraveled unless they are analyzed in terms of the historical place-based context in which they have been formed.

Hybridity has been suggested as a way to overcome the tangled relationships between global and local by moving beyond simple binaries to show ways in which disparate peoples, things, and technologies interact to produce new formations. Thus, hybridity seeks to move past an understanding of cultures and peoples as discrete. Mary Louise Pratt uses the term ‘contact zone’ to describe the interactions of people during the colonial and post-colonial encounter.\(^{156}\) By using ‘contact zone’ instead of ‘frontier,’ she moves beyond the power imbalance implicit in the spatial language of ‘frontier,’ and focuses instead on the co-presence of colonizer and colonized. This attends to ways in which different group selectively adapt ideas and technologies, both from colonized to colonizer and vice versa, in a process that Pratt refers to as ‘transculturation.’\(^{157}\) This is not a simple transmission of ideas from one place to another, such as from colonial
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metropole to periphery or from modern to traditional, but rather the development of new trajectories to local-global relations. Further, the ‘contact zone’ is a place wherein subjectivity is constituted, as well as continually negotiated.

The concept of hybridity has been used in additional ways to challenge commonsense epistemologies. Rose notes that several scholars take hybridity beyond the ‘contact zone,’ while others address ways in which hybridity can challenge the binary of Nature and Culture, or Self/Other (Bhabha), as well as drawing attention to the agency of non-human actors (this also draws on Actor-Network Theory).  

This not only draws attention to the power imbalance of these relationships, but also to the dynamic qualities of the interactions. What this leads to is a discussion of the ways in which different places and spaces are connected rather than on the boundaries themselves, or on the places in between (such as Thirdspace).

But, both Dirlik and Escobar are critical of hybridity and argue that it has limitations. They point out that hybridity draws attention away from the original components, thus it risks eliminating the particular as well as claims to identity and authenticity. It also eliminates the ability of people to develop identities in opposition to modernity. Escobar prefers Soja’s theory of Thirdspace, which he finds to be helpful for moving beyond binary understandings of the world. Thirdspace adds to the dialogue
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without destroying individual elements. Instead, it recognizes the world as a combination of “lived, perceived, and conceived spaces.”

Another way of rectifying the binary is by recognizing that culture is dynamic. The concept of culture is itself a construct. As Abu-Lughod articulates, there is no one essential total culture, instead there is multiplicity of particulars. Culture has been used in many ways, but, in terms of this discussion, it has been used a means of establishing difference between people, particularly the hierarchical differences between people of the West against the Rest. Boas notes the way in which the academy has contrived to establish a hierarchical ranking of all cultures so that those of the West remain privileged. In contrast, many scholars now argue that any given culture is historically and contextually contingent, and it is an active force. Alexander Lesser argued that

‘we adopt as a working hypothesis the universality of human contact and influence’; that we think ‘of human societies – prehistoric, primitive, or modern – not as closed systems, but as open systems’; that we see them

161 Escobar, "Place, Economy, and Culture in a Postdevelopment Era," 204.
‘as inextricably involved with other aggregates, near and far, in weblike, netlike connections.’\(^{164}\)

Rather than focusing on cultures as discrete entities, attention must be focused on the processes that transcend individual “cultures” and on the connections that exist between “cultures.”

Escobar, Dirlik, and Massey critically engage with the concept of the global and its hegemony.\(^{165}\) Globalization has been equated with the spread of the cultural ideas of European capitalist modernity where certain kinds of values are privileged over others. These scholars argue that different systems and movements create different formations of space and place. Capitalism promotes a uniform kind of space that is abstract and devoid of the kinds of meanings embedded in places. It advances a generic understanding of place as the source of materials, labor, and markets, but not as formative of meaning. Further, it links place with marginality and stasis. Drawing on Gibson-Graham, Escobar argues that capitalism is not exclusive, nor is it the only economic system. A recognition of this makes it possible to disrupt the teleology of capitalism’s spread and work to dismantle its dominance.

These scholars argue that places are an important means to counter capitalism and modernity. Places are not just important for a nostalgic sense of the past, but also because they are a way to evaluate change over time. In discussions of the local and the global the former often appears to be at a disadvantage; however, neither can exist without the other. Just because something is global does not make it universal; it still has its limits. For example, even though global capitalism is more mobile, it must still have some
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practices in place and in order to effectively compete in a place it must adopt some of the elements of that place whether they be language or cultural practices. Conversely, there are ways in which local practices reach out to shape global interactions. It is important to keep in mind that while they are mutually influential, they are not equally so. It is also important to think of the global and local as more than scales, but instead as processes and powers. Once the global is recognized as being in flux, then there is the possibility of rupture. Another important aspect of place is that that is where politics originate and are developed. Thus, an analysis of place enables an understanding of the ways in which power is articulated. Globalization and capitalism must be repoliticized in order to show that they are not inevitable or politically neutral. Instead, they are the products of specific discourses and practices. This opens of possibilities of challenging them and showing that alternative practices are possible.\textsuperscript{166}

Another way in which place poses a challenge to dominant understandings of globalization is by highlighting alternatives to capitalism. Other ways of being and other economic systems have always and continue to exist. These offer a challenge to the supposed hegemony of capitalism. Noncapitalisms do not necessarily get destroyed through the arrival of capitalism nor is everything is defined by relationships to capitalism. In other words, while people and cultures around the globe are connected to global capitalism, their understandings of the world and their relationships with it are not defined by capitalism. Their understandings originate from their place-based experiences. Ethnography can be an important means of highlighting ways in which capitalism is being resisted by looking at what people do as alternatives to capitalism and how people
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shape their own lives. This goes beyond resistance in that people are developing their own systems based on their own priorities and understandings of the world; they are not just subjects in the wake of the spread of capitalism, but agents in their own right.\textsuperscript{167}

In order to reassert the power of place and view it as a project that is ongoing, we must develop new ways of discussing it. Dirlik turns to Lefebvre, who argues that place is not just the setting of history, but a product of history and society.\textsuperscript{168} Dirlik, however, argues that place is not just a product but the nexus between the social and the natural in which they are interlocked in mutually influential ways. He also criticizes Harvey for overemphasizing capital and leaving out other ways in which society and nature are mutually constituted in place as well as aspects of the “political, psychological, and esthetic.”\textsuperscript{169} In contrast with Harvey, he argues that practices and identities have the power to mobilize beyond place and operate at a global level. This resonates with my example of Ngati Porou Whanui Forests Ltd. above. Dirlik notes that indigeneity does not necessitate fixity and that, in addition to traditions of mobility, diasporic populations still maintain strong senses of the importance of place. The point is that the place is a specific one that is connected to their identity. Rather than the reduced, oversimplified sites of nostalgia bereft of formative meaning, Dirlik argues that places must be recognized as having a role in forming life in a global world.

In contrast with both Harvey and Massey, Dirlik and Escobar argue that the physical terrain of place must also be taken into account.\textsuperscript{170} They argue that we must
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recognize that place is in flux, or in a state of becoming, and is a ceaseless project that is produced by many different relationships, including those with the physical world and non-human entities. We must move beyond the idea that Nature and Culture are separate and that the world is an object. Instead, all things are interrelated and these relationships are reproduced through everyday practice. Phenomenology is an important means to move past fixed and abstract notions of place. Using Heidegger’s concept of dwelling, Escobar argues that learning arise through direct interaction or bodily immersion in the world rather than abstract intellectual apprehension of the world. He further turns to phenomenological biology to draw attention to the ways in which historical context shapes our lived experience. Thus, it is the ecological setting, or the physical place, that is constitutive of culture. Nor should boundaries solely mean exclusion or should “grounded” be viewed as problematic. In contrast, an emphasis on ways in which place is “grounded” serves to draw attention to how place and its inhabitants (non-human and human) shape each other and shape relations beyond. Thus, place is not simply influenced by external capital and global factors.

Dirlik prefers to describe relationships to place as place-based rather than place-bound in order to emphasize the ways in which relationships are rooted or grounded, but not delimited by its location in that the local reaches out to shape the world around it. Places are not limited to their location; they can mobilize and build networks to advance their own interests and counteract the hegemonic forces of capital in terms of how places, place-based knowledges, worldviews, and power are viewed and practiced. People who say that place-based changes are impractical or that they originate from a defunct notion
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of the past are eliminating the possibility that people have other ways of living in the world. Further, it ignores the power difference between those who fight for place and those who argue that place does not have relevance. Dirlik, however, cautions that when promoting place it is important to not present a temporally fixed and bounded notion of place, but rather one that is dynamic and interconnected.

In order for place-based alternative ways of living and being to endure, we must reappropriate the global and “space of power.” Places must become visible and must change the way that life is lived, but while still maintaining the uniqueness and power of places as specific lived experience and grounded reality. Dirlik and Escobar argue that it is important to attend to the ‘grounded’ lived reality of place as an actual location. It is necessary to deal with the specifics of different place situations rather than to solely operate in the realm of theory. To do otherwise is fail to see how these different relationships form and change over time and thus to lose the elements that give discussions of place their explanatory power and relevance.

These integrated approaches take off from the position that while places are constructed and experienced at a local scale they can also be understood as having connections and networks that span much larger scales. In this way places are more dynamic and progressive. They have the potential to be simultaneously global and local in the way that people experience them, but in such a way as to not demote place to sites of vulnerable localness in the face of structural forces of capitalism, or as bastions of conservatism rooted in the past.
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This chapter has discussed the ways in which global projects of capitalism and modernity have spread and influenced places. It has also addressed characteristics of place-based Māori culture and how these ways of being-in-the-world resonate with geography and phenomenology. Chapter Three will investigate the interactions between globalizing forces and local cultures in New Zealand in terms of property rights and political autonomy. This will be followed by Chapters Four and Five that deal with spatializing strategies, which are important elements of global capitalism.
CHAPTER 3. DISPOSSESSION

3.1 INTRODUCTION¹

In European colonies actual experiences of indigenous peoples and settlers and practices of establishing colonial control varied significantly through space and time. In terms of settler colonies, some places were settled prior to the establishment of formal colonial rule. Each process, however, reinforced and facilitated the other. Governance was often established to intervene in settler and indigenous interactions on the one hand and on the other hand settlers often preferred places that were under the official control of their government. Banner notes the distinction between sovereignty and property.² British and American colonists felt that exercising the former over indigenous peoples was their right by virtue of “English discovery and settlement,” but they did not agree on how land should be acquired from natives.

Therefore, one of the key issues when it came to colonies was the European acquisition of land. There was no official policy in Britain or the United States to ignore indigenous rights to land and general agreement that those rights had to be obtained through legal means rather than by force. The on-the-ground reality of land acquisition, however, was highly contested and a range of different practices emerged. Rather than a case in which ideas from the colonial metropole were imposed upon the colonies the local situation influenced the ways in which the land tenure policies developed.

There were a variety of means by which Māori were dispossessed of their lands. Initially, settlers and companies purchased land directly from Māori. The Crown

¹ The following section is drawn from Stuart Banner, Possessing the Pacific: Land, Settlers, and Indigenous People from Australia to Alaska, (Cambridge, Massachusetts; London: Harvard University Press, 2007), 1-12, 47-83; Alan Ward, The Rangahaua Whanui National Overview Report, volume iii (Wellington: Waitangi Tribunal, 1997), 119.
² Banner, 1-12.
practiced preemption from the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi until the middle of the nineteenth
century. These first two can both be classified as alienation by contract. Between 1845
and 1872 there were a series of military conflicts known as the New Zealand Wars. A
direct outcome of this was Crown acquisition of Māori land by confiscation and cession.
Subsequent to this phase, the government implemented land tenure reform in which
individualized title supplanted a family-based system of bundled use-rights. This process
enabled yet further land transfers from Māori to European. In addition, the government
acquired land through public works appropriations (including for scenic reserves), as
gifts, and through development schemes. The vast majority of the alienations, however,
were via the first three methods: contract; confiscation and cession; and land tenure
reform. These, as well as their impacts on Te Urewera-Kaingaroa and Te Tairāwhiti, will
be the subject of this chapter.

Māori peoples and the British had different concepts of property rights. Māori
divided “functional” uses of land where people have rights to exploit certain resources in
certain places. Thus, an individual could have many different rights, but these would be
located in several different places. Māori viewed their relationships with land as
encompassing a variety of non-economic uses. Land was something to which Māori
maintained close cultural, spiritual, and familial bonds; tangata whenua belonged to the
land. The hapu (sub-tribe) was the ultimate repository of property rights and controlled
particular territories. The sub-tribes basically operated as individual sovereign systems
and rights could not be ceded to people outside of the group except in unusual
circumstances. Even though Māori enjoyed a low population density, every parcel of land
and all the use rights were allocated. These rights were organized within the hapu and
allocated to individual families. Families retained these rights and passed them to successive generations. While rights could be negotiated and were flexible, distribution of said rights outside of the family unit required coordination at the hapu level. There was no system for the sale of property.

This was in contrast to the existing British system wherein all the resource rights were bundled into a delimited area of “geographic space.” While Britons also recognized non-economic uses of land, such as a sense of home and aesthetic valuations, land was largely defined in economic terms. This was especially the case for many early settlers who had fled poverty in England. The differences in the exercise of property rights led to confusion and misunderstanding.

Another major disparity lay in the methods used to record and define property ownership. The British used survey systems and written deeds to establish rights. In contrast, Māori relied on oral histories that incorporated use rights into genealogies.

While there were key differences in the systems, the British did recognize Māori as having a property system and the Crown decided to acknowledge Māori rights to the entirety of the country, rather than just to those areas under direct cultivation. “The recognition of Maori property rights meant that in the absence of war the British could only acquire land by purchase.”

In the case of New Zealand, settlement preceded the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi, which was when Britain formally acquired the right to govern New Zealand, though the actual understanding of what “govern” meant was problematic. In response to the European desire for land, Māori tribes came up with individual methods of extending
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property rights to the newcomers. Often these first settlers would intermarry with Māori people and live amongst their hosts. This afforded Pakeha the protection of the tribe and for the tribe it effectively appeared as though the land was staying within the purview of the group. After the formal establishment of rule, however, the rate of immigration increased dramatically. These new Europeans frequently sought to establish separate settlements.

3.2 LOSS BY CONTRACT

In the years immediately preceding the Treaty, there was a rapid increase in land sales. This was primarily driven by speculators who anticipated that the assertion of formal colonial rule would lead to a surge in immigration. Many of these sales were dubious in nature and led to some of the first confrontations of the New Zealand Wars.

The extension of British sovereignty over New Zealand led to an important change in the ways in which land was sold. With a few exceptions (1844-46) between 1840 and 1865 the Crown asserted the right of preemption. This meant that the Crown was the only legal purchaser of Māori property. A lack of competition amongst buyers prevented the price of land rising to a reasonable value. As a result, the Crown was able to sell land to settlers and companies at a significant profit.

While some have argued that preemption was to protect Māori from unscrupulous speculators and buyers, what ended up happening was Crown land agents exploited Māori. Banner argues that there would have been other ways to regulate the sale prices of land; however, that would have prevented the Crown from realizing an important source
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of revenue. “Preemption’s long life as part of British colonial law was doubtless due in large part to the advantage it gave to the government rather than to any benefits it provided for the native populace.”⁵ In this situation, the overall level of political organization of the Crown vis-à-vis Māori iwi enabled the former to acquire the land wealth of the latter. By 1853, the government had bought half of New Zealand. The majority of acquisitions were in the South Island, which had a much smaller Native population.

Māori were motivated to sell their lands for a variety of reasons. Intertribal rivalries eventually fostered an arms race. Land was one of the few means by which tangata whenua could acquire weapons. Māori were also very interested in the British market economy. They were able to obtain manufactured goods and technology by the production of agricultural surplus. Land, however, was their greatest and most abundant asset. Many tribes were eager to cultivate a relationship with the Crown. Iwi might want to avoid appearing uncooperative to the Crown, which was clearly a powerful agent, ally or not. Finally, prior to contact, Māori tribes had great deal of flexibility when dealing with areas of overlapping or disputed land rights. But, in situations where the Crown desired land, tribes were forced to sell or risk having the land sold by those tribes with overlapping claims. Tribal divisions prevented tangata whenua from organizing to exert more equal power in the face of the government monopoly over land purchases.

Over time conflicts arose. There were misunderstandings about of the meaning of land sales. A variety of cultural differences prevented full understanding. Māori did not have a native written language and thus did not accord written contracts the same
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⁵ Ibid., 78.
authority that Britons did. Language barriers and differences in property regimes were also major issues. Māori intended to extend usufruct rights, but not alienate the land in perpetuity. While some British recognized the differences between the two tenure systems, they did not seek to conform to the Māori system.

As Māori became more aware of the implications of the land sales, they started to organize to block further alienations. By 1856 a collection of iwi representing a large portion of North Island formed the King Movement. This league was established specifically to address the issue of land; however, while it was headed by a King his position was primarily a means to prevent further land sales and not one of governance, therefore, it was not a reconfiguration of tribal power. By 1860 they had effectively stopped land sales. At the same time, however, rising immigration meant further demand for land.

Prior to 1865, the customary practice for purchasing land was to secure the consent of the entire tribe. This meant a costly and time-consuming process. Crown agents were caught between increased pressure from immigrants demanding land and the King movement blocking sales. Agents started to negotiate with individual sellers in breach of the requirements to secure tribal consensus. The led to a weakening of tribal authority, conflicts over the veracity of the sales, and wider tensions.

By the 1860s many iwi were directly involved with and affected by Pakeha society; however, this was not the case for the entire country. Tangata whenua in Te Urewera-Kaingaroa and Te Tairāwhiti were interacting with the British market economy and had incorporated some settlers into their communities, but they were still largely autonomous. In this sense, there were several New Zealands. There were those where
Pakeha society dominated and those where *iwi* sovereignty prevailed. Problems with land sales, however, eventually led to outright confrontation and a series of wars. These wars moved around the country and brought dramatic changes to previously autonomous regions.

Māori in Te Tairāwhiti maintained control over their lands until the mid-1860s. From that point forward, Ward estimates that Māori land ownership went from “100 percent in 1860, to 54 percent in 1890, 38 percent in 1910, and 21 percent in 1939.” As in Te Urewera-Kaingaroa, some of this was the result of war, when lands were confiscated (or ceded), but much of it was purchased once the Native Land Court determined title. Even those lands that were returned to Māori or had remained under their ownership were frequently under restrictions as far as management. Though the Natives of this region maintained ownership over a higher proportion of their lands as compared to those *iwi* in other districts, they nonetheless lost control over the majority of the arable, flat lands.

While Māori in Te Urewera-Kaingaroa and Te Tairāwhiti did engage in land sales, there were few contracts until after the mid-1860s. That point marks the beginning of major alienations for both regions.

### 3.3 NEW ZEALAND WARS AND CONFISCATION

The New Zealand Wars were a series of military conflicts that took place between 1845 and 1872 and involved several different combatants, including British imperial forces, colonial troops, settlers, and a variety of Māori tribes and groups that fought both...
alongside and against the British. With the exception of a few early skirmishes, the majority of these battles took place on the North Island.  

These wars were important in that they led to the devastation of the mixed subsistence/commercial productive systems of tangata whenua, disrupted existing intertribal alliances, which were key as a safety net, and set in motion another justification for Crown confiscations of Native land. It also brought Crown scrutiny to places that had previously been isolated and therefore ended the de facto existence of independent Māori polities.

While land sales have been described as the central issue, the underlying cause of these wars was a struggle between Māori and the Crown over sovereignty. The Treaty of Waitangi theoretically meant the extension of formal British control over New Zealand, but the actual practice of that colonial power was highly circumscribed. In 1860, contemporary estimates place tangata whenua in control of eighty percent of the North Island. By that time both Pakeha and Māori recognized that ownership of land constituted the basis of political control.

Tribes were not opposed to the British presence and continued to value economic interactions. Belich notes that “the preservation of identity does not, of course, mean the absence of change. Māori society has always been capable of adaptation without losing
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its fundamentally Maori character."¹⁰ What *tangata whenua* were concerned with was the erosion of autonomy. Thus, they began to organize to put an end to land sales. This led to the emergence of a new level of intertribal political organization amongst Māori, such as the King Movement as described above. This assertion of sovereignty, however, was unacceptable to the British who, within the context of the Victorian milieu, would not tolerate a situation of dual states and wished to convert “nominal” into “substantive” sovereignty.¹¹

Belich identifies two main phases to the wars: 1860-1864 and 1864-1872. Discounting the earlier battles, he draws attention to the 1860 to 1864 period in which imperial forces, troops of the British Empire, were the primary agent against Māori. These soldiers would have had the support of some local colonial forces and pro-government Māori. The year 1866 marked the end of the involvement of the imperial army. Between 1864 and 1872, the conflict primarily involved colonial forces with the support of loyalist Māori against other Māori. Another key change in the make-up of the opposing groups was the level of pro-government Natives. Prior to 1864, *kupapa* Māori, or tribes which backed the government, were far fewer in number. After that year, however, there was a significant increase in their ranks.¹²

Belich argues that the 1864 divergence in *kupapa* participation may be attributed to changes in *tangata whenua* politics. Māori were by no means a single, unified entity. While there were several supra-tribal groups this did not signal a coherent sense of
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Māoridom, but the development of the idea of common interests. Yet, not all Māori agreed on how to achieve their goals. Nor did they immediately set aside intertribal rivalries. Thus, from the outset, Māori were involved on different sides of each conflict. The earlier resistance movements were largely led by intertribal groups such as the King Movement and Kai Ngarara. But by 1864 and the end of the Waikato campaign, the King Movement had been dealt a severe blow: the Crown’s forces had confiscated one million acres of land and captured two important King Movement towns. While the movement would continue to retain its autonomy for several years, it was clearly on the decline. Subsequently, anti-government forces were largely in the form of followers of new Māori prophet-led religions: Pai Marire,\(^\text{13}\) started by Te Ua, and Ringatu, created by Te Kooti.\(^\text{14}\) These two religions became the basis for the conflicts that lasted until 1872.\(^\text{15}\)

The new movements differed from the old ones in terms of the ways in which they interacted with the existing tribal political structure. Prior to 1864, intertribal movements did not disrupt iwi authority. Pai Marire and Ringatu, however, did challenge the chiefly status quo in certain ways. Thus, these groups may have estranged tribes enough to convince them to back the government. It is important to note, however, that kupapa had varying motives in siding with the British, and that these frequently diverged

\(^{13}\) Belich, *Making Peoples: A History of the New Zealanders from Polynesian Settlement to the End of the Nineteenth Century*, 229-246; Belich, *The New Zealand Wars: and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict*, 203-234. Pai Marire translates to “the Good and the Peaceful.” It was a fusion of traditional Māori, Christian, and innovative ideas. The religion underwent many iterations while under subsequent leaders. Though it was characterized as such, Pai Marire was not necessarily a martial religion.


from those of the government. For Māori, allegiance was almost always first for the tribe. Moreover, in many cases tribes minimized risk by playing both sides.\textsuperscript{16}

The wars were fought in various regions of the North Island. The early stage of the wars took place in the Bay of Islands between 1845 and 1846. This, in turn, was followed by a long period of peace. Hostilities resumed in Taranaki (1860-61), and then Waikato (1863-64). These were followed by renewed conflict in Taranaki between 1864 and 1867 as well as war in Wanganui and on the East Coast (in Te Tairāwhiti). There was a brief lull in 1867-68, and then conflict resumed in Taranaki and Te Tairāwhiti, the latter eventually shifting to Te Urewera. As the locus of fighting moved new areas were disrupted in turn.\textsuperscript{17}

The wars took a severe toll on surrounding communities. In addition to loss of life, infrastructure was destroyed, food became extremely scarce, and introduced diseases claimed the lives of many Māori. One of the characteristics of the West Coast and Te Tairāwhiti wars of the 1864-72 period was the practice of a ‘scorched earth’ policy by Crown forces that involved “systemically killing, looting and burning” and otherwise destroying “crops, villages, and non-combatants.”\textsuperscript{18} But, they were not alone in wreaking havoc. Pai Marire troops and Te Kooti’s army pursued a similar policy against ‘loyal’ tribes. In addition, Binney points out that Te Kooti would hold families and villages hostage as a method of coercion.\textsuperscript{19}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[19] Cited in Ibid., 6.
\end{footnotes}
A significant aspect of the wars was raupatu, or government confiscations of land from so-called ‘rebels.’ At the end of the Waikato campaign about one million acres of Māori land had been taken by the Crown. The government also confiscated large tracts of land in both Te Tairāwhiti and the West Coast between 1864 and 1865. While the latter were initially agreed to as a resolution to war, subsequent changes to the surveyed boundaries likely contributed to the resurgence in fighting that occurred between 1864-68.20

3.3.1 TE UREWERA-KAINGAROA21

The period between 1865 and 1890 was one of extreme upheaval and devastation for the Te Urewera-Kaingaroa iwi. During this time traditional subsistence economies and cultural system were severely damaged, leading to alienation from traditional lands and the beginning of a crushing cycle of poverty and dependency. The cases of the peoples of Tūhoe, Ngati Whare, and Ngati Manawa are illustrative of the wider experiences of Māori and the goals of the Crown in the area, as well as the methods the latter used to achieve them.22 Not only do they serve as examples of problems that Māori experienced relative to their immediate locale, but they also highlight the various ways in which different iwi sought to engage with the Crown over time.

22 For further details on these alienations, see Treaty of Waitangi reports and CFRT reports prepared for claims submissions.
Tūhoe and other the Te Urewera tribes initially attempted to stay neutral, however, the wars eventually crossed into their lands and brought suffering and land loss. While most exercised restraint at the onset of the wars, the individual hapu and tribes did not act in coordination. Some sided with the government while others did not. As with other regions, the wars around Te Urewera were layered onto existing rivalries and intertribal conflicts. The relative inaccessibility of their mountainous lands had previously served to protect them in relative isolation. During the wars, however, this remoteness made the area attractive as a refuge from government forces. Thus, various rebel forces, including those fleeing the Waerenga-a-Hika campaign at Turanga (Poverty Bay) in the east, Kereopa in the west, and (in 1867) Te Kooti all escaped into Te Urewera. Unfortunately, these actions, along with other events, linked the Te Urewera tribes with the resistance movements in the view of the Crown. Even more problematic, it meant that government forces in pursuit of these rebels eventually followed them into the region, which had consequences. For example, starting in 1868, government troops usually employed a scorched earth policy against Te Urewera.\footnote{Murtton notes that this practice was initiated in 1865, though not employed with regularity for another few years.}

Tūhoe experienced land loss through confiscation of both their northern and eastern lands. In 1866, the government pursued ‘blanket confiscation’ in the eastern Bay of Plenty as a punishment for participation in the war. This approach meant that an entire district, as designated by the Crown, would be confiscated regardless of whether or not all tribes in that area had participated in the wars, let alone fought against the Crown. These tracts of land would then be investigated in the Compensation Courts, which determined title and returned lands to tribes that were ‘loyal.’ This particular region
included the northern lands of Tūhoe. Unfortunately, by April 1866, all Tūhoe had been designated as rebels despite their active assistance to the Crown. This designation facilitated the government’s push to confiscate land in the region. Because they were categorized as the enemy, Tūhoe were ineligible for restoration of their rights. The other problem was that the government’s practice of confiscation had become a matter of land acquisition rather than punishment.

The confiscation plan sparked resistance among Tūhoe and their neighbors Whakatohea in early 1867, though this did not immediately lead to a total commitment to war. By April and June of 1867, government surveyors and settlers had moved into the confiscated area. This and the impending confiscations led to escalating conflicts and raids by Whakatohea and Tūhoe, on the one hand, and government forces, on the other. Despite these problems, Tūhoe were not completely invested in going to war until 1868. At that point, developments in the Te Tairāwhiti region changed their position. Some of Tūhoe’s eastern lands, specifically the Kauhouroa block, were ceded by Wairoa peoples (the Tūhoe sub-tribe of Ngāti Ruapani along with upper Wairoa peoples also had rights to this particular block). The court, however, refused to recognize Tūhoe, Ngāti Ruapani, or upper Wairoa claims as legitimate. This was again an outcome of the ‘rebel’ label. This resulted in near complete dispossession for Ngāti Ruapani. The situation was complicated when Te Kooti and his followers escaped from their exile on the Chatham Islands in July 1867. Even though Tūhoe did not agree to his request to cross their lands, he and some of his people did so in 1869 as they fled Ngatapa (in the East Coast) in defeat. Some Tūhoe later combined forces with Te Kooti for attacks on Ohiwa and Whakatane. These actions led to renewed conflict with the government in the eastern Bay of Plenty and Te Urewera.
For the next three years the government mounted a series of campaigns into Te Urewera in an attempt to capture Te Kooti. Some of the local tribes fought with him, but many remained neutral. While the latter did not support Te Kooti, or his presence in their lands, they also objected to the presence of Crown troops. Eventually, the military occupation of the region forced the Tūhoe leaders to openly join the government in pursuit of Te Kooti, who finally fled the area in 1872.

The outcome for Tūhoe was significant. The government wanted to eliminate this haven for autonomy and resistance by emptying Te Urewera and relocating its people to the coast where they would live as pacified subjects. The invasions of their land had decimated their subsistence base and many, though not all, had been forced to evacuate. Influenza spread through the area during this time and led to a high death toll. The people lost a great deal of land. The total amount of northern lands taken from Tūhoe has been estimated at approximately 124,000 acres, though there has been dispute over the figures, and some of that land would have been subject to multiple, overlapping claims. The bigger issue was the quality of the land. The confiscated areas in that region amounted to half of Tūhoe’s prime agricultural lands. This loss set the stage for Tūhoe’s economic future and their inability to develop a modern agricultural production system. In addition, the Kauhouroa lands, which numbered 157,000 acres, were not recovered.

Ngati Manawa and Ngati Whare, along with Patuheuheu, historically occupied the lands on the eastern edge of Kaingaroa Plain where it met the Te Urewera mountain region, separating Te Arawa in the west from Tūhoe in the east. Strategically, this was the easiest route in and out of the region. The area also divided one politically rebellious
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24 By 1872 many of those who had been forced to the coast were allowed to return to their homes.  
25 Murton notes that the 1927 Sim Commission initially believed Tūhoe losses to be 57,344 acres, but in their final report they fixed the number at 14,731 acres.
region, King Country, from another, Te Urewera. Politically, and through marriage, all three iwi were connected to one another and to their western and eastern neighbors, among others.

When fighting broke out again during the 1860s, first representatives of the King movement, later Kereopa, who led a Pai Marire faction, and then Te Kooti, each in turn appealed to all three iwi to support them in their separate wars. Armstrong points out that Ngati Manawa, Ngati Whare, and Patuheuheu met together and carefully assessed the strategic value of supporting either side or of remaining neutral. They were in a difficult position: Te Arawa had sided with the Crown while Tūhoe were tentatively siding with the ‘rebels.’ Thus, no matter what, relatives would somehow end up opposing one another.

Ngati Whare and Patuheuheu decided that their interests would best be served by siding with Pai Marire and Te Kooti. Their concern was to maintain control over their lands and, in the case of their close relatives the Tūhoe, they wanted a reversal of earlier 1866 Bay of Plenty and 1867 Wairoa confiscations. Despite the fact that they chose to side with the ‘rebels,’ however, they were not wholly committed to the fighting until 1869. In contrast, after a long delay, Ngati Manawa aligned themselves with the Crown. There is evidence that this decision was based on a real threat of raupatu by the Crown.

Because Ngati Whare and Patuheuheu had sided with the rebels and then lost the war, they were punished by being relocated to the coast, where they remained between 1870 and 1872. The lands there were of low quality. They had a difficult time eking out subsistence on the coast and requested to be allowed to return to their own lands, which were heavily damaged. Eventually they were given permission to go home.
The overall experiences of Ngati Manawa, Ngati Whare, Patuheroeu, and Tūhoe did not dramatically differ from one another. These tribes suffered greatly during the wars. Their lands had served as a battlefield. All of them experienced severe damage to their subsistence infrastructure either at the hands of enemies or from time away during fighting. For much of the wars, Ngati Manawa were forced to abandon their lands and seek refuge with their Te Arawa kin. Meanwhile, Ngati Whare and Patuheroeu were forced to the coast and Tūhoe suffered direct occupation. Thus, ‘loyal’ and ‘rebel’ each suffered terrible destruction to their clans and economic infrastructure. The aftermath of the wars was characterized by adversity. There were food shortages, high disease rates, and several natural disasters that included floods, frosts, and volcanic eruptions. Together these led to a high mortality rate, the erosion of tribal systems, and the breakdown of the wider regional economy. Following the end of the wars, all three turned to the government for aid. Appeals to the government for food and other forms of assistance, either by Māori or on their behalf, usually went unanswered regardless of whether the people in question had been loyal or not.

In the case of Ngati Manawa, not only did the wars create hostility within their tribe and between themselves and their relations, but their service to the Crown was poorly rewarded. They were paid at discriminatory rates, often paid late, given insufficient clothing, and lower quality weapons. When fighting subsided, small groups of them were kept on in order to work on roads, where they were still paid less than Pakeha. This had the added effect of keeping them from working on their own crops. Additionally, many of them had previously run up significant debts while seeking shelter
at Rotorua. Following cession of way, they became more dependent on European foodstuffs and acquired still heavier financial charges.

For the Crown, the initial goal was to establish military control over the region; land acquisition was a means of extending the legibility of the state and thereby giving the government a greater understanding of and control over land, people, and resources. Thus, land was first important for military reasons and only later for settlement purposes. From the perspective of the Crown, this was necessary to maintain peace and stability, and as reflected in a nineteenth century comment in the Bay of Plenty Times, this sentiment was shared by many:

The political importance of the North Island, and the colony, of our securing these vast areas of lands, comprising the volcanic plateau of Taupo and Kaingarooa to the coast, cannot be overestimated…its possession and control, by a civilised government, [is] a matter of great national significance, in respect of the peace, stability, and prosperity of the country.  

Following the cessation of war in the early 1870s, purchasing Kaingarooa was an important step along the road to asserting control over the remaining Māori areas in the King Country and Te Urewera. Road development and public works were considered essential to military control and communication as well as preparatory for European settlement. These roads could have enabled Māori to develop their own lands for the market, but that was not a goal of the government. Instead, Māori were a cheap and temporary source of labor for such projects. Such employment was viewed as a means of pacifying Māori as well as acclimating them to labor in an industrialized work regime.

Later on, a growing awareness of declining timber stocks prompted the government to pursue land acquisition to retain timber in reserve, and, eventually to
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26 Armstrong, 72-73.
acquire land for afforestation purposes. It is important to note that settlement interests continued to vie with forestry for many blocks of land. Neumann points out that while Crown goals changed over time there were often conflicting mandates between different departments and, depending upon the relative autonomy of individual state officers, the ways in which State policies were executed varied considerably.

3.3.2 TE TAIRĀWHITI

The wider New Zealand Wars eventually made their way to Te Tairāwhiti and in so doing brought Crown intervention into the previously autonomous region. The political turmoil around how best to maintain self-determination in the face of the increasing power of the colonial state added to existing tensions within the area. This touched off a civil war amongst Ngati Porou, primarily, which then spread south to Poverty Bay and turned into a war between Ngati Porou and Rongowhakaata and Te Aitanga-a-Mahaki. All of this had lasting consequences for the region.

In 1861, the King Movement sought support for their Waikato campaign from the peoples of the Te Tairāwhiti region. While tangata whenua sympathized with the goals of the Kingites, they disagreed over how to proceed. The Poverty Bay iwi were adamantly opposed to losing their autonomy to either Crown or King and steadfastly refused to get involved. The issue became a wedge that divided Ngati Porou. Initially, only younger people and opportunists advocated siding with the King Movement. Various people saw the situation in Waikato as an opportunity to seize power from their own tribal
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leadership. Many members wanted to retain their autonomy and not submit to the authority of the King. The issue of Native resistance eventually polarized many within the traditional power structure and by 1862 the tribe was divided. Several King supporters went to fight in the Waikato War. Their subsequent defeat made Ngati Porou less confident in the King Movement.

Outside issues again affected the Te Tairāwhiti, but the difference was that in 1865 confrontation entered the region. During that year a delegation of Pai Marire went to the East Coast/Gisborne to win adherents among the local tribes. They gained converts among Ngati Porou and Te Aitanga-a-Mahaki, but Rongowhakaata was generally opposed. The religious movement held an appeal similar to the King Movement. Some Māori saw their tribal future as inextricable from wider Māori concerns and Pakeha as a threat to all tangata whenua. Traditional leaders of Ngati Porou perceived Pai Marire as a new threat to their autonomy and sought to drive it from their region. This precipitated a civil war in the north that in time the loyalists/traditionalists ultimately won.

The Pai Marire refugees, who fled after their defeat in the north, shifted the center of attention to Poverty Bay. Initially, the anti-Pai Marire factions agreed to stay neutral. Soon after, however, Ngati Porou, which had followed the remnants of Pai Marire, appeared to be openly siding with the Crown. In response, Rongowhakaata sided with Te Aitanga-a-Mahaki and Pai Marire. Government forces, settlers, and civil war refugees all amassed in Turanga (modern Gisborne) and tensions began to mount.

The government issued a statement outlining ‘voluntary’ confiscation between 1864-65 as punishment for what the Crown considered to be rebellious behavior by the followers of the Pai Marire movement. The plan was that the “all lands between Lottin
Point and Lake Waikaremoana”28 should be ceded to the Crown, which would separate out the different tribal interests and then return to the kupapa and neutrals their rightful lands. This system had not been perfected for tribal justice; it’s main goal was to individualize title to make it easier for the government to purchase Māori land. It also amounted to a submission of tribal affairs over land to the authority of the Crown. For those tribes that had yet to accept loss of political autonomy, it was a difficult proposition. If tribes did not agree to the cession, their lands would be forfeit. This approach penalized all peoples in the area regardless of whether or not they had been fighting against the Crown and placed them at risk of losing their lands through tenurial reform.

Many Pai Marire supporters became doubtful about their position and started to look for a way out of the conflict; however, the government wanted a clear victory and the full surrender of the rebels. They wanted to ensure that there were no further possibilities of insurrection and so they led their forces against the Pai Marire at Waerenga-a-Hika in 1865, where the Crown and its allies were successful. Oliver and Thompson argue that this confrontation was key to determining the future course of Te Tairāwhiti and that what happened with Te Kooti was “an epilogue.”29

Following the end of that war, the Crown resumed its confiscation plans, but this time, as Oliver and Thompson note, “the Crown as confiscator had the distinction of being at once both ineffective and vicious.”30 Under the East Coast Land Titles Investigation Act 1866, the Crown proposed to investigate the ceded lands and return to
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28 Oliver and Thompson, 98.
29 Ibid., 86-96.
30 Ibid., 98.
loyalists their portion. It would, however, have been extremely difficult to clarify the land rights and many of the loyalists had prime land that the government coveted. Moreover, the government managed to upset its allies. For example, in 1866 the government told Ngati Porou, who had been a major asset during the war, that the portion they offered to cede was “too small.” They protested the plan; however, before the government could proceed Te Kooti arrived and complicated matters.

Te Kooti reignited the wars on the Te Tairāwhiti. He was from Rongowhakaata and served as a kupapa warrior. He was accused of treason, though this may have been influenced by the fact that he was not getting along with his tribe. Te Kooti was imprisoned on the Chatham Islands in 1866 alongside a number of the rebel Māori whom he had just been fighting. While there, he developed the Ringatu religion and converted his fellow inmates. He subsequently escaped in 1868 with most of his followers and their families. He professed a desire for peace, but the government wanted to re-incarcerate him. What began as an effort to evade the government turned into a campaign against the Crown and kupapa. From that point until 1872 he and his opponents were involved in a series of battles throughout the East Coast region, into Te Urewera, and through the Central North Island until he sought refuge in King Country.

The war between Te Kooti and the Crown and its allies had a profound impact on the region. In 1868 he and his followers attacked Pakeha and Māori settlements at Poverty Bay. Tangata whenua suffered greatly during his raids. These attacks fueled Pakeha demands for confiscations and placed tangata whenua in a difficult position. A group of 279 chiefs representing Te Aitanga-a-Mahaki, Rongowhakaata, and Ngaitahupo
agreed to cede the sum of their lands to the government in exchange for protection from Te Kooti.

The investigation of ceded lands was problematic. The 1866 Act established the Poverty Bay Crown Grants Commission to oversee the inquiry into title. The court did not do well at reckoning which tribes should or should not be penalized and there were instances in which loyalists lost land without being compensated while rebels did not receive significant punishments. The Crown had promised loyalists that they would receive some ‘rebel’ lands as a reward for their role as kupapa during the wars. This did not eventuate. There were also discrepancies between the amounts of land agreed to under the original cession in 1869 and what was actually appropriated. In 1921, an inquiry by the Native Lands Commission determined that 20,337 acres had been unfairly taken.

3.4 THROUGH LAND TENURE REFORM

In the postwar climate of severe economic hardship, food scarcity, and vulnerability to introduced diseases the government initiated its new land policy. Rather than incite further resentment and hostility through raupatu (confiscation), the government would pursue land tenure reform, which would be achieved through a new judicial system: the Native Land Courts.

The Native Land Courts led to the quick alienation of a great amount of Māori lands. Roughly twelve and a half million acres in the North Island were sold between
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31 The information for the following section is drawn from Armstrong, 1, 4-5, 11, 21-24, 56-57, 70-75, 80, 91-92; Banner, 84-127; Richard Boast, Buying the Land, Selling the Land: Governments and Maori Land in the North Island 1865-1921, (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2008), 177-248; McBurney, 124, 422.
1865 and 1911 with a further two and a half confiscated. In 1911, Māori retained only
seven out of twenty-eight million acres on the North Island.

Land tenure was a powerful tool of the Crown. Not only would it eliminate the
need to maintain control over the lands by force, but the costs of the process would be
borne by Māori. This was pursued despite the clear desire of Māori to retain control over
their lands. Māori, for their part, resisted efforts to buy their lands. They attempted to set
up tribal councils to oversee the disposal and leasing of lands and thereby retain control
in the process. But, the government refused to give any power to these Native committees.

There were a variety of reasons that the British pushed for the imposition of their
property system on Māori. Economic reasons were framed by cultural prejudices. For
example, the British believed that land not directly utilized was going to waste. There
was British antipathy to what they perceived as a backward system of production. From
their perspective, commercial production and capital investment were signs of social
progress. The Māori system was less conducive to large-scale commercial production and
a market system. Land sales were a means for Pakeha to put land to use and also for
tangata whenua to raise capital to then invest in improving remaining lands in order that
they become “productive.”

There were also social and political arguments. British cultural and religious
attitudes linked “proper” land ownership and “production” with morality, civic
mindedness, cultural superiority, political participation, and civilization generally. From
the point of view of the state, conversion of title was also a means of political
assimilation in that it undermined the tribal system of land management. This policy also
involved the extension of roads and public works, often built by Māori, which, combined with native schools, would further hasten assimilation. It would facilitate the dismantling of tribal autonomy and thus convert Māori from tribal members to subjects of the Crown. Finally, it would help to effect permanent settlement, which thus increased the legibility of the native populace in terms of the State’s ability to control it. In other words, the State had greater knowledge of and control over the movements and activities of its subjects.

Although individual Pakeha political cliques had different views about the acquisition of land; they generally agreed on the need to make it available for Europeans. The perception that Māori were dying out was one justification. In the case of politicians that were generally sympathetic to Māori, such as the Liberals of the late nineteenth century, their prior experiences in Britain and Ireland strongly influenced their land policies. They did not like the social and political hierarchy and exploitation, or the vulnerability to hunger and deprivation that characterized those societies. They also believed that Māori had a surplus of land, and therefore land purchases were reasonable as a means of providing for those without.

The Native Lands Act of 1865 established a new system that quickly changed the practice of land sales. Native Land Courts were created to investigate and assign title to land. Only once title had been determined could land be legally leased or put on the market. The policy quickly undermined tribal authority and resistance to sales. Previously, sales required full tribal consensus, but the new approach empowered any individual iwi member to initiate the process. This then forced all the lands in question into court proceedings regardless of the desires of the rest of the tribe. As a result, the balance of power had shifted.
There were many problems with imposing the English legal system on the process of reform. The primary goal of the courts was to aid in selling land to the British rather than making sure that Māori received justice. Judges exerted a tremendous amount of influence over the court proceedings. Their attitudes and values were not well suited to properly interpreting Māori ownership under the circumstances. Judgments could not be reversed regardless of their legitimacy. “When judicial norms clashed with the goal of ensuring that Māori land was registered to its true owners, it was often the norms that prevailed.”\(^{32}\) Also, Banner notes that there was a great deal of “carelessness” and “lack of concern” over outcomes. Sometimes officials would not properly notify the public; the true owners would not know to attend the meetings and so would lose their rights. Errors were facilitated by many involved, including Māori, some of whom lied or overstated their rights.

The difficulties in reconciling English property law to native custom led to widespread disenfranchisement. Regardless of the fact that most land was jointly shared by hundreds or thousands of people, the vast majority of titles issued between 1865 and 1870 were issued to a maximum of ten owners per parcel. The remaining members of the tribe lost all rights. A lack of clarity on the nature of shared ownership sometimes led to the loss of inheritance rights or resulted in inappropriate redistribution of rights.

While the Native Land Court meant that Māori would be able to sell on the open market, there were several problems that meant Māori received a fraction of the land’s value. First, the procedure was costly. There were court fees, legal representation fees, and survey expenses. There have been documented situations in which surveyors would

\(^{32}\) Banner, 112.
determine the boundaries of land parcels without the explicit consent of the owners and then levy the fees against them. As Māori often lacked money to pay for these surveys, they usually found that some of their lands would be taken as compensation. Plus, the court usually sat in Pakeha towns far from Māori lands. The proceedings often took several months and involved multiple iwi and claims, which meant people were unable to tend to their crops and had to pay for food and shelter abroad. Some Pakeha practiced predatory lending. Once title was declared, many Māori found that they retained little after clearing their debts. Furthermore, tangata whenua had to compete with the government, which had purchased thirty million acres under Crown preempt and could afford to sell it cheaply. This had the added effect of depressing land prices, which meant that Māori were not in a position to pass the costs of the court process on to the buyers; it was a buyer’s market.

When Māori resisted Crown efforts to purchase land, agents pursued alternative measures to achieve the same ends. They coerced Natives into leasing out blocks or parcels. This prevented any private interests from competing with the government for the land. The leases were intended as a temporary measure until Māori could be convinced to sell, though many tangata whenua recognized the deception. As evidence of this practice, the government stopped paying its rent on the leases and did not hold the Native Land Court hearings in the Taupo and Bay of Plenty region from 1873 to 1877-78. This created further hardship on Māori while also denying them any avenue to seek reparation. It also exacerbated the poverty and desperation of tangata whenua to the point that many were willing to sell by the time the court reconvened at the end of the decade. This level of duress placed Māori at a severe disadvantage when negotiating the prices of their land.
The disturbing part of this whole process was that it was directed against ‘loyal’ and ‘rebel’ alike.

The advance of the “geographic space” system of property rights at the expense of the “functional” system of use-rights can be seen as a part of the wider rise of spatializing strategies. In both the direct purchases prior to 1865 and the investigation of title under the Native Land Court the emphasis was on dividing up land into discrete parcels. The changes in the processes reflect adaptations to local circumstances. The speculative rush immediately preceding 1840 caused conflicts that led to some of the first battles of the New Zealand Wars. Crown preemption was a means, though primarily for the benefit of the Crown, of preventing such problems. Crown preemption, however, was a part of the wider erosion of Māori autonomy, thus precipitating new methods among tangata whenua to prevent such disempowerment. Organizations like the King Movement were untenable in the eyes of the British because they constituted an effort by Natives to protect and enhance their sovereignty. These mutually exclusive goals regarding sovereignty forced the country into the main confrontations of the New Zealand Wars, which pitted Māori against Māori, settlers, and the government. By replacing direct purchase with land tenure reform through the Native Land Court, the British were able to co-opt minority Māori factions interested in selling, eliminate tribal resistance to the sales, dismantle tribal sovereignty, and make Māori participants in the whole process.

Another change was the disruption to tribal and intertribal structures. In addition to the outside threat of the government, there were internal problems. During the wars some people attempted to improve their political position within their īwi by siding with Crown or going against the Crown. Later, during land reform, some people seized power
within their own sub-tribe or tribe by pushing their communal land through Native Land Courts. At a wider level, the wars disrupted intertribal regional economic systems and created new grievances between iwi. Prior to European arrival and efforts to buy land, Māori tribes had a great deal of flexibility when dealing with areas of overlapping or disputed land rights. In situations where the Crown desired land, however, tribes were forced to sell or risk having the land sold by tribes with overlapping claims. This also contributed to later intertribal conflict.

Land tenure reform was also a clearer, and more devious, way of achieving three elements of the modern state, which are legibility, order, and productivity. All land, regardless of tribal desires, could potentially be processed through the Native Land Court. Surveys and “fair” court proceedings established title, which then made the land available as a resource for sale. This enabled it to be put into productive use. What was even more convenient for Europeans was that the Māori sellers primarily absorbed the costs for such changes.

These evolving ways of acquiring Māori land and dismantling tribal property systems can be seen as the extension of the global project of European colonizing societies in extending market interactions around the world. Māori were a people of place. The new system came at the expense of tangata whenua cultural connections to and uses of the land. The emphasis was not on justice for Māori, but on moving land into the hands of Pakeha. The British rationalized this by arguing that traditional Native tenure inhibited commercial production. But, there were also arguments that Māori were
inherently incapable of equal participation in a market economy. Thus, attitudes about racial and cultural superiority were used to validate European activities.

In deciding how best to approach land reform, the issue was framed as whether or not Māori should be incorporated within British society and its economy. The question was not whether the British should adapt to the Māori system. There was an assumption of cultural superiority and again a situation in which the globalizing effects of the British empire draw relatively autonomous regions into its sphere of influence.

The important point, as Banner notes, is that the well-organized political group exerts more power in creating the structure of the system. Thus, the Crown held a monopsony while it exercised preemption between 1840 and 1865. It also was a powerful rival in the market for Māori who had survived the court process, thus keeping land prices artificially low. The outcome was that Māori were disenfranchised and impoverished as “landless rural laborers.” Ironically, it was a situation in which most Pakeha blamed Māori for their losses.

Throughout the land tenure reform process, tangata whenua attempted to influence the outcome in their favor. There were only a few Māori in Parliament or government. They tried various methods to protect Native interests in terms of slowing the process of alienation and maintaining means of self-determination. They did not always agree with one another nor did the wider Māori populace always have same views about how best to serve their interests. Government sometimes went along when it served the interests of the administration, but the overriding State goal was to acquire more land for European settlement. Different areas tried different methods to protect themselves, but in the end Māori everywhere were subject to significant alienations. In contrast with
Crown preemption and confiscations, the most extensive dispossession were the result of land tenure reform.

### 3.4.1 TE UREWERA-KAINGAROA

The Te Urewera tribes, including Tūhoe and Ngati Whare, maintained solidarity and devised a means to protect their interests. In 1872, they formed an organization called *Te Whitu Tekau* (The Union of Seventy), which sought autonomy for their *rohe* (territory). This group, which operated into the 1880s, established a system of regional self-government that opposed the alienation of any of their collective lands and prohibited the entrance of surveyors into Te Urewera. Native Land Court investigations, however, which led to alienations, continued all around them. The area became an island in a sea of purchases. Because they shared land interests with neighbors along the edges of their region some of those lands were subject to Court investigations and land acquisition. The outcome for the peoples of this region was the loss of the bulk of their better quality lands.³³

By 1890 the Te Urewera peoples faced the real issue of whether or not their lands would be subject to the Native Land Court and so developed a new strategy. In 1895, they entered into discussions with Seddon, who was then Native Minister. The outcome of these talks was the Urewera District Native Reserve Bill (UDNR) of 1896, which applied to an area of approximately 650,000 acres. This was an agreement with the government involving a tradeoff in which Te Urewera ceded autonomy and would undergo tenurial reform. In exchange, the lands would be protected from alienation and

---

the tribes of the region would retain control over the modernization of their economy.
The key aspects included a survey of the entire region, internal partitions of land (but not by the Native Land Court), and a system of self-government run by a General Committee, which was composed of elected Māori representatives. The government would bring certain benefits to the area including an education system, roading, which had the further value of providing work, new food sources, and would develop tourism. In addition to the reserve, the people of Te Urewera retained a further 150,000 acres along their borderlands.34

While this reserve granted Te Urewera autonomy it must be contextualized within wider political trends in society. Even though it had paternalistic elements, this Act is an indicator of the ways in which the Crown tried to protect Te Urewera’s interests. The Act clarified the relationship between the Crown and Te Urewera, in which Crown authority was acknowledged. Thus, advocates of the reserve viewed it as a means to end the embarrassment of the area’s de facto resistance to Crown authority. McBurney, however, points out that this concession was largely the result of Pakeha perceptions that the mountainous region was unfit for settlement. However, this hands off policy eventually changed for several different reasons.35

Despite these efforts, the vast majority of Te Urewera was alienated during the early twentieth century. The process began with limited sales under the Liberal Government. Between 1908 and 1910 a series of negotiations between various government agents, including the Māori officials Ngata and Carroll, and one of the Tūhoe
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35 McBurney, 421; Boast, *Buying the Land, Selling the Land: Governments and Maori Land in the North Island 1865-1921*, 205-212.
leaders, Rua Kenana, led to the sale of some 27,070 acres. Rua was looking to raise funds to finance land development. The ascension of Massey’s Reform Party in 1912, which was closely aligned with farmers, dramatically extended the scope of Te Urewera dispossession. Under Massey, the Crown undertook another massive round of land purchasing. From 1912 to 1922, the Crown acquired approximately one million acres of Māori land. In Te Urewera, the Crown bought 345,000 of the 656,000-acre reserve, though it did not enforce this sale until later. Under Herries, then Native Minister, the government decided to circumvent the law that required purchases to go through the Te Urewera General Committee, which sped up alienations. Boast argues that of all phases of Crown land acquisition this last one was the most harmful, especially for Te Urewera.36

Other factors contributed to Te Urewera sales. Public perceptions about the value of Te Urewera for settlement had shifted. By 1915 the Native and Lands departments were pressing for alienation. This was odd, for even by professional estimates, the mountainous region had very low agricultural potential, was highly prone to erosion, and would have a low cost/benefit ratio. Boast argues that this reflects the power of settler and farming ideology.37 In addition to wanting to open up the region to settlement, the


37 Boast, *Ngati Whare and Te Whaiti-Nui-A-Toi: A History*, 146-8, 153-5. In 1915 Wilson and Jordan reported on the quality of the lands. They noted that the soil was poor, inclined to erode once the native vegetation and forests were cleared, and would not support dense settlements (with the exception perhaps of Ruatoki lands). By their estimates the land would only support 350 Pakeha families, and would not support a higher density of sheep either. Given the costs of surveying and creating roads as well as the low agricultural output, the overall return from such settlements was relatively low. Despite this, they recommended that the government go ahead with the alienations and settlements. At that time, even with a low cost-benefit ratio wherein a lot of money would be spent on settling a low quality area that would erode, that plan of action was desirable. Meanwhile, Boast notes that it would have been far more
increasing scarcity of kauri in the Northland made the timber in the Te Whaiti region of Te Urewera valuable. The government also wanted the area for soil and water conservation, hydroelectric development, wildlife protection, and scenic preservation reasons. All of these interests had an impact on future land use options for the Te Urewera people. In order to justify its actions, the Crown frequently portrayed local Māori as obstructionist or acting against the needs of the nation. Hutton and Neumann point out that not only were tangata whenua frequently willing to sell land and accept Western forms of modernity, but they were looking to develop in ways that would be mutually beneficial.\(^{38}\) In contrast, the government seemed opposed to working out any agreements that would have addressed the needs of Māori as members of the nation.\(^ {39}\)

Te Urewera Māori found it difficult to resist dispossession. There were several barriers to economic development in the region. The geographic situation and isolation, which had initially secured some protection from Crown attention, was soon a liability. The rugged terrain had low agricultural productivity and the area was frequently subject to frosts. Further, the isolation impinged upon their ability to move goods to market. Māori also faced a shortage of capital. There were few options available to Māori other than the sale of assets. The relatively undeveloped state of Te Urewera lands often reflected a lack of capital rather than a lack of willingness. Unfortunately, the earlier disruptions to infrastructure had taken a toll. The Te Urewera peoples were often on the brink of starvation. Lacking alternatives, their desperation frequently led to land sales.\(^ {40}\)

---
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During the second and third decades of the twentieth century control over Te Urewera shifted to the government. By 1918, sale negotiations in the area were widespread. The title situation, however, was still not clear, which prevented European settlements. Between 1920 and 1927 the government undertook a major consolidation project to resurvey and divide all of Te Urewera. During this process, the Crown took more land in exchange for a promise to build roads and to pay for the new survey. The Crown’s portion of the reserve went from 345,000 to 482,300 acres so that Te Urewera were left with only 173,700 acres of their reserve. Though they still retained 150,000 acres in the borderlands, approximately half of this was sold during the ensuing decades. Thus, of the roughly 900,000 acres with which they began, they kept approximately 250,000 acres.41

The political climate, however, changed during this period. Scenic preservation had finally become a powerful public lobby. This, combined with Te Urewera’s general lack of agricultural value resulted in the government’s decision to not open the area to settlement. Instead, Te Urewera was reserved as a national park in order to preserve wildlife, prevent erosion, and protect downstream farms. Thus, only a few Pakeha were ever settled in the area. Te Urewera purchases were a big and expensive mistake that did little for the public, but deprived Māori of their patrimony.42

One of the aspects of these alienations was that their impact was spread unevenly over the individual tribes and sub-tribes. Ngati Whare lands were limited to the Te Whaiti region, which tended to be marginally productive. But, what the area lacked in
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agricultural potential, it did have in timber. The Crown, however, desired those forested blocks and set about acquiring them. This not only diminished the economic capacity of Ngati Whare, but it resulted in further land losses.\(^{43}\)

Ngati Manawa followed a different path from their neighbors and relations. The enmity that had developed during the war between Ngati Manawa, on the one hand, and their Te Urewera relations on the other had not fully subsided. Although they did maintain connections with Ngati Whare and Patuheuheu, Ngati Manawa were excluded from the Te Urewera organization, *Te Whitu Tekau* (The Union of Seventy). At the same time, Ngati Manawa were left out of Te Arawa’s Tribal Committee system. This political isolation, compounded with the erosion of local and regional subsistence systems, left Ngati Manawa with few alternatives. They began to go through the land reform process.\(^{44}\)

McBurney argues that even after Ngati Manawa submitted to the Native Land Court, they had expectations that such proceedings would be to their benefit.\(^{45}\) Not only would they eliminate their growing debt left from sheltering at Rotorua during the wars, but the sale of Kaingaroa No. 1 would cement a relationship with the Crown, thus creating a mutually beneficial alliance. “Such benefits might have included an enhancement of their social, economic, educational or even military capabilities.”\(^{46}\) Ngati Manawa did not expect that the sale would lead to a series of further sales and alienations, but from 1878 to 1927 they lost control over the bulk of their lands. Not only were the Land Court years characterized by conflict and infighting for the *iwi*, but by
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participating in the court process, they went in direct contravention to the regional efforts
to resist Crown penetration.

There has been a great deal of contention over whether or not some of these
alienations were legitimate. Maurice, a Ngati Manawa man, says:

There’s conflict there, that’s what we’re arguing about right now, the
government says they paid for it. Ngati Manawa’s story is they never were
paid for it.47

He also describes the impacts of the imposition of the Western spatial framework of
private property:

Heruiwi base blocks. They were…confiscated to pay for surveyors
costs…Yeah, you read our history our historical account. Our people
didn’t sell any of those places. You gotta pay these liens. You know what
liens are? It’s like a tax…People didn’t even know what they were talking
about. Then they get a bill. We didn’t ask for them to go in there. ‘Oh
we’ll take this land to pay for it.’ Documented, all documented. Right up
to now, where Ngati Manawa people have written in and told them this
was an unfair process. This wasn’t fair. The forest thing wasn’t fair you
know? Oh but the government is basically looking out for the majority,
ever mind about the indigenous people you know?48

These were the basis for some of the grievances that people, such as Ngati Manawa, were
lodging as treaty claims while I was in the field.

Overall, the peoples of Te Urewera lost a significant amount of their land base.

Much of what was alienated constituted the more arable lowlands. In contrast, much of
what they retain was characterized as harsh, mountainous, and tended to be isolated. This
not only meant a loss of their patrimony, but a diminishment of their productive capacity.

47 Maurice Toetoe, Interview by author, 18 December 2006, Murupara, Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa,
Murupara, N.Z.
48 Maurice Toetoe, Interview by author, 18 December 2006, Murupara, Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa,
Murupara, N.Z.
3.4.2 TE TAIRĀWHITI

In the region as a whole the īwi maintained control over their lands until the late 1860s, at which point alienations began. Ward estimates that Māori land ownership went from “100 percent in 1860, to 54 percent in 1890, 38 percent in 1910, and 21 percent in 1939.”49 As in Te Urewera-Kaingaroa, land loss came from confiscation (or cession) and purchasing after the Native Land Court determined title. Even those lands that were returned to Māori or had remained under their ownership were frequently under management restrictions. Though the tangata whenua of this region maintained ownership over a higher proportion of their lands compared to those īwi in other districts, they lost control over the majority of the arable, flat lands.50

The process of land reform in Poverty Bay was convoluted and involved a great deal of conflict over land ownership. Ward cites Daly who notes that the Crown’s actions were clearly designed to ensure that it was able to alienate the best lands from the īwi of the Gisborne region.51 The East Coast Land Titles Investigation Act 1866 enabled the courts to investigate titles to any and all lands regardless of the preferences of the owners. The intent of the Crown agents was to award title to those Māori who had been ‘loyal’ while also facilitating the alienation of some of the lands. Loyalists, however, did not in fact receive any protections under this and similar legislations. These lands were investigated by the Native Land Court which then awarded title. Most of those lands were awarded back to the īwi. Once title had been established, however, this facilitated the sale of land.

49 Ward, 75.
50 Ibid., 75-85.
51 Ibid., 87-94.
The most intense phase of alienations occurred between 1865 and 1890. The Crown undertook a series of purchases as did private individuals. “The best and most accessible land was from the beginning taken up privately.”\textsuperscript{52} By 1908, the Crown had obtained at least 946,000 acres of the 1.9 million acre region, much of which it then sold to private interests. The Crown also manipulated Court decisions and passed legislation as needed to achieve its goals. When it became apparent that the 1866 Act did not include prime arable lands and oil resources, the Crown amended the Act to cover those lands. The Crown also made sure that titles were distributed according to its goals rather than according to \textit{iwi} norms governing land priorities. Though the Crown recognized that Māori objected, that the situation was unjust, and that it was creating serious problems for the \textit{iwi}, it did not make an effort to mitigate against such consequences.\textsuperscript{53}

The Te Aitanga-a-Mahaki area known as Mangatu is an example of the impacts of the land tenure reforms. Because of its location in the interior uplands of the region, it remained relatively undisturbed through the 1870s. By the 1880s, however, the majority of the flat land around Poverty Bay were occupied and/or exploited by Europeans; settlers then looked to acquire land in the hill country. Mangatu was subjected to a great deal of pressure from Europeans to be opened up for alienation because it was the largest portion of Māori freehold land. Various people persuaded the owners of Mangatu to put their land through the courts. This led to conflict as many Europeans attempted to influence the outcome of the court proceedings for their own benefit.\textsuperscript{54}

\textsuperscript{52} Oliver and Thompson, 99.
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\textsuperscript{54} Jacqueline Haapu, \textit{Te Ripoata o Mangatu: The Mangatu Report (draft)} (Te Aitanga a Mahaki Claims Committee, 1997),
Mangatu was investigated by the Native Land Court in 1881, which decided to divide it into six parcels. Haapu is critical of the decision to parcel out the land.\textsuperscript{55} She argues that this division was encouraged by Europeans as it facilitated purchases of the pieces. As with the Central North Island \textit{īwi}, the high costs of traveling to and attending the long court hearing in addition to the various costs and fees associated with land reform created a significant financial burden on Te Aitanga-a-Mahaki. They sold Mangatu 5 and 6 to meet their debt. Mangatu 2 was sold later.

In contrast to the experiences of the peoples of Poverty Bay, Ngati Porou stayed away from the Native Land Court for several years. Their loyalty to the Crown during the wars was a contributing factor in delaying land tenure reform. This had been one of the goals of Ngati Porou when siding with the Europeans. At the end of the 1870s Ngati Porou began processing their lands through the Court. Ngati Porou took a proactive role and sought the sales and leases as a source of income. In their situation the court proceedings were carefully organized under tribal directives. In comparison with the experiences of Māori in other regions, Ngati Porou tenurial reform was not a bleak and depressing process. As with the Poverty Bay area, much of the land that Europeans acquired was on the coast or adjacent to it. Northern coastal purchases were concentrated between Tolaga Bay and Waiapu.\textsuperscript{56}

The Crown approach to alienation of Ngati Porou land varied over the years. During the 1870s and 1880s the Crown maintained a policy of respecting Ngati Porou preference to retain title to land while leasing it to various private and government parties in the region. Ngati Porou, however, were not able to fully escape the land hunger of the

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., 34-63.
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state. During the 1890s, the Crown took up purchasing again while the Liberal Party was in power. While previous government purchases tended to be inland, this new round of acquisitions were nearer to the coast, and included lands that were in use by Māori. This precipitated a significant loss of land; 60 percent of 705,228 acres. Overall, the most intense phase of land loss for Ngati Porou occurred between 1873 and 1900. In recent claims to the Waitangi Tribunal, claimants have questioned whether or not the investigation of title by the courts resulted in allocation to the appropriate parties. Ngati Porou protested against the process of alienations. They have argued that those who were given title and the right to sell were not legitimate and were those peoples who were willing to sell. Critics have also pointed to the role of survey and court costs in precipitating sales.\textsuperscript{57}

While Ngati Porou did not suffer outright confiscations, the iwi was coerced into ‘voluntary’ cessions. The efforts on the part of Crown agents to pressure Māori to give up their lands were temporarily abandoned during the Te Kooti conflict as the Crown wanted to maintain friendly relations with Ngati Porou, who had strategically sided with the government. Afterwards, the Crown switched to a purchase approach.\textsuperscript{58}

By 1907-8, of the 1,319,014 acres in Cook Country, which encompasses area around Gisborne, only 372,414 were retained by Māori. The vast majority of the alienations were as sales. In Waiapu County, which is Ngati Porou territory, Māori kept 382,228 acres out of the 705,228 in the county. In comparison with Cook County in the south, a higher proportion of the alienations in Waiapu were in the form of leases. In total, some seventy-five percent of all lands were transferred out of Māori hands in the

\textsuperscript{57} Ward, 77-84.
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south as opposed to sixty percent in the north. The practice of seeking leases on the coasts and freehold sales in the interior appears to be an intentional plan to acquire the land wealth of the region.  

Overall, the peoples of the Te Tairāwhiti region lost the majority of their lands through processes that rarely took their interests into consideration. Ward’s discussion of the alienation demonstrates that the government used unfair practices when it was supposed to be protecting Māori interests.

Reflecting back upon this process, some of the people in the HOMNUTI trust organization expressed frustration and anger over the imposition of the Western property regime. Tui describes the logic behind the individualization of title:

The individualization of title was to make easy the acquiring of land. What happened was you had one block of land, you had about a hundred heads of families who would make decisions on that land. So, they individualized the title so that they could just go to one person who had title and buy that tract of land or lease that tract of land with the signing of one hand.

Uncle Dick points to other aspects of tenure reform:

That lease, the lease it decimated our people. It started us fighting one another.

He and Haro describe the ways in which the alienations persisted into the twentieth century:

Haro: You’ve got instances, recorded history now, where you have returning soldier, a European solider, New Zealander, would actually take up the land of his Māori colleague, his Māori mate, who fought in the trench next to him because the powers that be, when he was away, that Maori soldier was away, confiscated his land, turned it into a ex-soldier’s sustenance…economic planning programme.
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Uncle Dick: All those farms that were formed, for that reason, not one Māori got one of those farms.\textsuperscript{63}

Their comments highlight a shared history between Māori and the Crown that has been fraught with conflict and dispossession.

3.5 CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter has partially addressed the question of how Aotearoa became integrated into the world economy. The introduction of European ideas about property rights and political power led to the widespread disenfranchisement of the Native peoples of Aotearoa and enabled the creation of the young New Zealand. This chapter also addresses Māori reactions to these changes, which took place over many stages.

The Treaty of Waitangi 1840 did not have an immediate impact on the peoples of the Te Urewera-Kaingaroa and Te Tairāwhiti regions. By the middle of the nineteenth century, these \textit{iwi} frequently interacted with the Pakeha economies and often welcomed such interactions. But, Pakeha governance was limited to those areas directly under European occupation. Thus, the British Crown had only achieved nominal sovereignty. Māori were not passive victims in this process. Soon many recognized that substantive sovereignty was defined by control of land and that continued sales would erode their autonomy. Unfortunately, various efforts to organize and prevent further sales were met with Crown repudiation of Māori rights through outright force in the form of the New Zealand Wars. These wars, which were layered onto intertribal conflict, brought Pakeha influence into some of the more remote areas of North Island. As a result, \textit{iwi} that had previously been autonomous were forced into making a choice between resistance and

\textsuperscript{63} Ibid.
possible confiscation or cooperation and continued autonomy. Regardless of their positioning as ‘loyalists’ or ‘rebels,’ however, all were eventually subjected to the devastating impacts of the Native Land Court with its varying scales of dispossession. Throughout this entire series of interactions with the Crown and settler society, *iwi* used different methods to protect their interests, all with varying degrees of success. Despite this, by the beginning of the twentieth century, they had suffered tremendous land loss either through sale or long-term lease.

While Crown motivations and methods varied over time, with different departments often following conflicting mandates, the end result was that much of the land in Aotearoa had been alienated from Native control. Furthermore, those portions that remained in Māori hands tended to be fragmented and of marginal quality, which made it extremely difficult for Māori to maintain subsistence systems, develop European style farms, or otherwise make the land produce enough to support the communities. Land quality, however, was only one of several obstacles that *tangata whenua* faced. One of the most difficult was acquiring money to develop lands in order to participate in the emerging market economy. This is discussed in detail in Chapter Four.

There are several implications of dispossession. Māori were confronted with a new economic order with which they struggled to engage. The loss of their most productive lands placed them at a disadvantage in this matter (this will be discussed further in Chapter 4). Widespread alienations also had a significant cultural impact. Land was one of the sources of their power and authority (*mana whenua*). The sales of their land and the long-term leases equated to an erosion of autonomy (*rangatiratanga*) (these issues will be addressed in Chapters 4 and 6). It also had the effect of separating Māori
from their historic places, which have served as the basis for identity, place-based knowledge, and sense of place (this will be the focus of Chapter 7). The process of deprivation, however, was not over. When the Crown turned its attention to the management of forests, Māori land would again be subject to government efforts at control and alienation (discussed in Chapter 6). The following chapter will address the ways in which the introduction of European spatializing strategies affected land use and resource consumption, which involved significant transformation of the physical environment, it will give an overview of the development of New Zealand’s globally-oriented economy, and it will discuss how Māori engaged with these changes.
CHAPTER 4. DEFORESTATION: LANDSCAPE TRANSFORMATION & COLONIAL SPATIALIZING STRATEGIES

4.1 INTRODUCTION

As outlined in Chapter Two, the global is used to describe phenomena that transcend the level of the state. While this does not mean that the entire world is incorporated, the term global refers to networks and practices that connect different parts of the Earth. Another term used to describe these processes is universal. Universals are the products of specific places in time, but are able to mobilize and connect disparate peoples and entities. They are always changing and can be used to either oppress or to liberate. An important characteristic is that they must have broad appeal. Certain changes in technology, transport, and science make it possible for these universal projects to move and engage across distances.

The globalization of European ideas associated with the Enlightenment, modernity, and capitalism involved the spread of particularly European ways of interacting with the world. Central to this was the intellectual development of the rational subject who is conceived of as separate from the world. Alongside this is the belief that there is an underlying order to the world, the truth of which is available to those who are capable of systematically studying it. The presence or absence of this capacity is a distinction that not only divided men from the world, but has also been used to justify the hierarchical ranking of different cultures and individuals.

One of the ramifications of this way of thinking is that Europeans were not content to discover the order of the world, but felt that it was necessary to change the world to represent that structure. For the modern state, spatializing mechanisms are the means by which to achieve legibility, or simplified, usable, knowledge about the
country’s territory and subjects, order, and productivity. All of this reflects an instrumentalist attitude towards the world.

Māori were interested in the new opportunities that trading with Europeans and Americans had to offer. Despite their interest in participating, efforts to facilitate trade, and otherwise engage with the global economy Māori were eventually at a disadvantage in a number of ways. They were gradually marginalized numerically and politically. Transformations to the environment and control over trade and production spiraled beyond the means of tangata whenua. One of the main causes of inequity was land alienation, which limited the resource base for economic participation. It is in this context of a changing economic and political situation that Māori, though keen to participate, were continually circumscribed in their efforts and marginalized in their own lands.¹

4.2 GLOBAL CONNECTIONS & DEFORESTATION

4.2.1 INTRODUCTION

First European contact with New Zealand occurred in 1642 with the arrival of two Dutch ships, led by Captain Abel Tasman. But, it was not until Cook visited in 1769 that Europeans seriously considered what benefits they could draw from the islands. Cook was impressed with the quality and size of native timber, for which the British navy had great demand. Moreover, Cook’s visit occurred at the beginning of a ninety-year scientific exploration phase, which was important for bringing information about New Zealand to the wider world. Over that time a variety of people, including the British, French, Russians, Spanish, Americans, Africans, Indians, and other peoples from the

¹ Brian Murton, Paeata Clark, and Richard Benton, "Bay of Islands Integration into World System" (Unpublished draft manuscript, 2006).
Pacific, visited the South Pacific, initiating a shift from New Zealand being relatively isolated in 1769 to being integrated into a global economic system by the early 1800s.² Europeans were building a new world economic system by utilizing a combination of navigation, transoceanic technology, methods of investments, colonies, trade systems, and military power. From the sixteenth to the nineteenth century, European foreign activities were mercantilist, focused on enriching the home country and primarily geared towards the acquisition of luxury goods. By the late eighteenth century, international economic and political competition between various European states played out in different parts of the world in terms of the influence of different ports, colonies, and territories and also in terms of the kinds of trade pursued. As the rivalries turned into conflicts, states looked to secure raw materials, such as timber, flax, and whale oil, to supply their military endeavors. The procurement of such goods was also important to the development of industrial revolutions. During this time, the British East India Company and its activities were significant to the cultivation of trade with New Zealand.³

Various developments in international linkages and trade made New Zealand important as a component of the world system. The British Navy was interested in spars and masts, especially since it was involved in many naval wars and because there were none available in Britain. The navy was reliant on North America and the Baltic, though trees from the latter were inferior and the supply could be cut off during a war. Previously, distance and isolation were significant barriers to exploiting New Zealand’s

³ Murton, Clark, and Benton,
forests. The loss of the American colonies that resulted from the War of Independence (1776-1782) made New Zealand more important as a timber source. The establishment of convict colonies in Australia during the 1790s made such exploitation economical.

Kauri was particularly important for the spar trade between 1794 and the 1830s. It later became the basis for New Zealand’s economic growth. New Zealand’s relative unsuitability for convicts may have led to the development of Australia for that purpose. Poole points out that English need for naval timber was important for later New Zealand exports, the trade of which was “pioneered by merchants from the growing Sydney settlement.” Export of timber eventually extended beyond Australia to other places around the world. In addition to timber, flax, kauri gum, and ocean resources were considered of vital importance to England.

Other changes affected New Zealand’s importance for world trade. By the end of the 1700s, the whale fisheries in the Atlantic and Greenland were in decline. This was a time when the demand for whale oil, for machinery, and bone was on the rise. The South Pacific became the focus of many different whaling interests, especially those of the Americans, who represented the majority of whalers and ships. In addition, British trade with China was relevant. The Chinese preferred gold or silver in payment for tea, which placed a heavy strain on Britain’s wealth. Before opium, sealskins were one of the few alternatives accepted. This also made New Zealand a valuable resource base. In addition
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to providing raw materials, New Zealand was an important supply port and recreation stop.\textsuperscript{8}

A range of outsiders took up residence in New Zealand. Initially there were a few beachcombers and escapees from ships and convict colonies. As trading opportunities increased, the amount and type of foreigners changed. Traders, sealers, whalers, flax and timber cutters, missionaries, and those seeking recreation established homes; these were primarily centered in Bay of Islands. This increase in a foreign presence meant more direct interactions between Māori and the outside. All of these newcomers facilitated the exchange of goods, ideas, technologies, and diseases.\textsuperscript{9}

A full discussion of the reasons and the history of New Zealand settlement is not within the scope of this dissertation. As discussed, however, in Chapter Three, after the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi, European settlement of New Zealand increased dramatically.

European settlement was initially concentrated on the coastal lowlands and grasslands, as these were easier to occupy and to convert to European land uses, especially pastoral farming. Once these were occupied, however, Europeans turned their attentions to the forested and hilly interior.\textsuperscript{10}

European settlers in Aotearoa/New Zealand viewed the place as rich in ecological capital that should be converted into individual prosperity. The priority for the emerging colony was agricultural production. The forests were viewed as resources to be properly exploited. They were either the location of merchantable timber and fuel wood and/or arable farmland. In both of these cases, they were not recognized as complex ecosystems

\textsuperscript{8} Murton, Clark, and Benton,
\textsuperscript{9} Murton, Clark, and Benton,
or habitats, but instead as commodities. From this perspective, any method of disposal that meets productive criteria was considered legitimate. Conversely, maintaining the forest for intrinsic value was untenable at this early stage in Pakeha settlement.

The forests were viewed as limitless. It was this attitude of the boundless nature of the forests that made their destruction reasonable and even necessary in order to put the trees and underlying lands to productive uses. Also, their dense and tangled architecture were culturally anathema for the British. Only after the forests were of increasing scarcity and they had, in effect, been tamed was there sufficient public support for their protection. Until then, they were harvested or destroyed to make room for pasture.

4.2.2 DEFORESTATION: SETTLEMENT

Various factors affected the rate of forest exploitation. The signing of the Treaty of Waitangi marked the beginning of an intensive period of deforestation. Prior to that, settlement and overall extraction of timber had been fairly limited. Between 1840 and 1900 the forest cover was reduced by half, though up until 1860 very little cutover forest was converted to pasture (Figures 7 and 8). After 1860 there were more rapid and dramatic changes to the environment. This was because the flatter lands had already been occupied; after 1870 government policy was to settle people on areas under forest. Thus, forests were subject to the combined pressure of pastoral conversion as well as harvesting of timber.11
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The mechanisms and speed of deforestation were influenced by colonial practices, technological changes, and settler attitudes. Most settlers were poor; they were looking to secure their economic betterment. People had purchased the land from the New Zealand Company while in Britain, but the company had not actually bought most of the land it was selling. In many cases the ownership had not been secured from tangata whenua. The new settlers were often forced to wait in Wellington until land was available. People frequently waited two to three years. During that time they spent what little money they had. This meant that once they were on their property their survival required that they quickly put the land into agricultural production.12

An important aspect of early settlement was the existence of laws that required “improvement” to land in order to secure title. This usually meant that a certain portion of land must be cleared. Thus, the primary reason for deforestation was to convert forests into pasturage. Unfortunately, this required significant changes to the land. The woodlands in England were quite different, which meant people were ill-prepared for the density of New Zealand’s forests. The land had often not been surveyed. There were few means available to clear the land other than by hand. Logging was not feasible as these settlements occurred in remote areas that had limited transportation infrastructure. Many people perceived the forests as a barrier, and also as limitless.13

The main tool settlers used to clear their land was fire. Homesteaders would cut timber in winter and spring, ringbark the larger trees, then leave all the wood to dry. After a suitable dry spell, the area would be burnt. Some of the wood would be used for farm

Figure 7. Map of New Zealand Forest Cover ca. 1840
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Figure 8. Map of New Zealand Forest Cover ca. 1955
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buildings and fences; however, most was simply destroyed. Unfortunately, many of these fires would get out of control and burn for several weeks. Fleet notes that after an area had been burnt once, it was highly vulnerable to a second fire.\textsuperscript{14} The second fire usually burned hotter and faster than the first. These secondary fires often consumed vast amount of untouched forests. Wildfires could rage for days or even several weeks. They could lay dormant in the duff under kauri forests before reigniting and destroying the standing forests. In addition to valuable timber, these fires destroyed homes, mills, habitat, and fauna. For example, the 1868 fire in Banks Peninsular burned 8000-12000 hectares, the 1881 Puhipuhi fire destroyed 500 million feet of lumber, and the 1896 Whangamata fire destroyed 16 million feet of wood.\textsuperscript{15}

The forests generally grew on rich, arable land. The high premium placed on agriculture over timber and the lack of efficient means to transport and mill wood often meant that forests were destroyed rather than harvested, although settlement and lumber production often went hand in hand. This meant that they ended up wasting a lot of wood which otherwise might have generated money. Roche notes that this priority placed on agriculture was largely driven by New Zealand’s status as a colony.\textsuperscript{16} He writes that the “rhetoric of colonization” in itself encouraged farming as a primary pursuit. Furthermore, there was great pressure for New Zealand to contribute economically towards the empire as a whole. For New Zealand, farming and extractive production were the main options.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{14} Fleet, 49, 79.
\textsuperscript{16} Roche, "The New Zealand Timber Economy, 1840-1935," 299.
\textsuperscript{17} Fleet, 48; Grey, 210; Jim McAloon, "Resource Frontiers, Environment, and Settler Capitalism," in \textit{Environmental Histories of New Zealand}, ed. Eric Pawson and Tom Brooking (South Melbourne,
Increases in population also accelerated the forest clearances. After the Māori Wars of the 1860s, the Crown confiscated 1.2 million hectares of native land. Prior to 1860, the Crown had purchased 2.8 million hectares. Between 1865 and 1892, the Crown bought another 2.8 million hectares. The government decided the new land required an increase in settlers and labor. In 1864, the state started recruiting skilled labor and settlers from Ireland, England, Scotland, and South Africa. These immigrants were given undeveloped forest for settlement. This labor was needed to develop roads, rail lines, and tramways. As the transportation network extended, it granted access into more forested areas for both settlement and timber production. Between 1875 and 1879 about 15,000 settlers arrived each year. Many of these people were from Scandinavia.\(^{18}\)

Other changes affected population growth and the consumption of wood. In addition to state encouragement, the Gold Rushes of the 1860s and 1870s also encouraged both immigration and were a direct consumer of wood through the construction of gold processing infrastructure. The introduction of refrigerated shipping was another important change. This made it possible for small farmers to make a living by producing dairy for foreign markets, especially for Britain. As a result, there were increased pressure on remaining forests.\(^{19}\)

### 4.2.3 DEFORESTATION: TIMBER PRODUCTION

The forests were not just valuable for the land under them. The trees themselves were considered an important resource, though Fleet notes that in 1875 New Zealand was
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importing wood at the same time that settlers were burning it down.\textsuperscript{20} Forests were cleared to produce wood, both for domestic use and export. Throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the timber industry underwent many changes. This affected the rate at which trees were cut over time.

Unlike other aspects of timber production, there were few changes to the actual felling of trees. During the late eighteenth century it took approximately two days to produce one kauri spar. The British often tried to employ Māori in the logging and extraction. Trees were mainly cut by axe, though they were sometimes felled with a crosscut saw. These practices continued well into the twentieth century. Power chainsaws were not introduced until the 1940s, after which they quickly displaced the cross-cut saw and much of the use of axe.\textsuperscript{21}

In contrast with cutting, the extraction and processing of timber became increasingly mechanized. While increased immigration meant increased burning, there were also technological changes in harvesting and processing that affected clearances. The movement of logs has undergone significant mechanization. Logs were first extracted by sheer human-power and floated out on water. The earliest methods included the use of blocks and tackle, canthooks, capstans, and timber jacks. As kauri frequently grows on ridges, people had to drag the logs up and down over uneven topography and through boggy areas. It could take up to two days to move one spar. Bullocks were introduced in 1820s. They were used to drag trees out of forests and to rivers, from which logs could be floated. But, bullocks were often of limited use in the kauri region as the terrain was too steep and difficult. Horses were also used to haul wood. Loggers also

\textsuperscript{20} Fleet, 81.
used rolling roads and chutes to move the trees short distances. By the 1850s dams were also in use to move the logs. The premise was that once a sufficient amount of rain had fallen, the dam would be sprung and the logs washed downhill. As timber extraction became more developed, people created more elaborate dams. By the 1860s primitive tramways were in use where logs would be loaded onto a cart or ‘bogie’ and hauled along rails by bullocks or horses. Steam-driven trams were introduced in the 1870s. Motorized trucks and vehicles would first have been used by about 1920. Simpson estimates that diesel engine tractors were first introduced to New Zealand in 1927 and were used for both extraction and to power sawmills. The use of motor vehicles dramatically increased after WWII.\(^{22}\)

Once a tree was cut it had to be processed for use. The earliest method was pitsawing. This was a basic, small-scale method where two sawyers would dress the trunk by hand. Sawmilling began during the 1830s. The first water-wheel driven mill was built in 1838. Steam-powered mills were introduced in the 1840s. In 1842 there were four mills. By 1876 there were 125 mills in operation. Pitsawing remained important through the 1850s, though it was redundant by the 1860s. At that point, mills could produce thousands of meters of board feet per day. The first recorded electrically powered mill was in 1906. In 1910, the first gas-run mill began to operate. This marked the decline of water-driven mills. Again, diesel engine tractors arrived in the 1920s (see above). With the 1937 introduction of a blade attachment tractors could complete what would normally
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take weeks worth of human work in just a few days. Each of these technological changes greatly reduced the cost and time involved in lumber production.\textsuperscript{23}

The spatial patterns of forest exploitation were largely influenced by settlement and transportation. Up until the 1870s, cutting and milling were concentrated along the coastal areas, especially in the northern areas of Hokianga, Kaipara, and the Bay of Islands. People were only able to expand operations into the interior along rivers and waterways; water was the means by which logs were transported. After 1870, logging rapidly increased. This was a function of increased population pressure and access. The development of new techniques for removing logs from the backcountry and the growth of transportation infrastructure allowed loggers to go deeper into the interior. As settlement expanded throughout New Zealand, aided by the expansion of tramways, railways, and roads, new areas of forests were opened up. Mills were often set up in tandem with transportation systems. These mills often became the nucleus around which settlements would form.\textsuperscript{24}

The type of tree logged changed over time. It was largely the result of market demand, location, availability, and accessibility. During the early trading phase kauri and kahikatea were exploited though kauri soon emerged as far superior in terms of durability and usefulness. As mentioned above, kauri was spatially confined to Northland and Auckland and was very important as a spar timber between the turn of the eighteenth century and the 1830s. Early extraction was concentrated in the former area and eventually expanded south to the latter. The extension of the transportation system often led to logging of other species. For example, once Palmerston North was connected to the

\textsuperscript{23} Fleet, 73, 60-64; Simpson, 148-151, 187-188.
\textsuperscript{24} Fleet, 24-31, 53-57, 62; Grey, 383-384; Wynn, 106.
wider transportation network, loggers cut totara, rimu, and matai. In 1908, the completion of the Main Trunk Line, which connected Auckland and Wellington, opened up the King Country. The forests in that area contained totara, black maire, rimu, miro, matai, and kahikatea. In the 1880s Hawkes Bay started processing totara for domestic and foreign consumption. In 1885 totara, black maire, rimu, tawa, and miro were being logged. On the South Islands, the mills in Canterbury primarily processed beech and, to a lesser degree, matai, rimu, and kahikatea. In Marlborough, the primary species that were logged included rimu and kahikatea.25

Kauri continued to be harvested until well into the twentieth century. But, after the 1860s it did not comprise the majority of timber produced. This was largely because other trees were being harvested at greater rates. As kauri became less important relative to other species, Auckland declined relative to other areas in terms of milling. By 1876 the majority of mills were located in Canterbury, though there were mills located throughout the North Island. As the kauri forests were depleted, northern mills shifted towards processing kahikatea. Between 1916 and 1935, kauri went from representing 16.1 percent to 2.3 percent of the total amount of timber production. Kahikatea also decreased. Meanwhile, there was a shift towards rimu, which comprised 51.5 percent of timber by 1935. Matai and totara also became important species.26

The widespread availability of wood and the perception that it was limitless meant that it was one of the cheapest building materials for the young colony. Wood was crucial to domestic consumption. Roche notes that by 1911, wood was utilized in more than ninety per cent of all housing. It was the central raw material of the young colony and

26 Grey, 383-384; Fleet, 64.
used in a variety of applications including: construction, ships, infrastructure, firewood, furniture, and packaging. Kauri, rimu, matai, and kahikatea were used for housing; pohutukawa, puriri, rata, and kauri were used to construct boats and ships; and puriri was used for wharves and wagons. Timber was also used for trams and railroad construction. The rails were made of matai, sleepers were made of totara and puriri, and battens were built from rata. Telegraph poles were made of totara. Kahikatea was used for boxes, especially butter boxes as it was odorless and did not change the qualities of the product, and tawa was used to make barrels, butter kegs, and other containers. Mills and worker housing also took up wood. Wood went into gold mining infrastructure.

In addition to producing lumber and wood for export and domestic use, the timber industry itself was a major consumer of trees. This was primarily in the form of infrastructure, such as dams, chutes, skids, tram and railways, which were all to move logs. As with settlement, the timber industry was characterized by a great deal of waste. The view that the forests were limitless meant that millers often only wanted the best tree or the best part of a tree. This also meant that less valuable species might be damaged along the way. If an area was too remote and the terrain difficult, loggers would abandon cut logs that were too difficult to extract. Extraction was often wasteful. Logs moved through chutes or via burst dams at high speeds. Occasionally they would get out of control and crush adjacent standing timber. The logs themselves were frequently damaged en route. Approximately thirty percent of all kauri logs were lost in the drive to the mills. Overall, the process led to upstream waterway damage and downstream aggradation and deposition. The drives were also dangerous for farmland. This generated
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a lot of conflict between the timber industry and farmers. It is interesting to note that at that point in history, the timber interests were more powerful than those of the small farmer. Millers could use wasteful and dangerous methods that posed risks to the forests as well as nearby farms and yet famers had no legal protection. Gum diggers also created waste by setting brushfires to clear the understory.  

The figures for overall production output show a steady increase throughout the nineteenth century and into the first decade of the twentieth century. In 1876 there were 125 mills in operation. Output was estimated as 103,039,037 though there are some problems with the records. Otago did not report that year. Between 1903-1907 the annual output was calculated at 413,289,742, with 1907 being the highest total to that point at 432 million feet (not reached again until 1949). After that year the industry contracted as a result of an economic downturn. In 1910, the output was 265 million board feet.  

Wood was also an important export product. New Zealand timber was consumed in Australia, India, China, California, Britain, and Spanish Latin America. Even during the Depression of the late nineteenth century, exports of kauri and kahikatea increased. Fleet notes that 324,700 feet of wood were exported in 1843 and 1,113,312 feet were exported by 1847. By 1853 the exports had increased to 8,872,635 feet, which was in addition to “882 spars and 1,760 loads of junk timber.” This marked a temporary peak as the following year 1854 only 4,566,724 feet were shipped out, plus 251 spars and in 1855 only 818,533 feet were sent abroad. In 1880 over 7.5 million feet of wood was
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exported and by 1890 over 42 million exported. Much of this went to Australia. In 1907, about 75 million feet was exported.\textsuperscript{32}

4.3 MĀORI ENGAGEMENT WITH THE GLOBAL ECONOMY

4.3.1 INTRODUCTION\textsuperscript{33}

From the early nineteenth century until the middle of the twentieth, Aotearoa and its people were drawn into the developing world economy. The pace and scale of change as well as the spatial nature of contact varied over time. Initially, Māori welcomed the new goods, ideas, and technologies and became closely involved in market production, even dominating agricultural output. They displayed flexibility and, for the most part, were in control of their dealings with foreigners; Māori accepted or rejected what they pleased. Over time, however, these interactions spiraled beyond their control. Eventually, they were alienated from their land and marginalized from the economy so that by the middle of the twentieth century they held only a fraction of the arable domain and primarily participated as wage labor. The fragmented and low quality parcels that they retained were insufficient to meet their needs and, with limited sources of finance, they had few options remaining in order to develop them.

Prior to 1840, Māori were generally in control of the ways in which they interacted with Europeans. These earlier phases of contact tended to be organized; chiefs oversaw the interactions between their people and outsiders. Tangata whenua were highly interested in many of the introductions and quickly gained the benefits of medicine, written language, foods, animals, and technologies. They used European goods

\textsuperscript{32} Fleet, 26, 62-64; Roche, History of Forestry, 47-49; Simpson, 309.
\textsuperscript{33} The information in the following section is drawn from Grey, 119-145, 203-260, 275-276, 312-313.
to improve their own position vis-à-vis other tribes. Sometimes they employed foreigners in raids against their enemies. These innovations quickly filtered throughout Aotearoa. Missions were established beginning in 1814-15. Māori freely adopted ideas according to their own agendas. They took an interest in the competitive aspects of different Christian sects.\(^{34}\)

Māori were keen to trade with the newcomers and selectively appropriated a variety of ideas and goods. They were introduced to new products such as metal items, weaponry, foods, clothing, and animals. They received technology, skills, and practices such as carpentry, agricultural techniques, and written language. They sought to alter their production systems to meet the commercial interests of the newcomers. Māori wanted iron tools, especially axes, blankets, shirts, tobacco, and, later on, firearms. In exchange, they produced potatoes, pigs, flax, kauri gum, and timber. Through this process, they were actively involved in altering their lands, either through the cutting of timber, harvesting of flax, or expansion of agricultural production. They provided labor to Pakeha and sold them land, though the actual meaning of the sale substantially from the Europeans to the Māori. The Native demand for various introduced products fit with a foreign demand for New Zealand goods, thus establishing the basis for New Zealand’s trade relationships with the wider world.\(^{35}\)

The development of trade relationships had a variety of impacts on spatial relationships. Initially trade was generalized, but by the 1820s there was a shift towards specialized commerce with groups that focused on particular economic activities. Centralized trade districts gradually developed in Kororareka, New Zealand and Sydney,
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Australia, each of which served to channel goods into and out of their respective countrysides. In New Zealand, a majority of these goods and activities were produced and managed by Māori. Over time, the development of commercial activities in these two regions led to the emergence of close linkages between them, though New Zealand also traded directly with other places. Kororareka was a part of a wider Pacific network of emerging centers of trade. These included Lahaina and Honolulu in the north and Levuka, Apia, Pepaeete, and the Marquesas in the south. As with Kororareka, these ports not only provided valuable commodities from the surrounding islands, but served as supply depots for whaling ships that plied the ocean.36

The most rapid changes occurred between 1820 and 1840. The pace of transformations varied based on the region and the type and extent of European exposure. The majority of interactions occurred in the Bay of Islands. Ideas were dispersed from there to the rest of Aotearoa, though there were other smaller points of contact along the coasts, such as for whaling and sealing stations in South Island. Many of the introductions were from the United Kingdom via Australia.37

_Tangata whenua_ underwent other changes to lifestyle and practices as they adopted new products and in order to acquire more goods. They moved to sites where raw materials could be more easily exploited, so they moved near swamps and coastal forests. They expended more energy on producing trade items instead of their subsistence base. They were fairly reluctant to adopt English farming practices as these were not entirely suitable for the climate and conditions in Aotearoa, but some methods were useful. Māori primarily focused on producing goods that were in demand and
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incorporated those metal tools that resembled their existing ones. They generally stuck to 
a traditional diet, though they did embrace the white potato and the pig. These enabled a 
shift in settlement and cultivation patterns and Māori became less reliant on birds and 
fern root. Some of these changes may have compromised their health.³⁸

The introduction of infectious diseases was disastrous and took its toll on Māori 
populations. By the 1830s, as more foreigners visited them, and especially as some 
settled in their midst, these groups shared ideas about society, land tenure, 
epistemologies, and ontologies. Increasing numbers of settlers and alienations of land led 
to changes in the built world and the ways in which the land was shaped and influenced. 
This amounted to an interaction between the life-worlds of Māori and Europeans, which 
brought its own set of challenges and developments.³⁹

There were broader socio-political changes. Interactions with the outside world 
led to transformations as Māori leaders (rangatira) took steps to organize together to 
protect their commercial interests. Demographically, introduced diseases continually 
diminished the Native population. Meanwhile, foreign settlement increased, which 
affected the general social climate and land alienation rates. The arrival and 
establishment of so many foreigners, especially whalers, led to the development of 
unsavory activities in the Bay of Islands such as prostitution and drinking establishments. 
In contrast, many ‘respectable’ foreigners and missionaries created separate settlements. 
Europeans attempted different measures to address social problems, but these tended to 
be crude. In comparison with other Pacific centers, the Māori of the Bay of Islands 
managed to stay independent of conflicts internal to the settler populations. In terms of 
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land, as mentioned in Chapter Three, the expectation that British would extend sovereignty over New Zealand led to a surge in land purchases and settlement just prior to 1840.\textsuperscript{40}

The introduction of firearms had a massive impact on Aotearoa. Intertribal warfare altered the political climate and led to shifts in land rights. Conflict also sparked new migration patterns and initiated depopulation of certain regions as people sought refuge from their enemies, though mass casualties from open war were not necessarily an impact. Guns and ammunition initially diffused out of the Bay of Islands. But, people in other regions quickly adopted them and then, in order to build their arsenals, sought direct or semi-direct trade with foreigners. Guns quickly became the most valuable European good conveyed through Sydney. \textit{Tangata whenua} were, however, mainly geared towards meeting their own agendas, so when they had acquired a sufficient number of muskets and ammunition, they would stop production for trade in order to pursue war. Once they were satisfied with these, they went back into production.\textsuperscript{41}

By 1839, Aotearoa was on the brink of major change. A majority of the coastal Natives were oriented towards outside trade. Most of the innovations had spread throughout the country. Musket based warfare had altered the shape of Native settlement patterns and left large expanses of arable land temporarily unoccupied. European settlers had begun to arrive and were coming into conflict with one another, though Māori largely stayed out of these matters. The problem, however, was that these settlers saw the value of Aotearoa’s resources, not least of which was the extensive lands and began agitating for Crown intervention. Māori thought that the signing of a formal treaty meant that they
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would work in partnership with the British Crown and that the agreement would ensure protection of their autonomy and rights to resources. That was not the case; however, it took some time to for the ramifications to manifest.\textsuperscript{42}

After the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840, Aotearoa/New Zealand underwent further changes. Māori quickly became dominant in agricultural production. They shifted from the traditional style to a commercial form of agricultural production that combined European and Native methods and was similar to what settlers practiced. This enabled them to be the main source of food for settlers and exports to Australia between 1840 and the end of the 1850s. During this time the colonial government facilitated their development. The Waikato region was the main producer. In addition, Māori continued to provide labor to settlers.\textsuperscript{43}

Māori dominance in agriculture peaked in the 1850s and then collapsed. This can be attributed to a combination of causes. Māori continued to address their own agendas, which were often based on prestige. Thus, while they built mills and incorporated European techniques, they did not observe all of the appropriate practices and eventually had problems with the quality of their produce. Māori grain, therefore, fetched a lower price on the market. This coincided with a drop in demands in Australia. They also failed to shift towards pastoral production, which was quickly becoming the backbone of the agricultural economy. Politically, increasing demands for land alienations, war, and actual land losses from war distracted tangata whenua. The outcome of these conflicts that was Māori retained much land, but the prime quality agricultural land went to settlers. Grey argues that the rapid adoption of foreign farming and economic practices

\textsuperscript{42} Grey, 119-145. 
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along with an emphasis on individualism undermined Māori social integrity and their ability to defend against European settlement. By the early 1860s, most Natives had shifted from commercial back to subsistence production along with wage labor.44

In comparison, Pakeha society was laying the foundations for its modern economy. This period saw the emergence of new urban centers as earlier areas of interaction, especially the Bay of Islands, declined in importance. Industry developed to meet the needs of the growing population. Pastoral production became entrenched in the South Island and continued to expand, both horizontally into the North Island and vertically in elevation at the expense of forests. By 1860, Europeans held the coasts and Māori had autonomy in the interior. In terms of the natural world, the forests were still largely unchanged.45

The late nineteenth century was a period of dramatic change in the overall characteristics of New Zealand, its economy, land use patterns, its relationships with the outside world, and Māori autonomy and rangatiratanga. Technological innovations originating from North America and Europe affected New Zealand’s development as well as its relationships with the developed world. Australia and Britain invested in New Zealand’s development, which enabled the expansion of its domestic transportation infrastructure and commercial infrastructure. A variety of advancements in farm processing, related technologies, and refrigerated shipping enabled a significant expansion of food exports. At the same time, population increases in urban Europe meant an increasing market for these goods. One of the outcomes was that smaller farms were commercially viable. Māori were interested in European style farming and these changes

44 Grey, 203-260.
45 Grey, 203-260.
should have enabled them to participate, but obtaining credit was still difficult and many areas continued to suffer from low quality lands.\textsuperscript{46,47}

There were also demographic changes. Innovations in manufactured goods and home construction meant overall upgrades in the standard of living. This period also witnessed improvements in communications, which combined with cheaper shipping facilitated increasing migration out of Europe, some of which flowed to New Zealand. During this period, there was an increase in the birth rate among settlers.\textsuperscript{48}

All of these technological, economic, and demographic changes led to a larger and more technologically advanced settler population in New Zealand, which had a dramatic affect on the natural and Māori worlds. There was a great push to convert natural resources into individual wealth and the colonial government viewed its role as a facilitator in that process. As much of the grasslands had already been settled, new immigrants turned to the heavily forested interior for farmland. While Pakeha were increasing, Māori were experiencing a decline not only in their proportion of the overall population, but also in real numbers. Thus, between 1858-1886 tangata whenua went from 48.5 percent to 6.7 percent of the total population and from 56,049 to 41,969 persons. This meant that they were at a greater disadvantage for resisting new alienations.

As discussed in Chapter Three, the land wars, which began in the middle of the nineteenth century and continued into this period, resulted in significant land losses for Māori; however, the Native Land Court, which was initiated subsequent to the wars, was

\textsuperscript{47} Grey, 223-260, 275-276.
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far more devastating in terms of alienations. The scale and intensity of land alienations over the latter half of the nineteenth century deprived Māori of the majority of prime arable lands. 49

Despite these changes, Māori continued to make an effort to stay engaged with the developing economy. Many attempted to shift towards a pastoral system. While in the 1850s Waikato had been the main area of farming, by 1886 Hawke’s Bay and the Bay of Plenty were the dominant regions and were employing more advanced tools and methods. Though some were successful, most were prevented from participating by a combination of factors that included low quality of remaining land, tenure problems, distance from market, and lack of access to finance. Changes that occurred at the broader scale also impinged upon Māori successes. Damage from the land wars, disruptions to regional exchange networks, and the loss of various key resources, such as access to the ocean, continued to marginalize tangata whenua. 50

Māori pursued different, evolving strategies to overcome these constraints. They organized politically to prevent further land loss and formed the Young Māori Party to elect representatives to Parliament. They lobbied for improvements to the land sales systems, requested more effective systems of title, and asked for a means to obtain credit to invest in their land. One of the major obstacles was a Pakeha refusal to recognize Māori as being capable of managing their own affairs and not suited to the management of capitalistic endeavors. This paternalistic attitude often guided a refusal to aid with investment. In response to this, Māori implemented a number of schemes or development plans in order to facilitate farming. These met with varying degrees of success. Problems

50 Murton, Clark, and Benton, "Bay of Islands Integration into World System" ; Grey, 275-276.
with finance usually necessitated land sales, pursuit of wage labor, or the sale of timber rights in order to raise the funds necessary to pursue farming or other development. Even though such choices were unwelcome, people had few viable alternatives. As a result, a great deal of Māori-owned land stayed undeveloped.\(^{51}\)

These problems were compounded by the rapid recovery of the Māori population. Between 1896 and 1936 the population rose from 39,854 to 82,326. The vast majority of the population, at 94.1 percent, was rural. The population continued to rise so that by 1956, the amount of Māori-owned land was inadequate for the subsistence or commercial production of even one-fourth of the population. Thus deprived of their land base, there were few alternatives to urban migration, which meant a further weakening of the connections to land, place, culture, and rangatiratanga. It is in this context of a changing economic and political situation that Māori, though keen to participate, were continually circumscribed in their efforts and marginalized in their own lands.\(^{52}\)

4.3.2 TE UREWERA-KAINGAROA

4.3.2.1 INTRODUCTION

Boast notes that by the early twentieth century, the traditional subsistence economies of Te Urewera Māori were heavily disrupted, especially for those peoples who were no longer near their traditional lands.\(^{53}\) Partly, this was the result of wars between 1865 and 1871, but it was also the result of the land losses. Through first confiscation,
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then the Native Land Court, and finally the consolidation process, the Te Urewera people had lost the majority of their most productive lands by 1900. While Māori in other parts of the country faced crushing debt and poverty, the Te Urewera peoples were often on the brink of starvation. This desperation frequently led to land sales.\textsuperscript{54}

In the first few years of the decade, the Te Urewera tribal leadership had decided that their peoples’ economic survival as well as the ability to hold onto their remaining lands turned on their ability to convert some blocks of land into agriculturally productive farms and thereby partake in the emerging European driven economy. They faced, however, serious barriers that included the inability to raise capital, a reduced land base, and isolation.\textsuperscript{55}

\textbf{4.3.2.2 TIMBER PRODUCTION: NGATI WHARE}

One of the ways to gain an income was through logging. In the broader region, Kaingaroa was not forested, but Te Urewera was. While Te Urewera Māori had important and meaningful relationships with their forests (as described in Chapter One), desperation for money made them willing to sell timber. In comparison with other parts of Te Urewera, Ngati Whare lands had much more high quality timber. The area included totara, rimu, kahikatea, matai, and maire, which all increased in value as the scarcity of kauri grew. Ruatahuna also had some quality timber. There were, however, several barriers to realizing the value of those assets. One issue was that Māori land was subject
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to different sets of regulations and policies when it came to selling timber. Another problem was that, the case of Te Whaiti, the ownership of the area and who had the right to dispose of the timber was not clear as Ngati Manawa also had interests in the area.\footnote{John Hutton and Klaus Neumann, \textit{Ngati Whare and the Crown, 1880-1999} (Wellington: Crown Forestry Rental Trust, 2001), 178-81; Murton, \textit{The Crown and the People of Te Urewera, 1860 - c. 2000: The Economic and Social Experience of a People}, 979-981.}

In order to sell off the timber, it was necessary to separate out the interests of Ngati Whare from Ngati Manawa. Hutton and Neumann discuss whether the two groups could have worked together to grant cutting rights, but conclude that tribal dynamics and conflicts from the 1860s onwards would have prevented this from happening.\footnote{Hutton and Neumann, 178-81.} In 1913, Judge Brown of the Native Land Court divided the area into two parcels, Te Whaiti 1 & 2, and awarded the former to Ngati Whare. He then ruled that Ngati Whare had preeminent rights to the area. Yet, when the allocations were made, Ngati Manawa ended up with the portion that held the best timber.

The Crown wanted to acquire the Te Whaiti forests and was strategic in its efforts to purchase the lands in question. The Crown recognized that the value of the timber would increase as national stocks decreased, but it wanted to purchase the area at a minimum price. One of its tactics was to delay clarifying the legal title on any land. Keeping the title unclear also prevented the sale of timber licenses. When the owners attempted their own harvesting, the Crown sought a legislative injunction against them; these often only targeted cutting on Māori land.\footnote{Hutton and Neumann, 184-202, 211, 215, 308-9; Neumann, 43-45; Boast, \textit{Ngati Whare and Te Whaiti-Nui-A-Toi: A History}, 138. The War Legislation and Statue Law Amendment Act 1918 was only enforced against Māori land while the Forests Act 1921-22 had no restrictions specific to European land.}
Hutton and Neumann argue that the period from 1907-1919 was significant in determining the economic future of Ngati Whare. With a few exceptions, they were blocked from selling the bulk of their timber. Faced with dwindling economic options, they were gradually forced into selling their lands. By the mid-1920s, the tribe had lost the majority of their lands and more than half of the community was forced to move in search of employment. Hutton and Neumann point out that one of the largest problems with interactions between Ngati Whare and the Crown was the latter had not understood that the former were not Tūhoe. As such, the Crown was under the impression that Ngati Whare had land interests elsewhere and that the whole of Te Whaiti could be acquired; this was not the case. Despite these losses, for many of the subsequent years Ngati Whare were able to raise money by selling timber on residual lands, which began in 1928.

Unfortunately, Crown intervention again frustrated their efforts. In 1938 the State Forest Service decided to try its own logging in Te Whaiti and Te Urewera in order to pioneer less wasteful harvesting practices. It sold the raw logs to Wilson Timber Mills. As a result, local Māori no longer had a ready buyer. This deprived them of yet another source of income.

Other issues hampered the ability of Te Urewera Māori to realize an income through timber production. Recognition of the limited nature of these forests, concerns about erosion, and a desire to protect scenic values and wildlife led to restrictions on logging in Te Urewera. Between the 1930s and 1970s the Crown pursued different attempts to rectify the economic losses arising from the denial of logging a satisfactory
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resolution was not achieved. The government, however, never explored the possibility of a monetary reimbursement for unrealized income.62

The government’s efforts did sometimes increase cutting of Māori timber. Concern over dwindling resources and the need to shift public consumer preferences towards exotics in order to make that industry a viable substitute for the native woods led the SFS to impose limits on milling on Crown lands. By the middle of the twentieth century, much of the remaining indigenous forests were on Māori land. Millers responded to consumer demand for native woods and began increasing their harvesting from Māori lands. Thus, logging actually increased on Native land. Between 1947-1958 there was a shift from 30 million to 80 million board feet harvested per year on the breadth of North Island. Thus, even with a variety of barriers, Māori earned significant sums between the 1920s and 1970s.63

4.3.2.3 FARMING THE LAND64

Despite their willingness to participate in the agriculturally driven market economy, Māori faced many problems. These included the overall reductions to the land base, the quality of those lands, and the small size of individual parcels. For example, the Kaingaroa region had a cobalt deficiency that went undiagnosed until the 1920s. This made the lands unfit for farming. There were also structural obstacles. Chief among these was a lack of money to finance development. In addition, the geographic situation that

---

had initially secured some protection from Crown attention was soon a liability. Isolation impinged upon their ability to move goods to market. These problems were compounded by the increasing restrictions of Crown policies on land use. Thus, in many ways, the relatively undeveloped state of the region reflected structural constraints rather than a lack of willingness.

By the early twentieth century, Te Urewera Māori retained perhaps 323,700 of the more than 900,000 acres to which they originally had rights. The portions that had been confiscated represented the bulk of the arable flatter lands. Much of what was left was unsuitable for farming; the rugged terrain had low agricultural productivity and the area was frequently subject to frosts. It is estimated that Te Urewera Māori held about 10,000 acres of high quality and 11-12,000 acres of lower value agricultural land.

Title ‘fragmentation’ was also an issue. This meant that over successive generations individual blocks of land were continually subdivided. This led, eventually, to portions that were insufficient for farming or other economic development. Between 1894 and 1920s some parcels of land had been divided up to eight times. This situation where options were limited further encouraged Māori to sell or lease.

Despite these concerns, Māori continued to investigate the possibility of agricultural development on their lands. They started different approaches to commercial production in all areas suited to it. These included individual and collective efforts, including a communal system at Maungapohatu. In addition to this, they cultivated subsistence crops.

The first significant barrier to development of what lands remained was a lack of access to loans. The major reason for this was the way in which title had been issued. The
Native Land Court had investigated and awarded title so as to eliminate tribal structures and to acquire land from Māori for Pakeha and Crown uses. The court did reserve parcels for Māori to retain for subsistence, but not so they could develop and partake in the modernizing economy. As a result, those portions remaining under Native ownership were not properly commoditized. For example, in many cases, Māori land was under multiple title. Financial institutions would not accept land as collateral unless it was owned outright by a single person. In addition, there were restrictions on how Māori land could be alienated, which further prevented Native land from being used as security for loans. “It could be sold or leased, but only under limited circumstances mortgaged.”

Solutions to these problems were not developed and made available to Te Urewera until later in the twentieth century. The Crown was generally unwilling to assist with development. As a result, there were few options available to Māori other than the further sale of land.

The second major issue was a general lack of access; Te Urewera was isolated. As a result, farm goods were not connected to wider processing and market systems. The tribal leadership requested roads in 1908 and 1909. The government agreed to provide these in exchange for more land, which was then acquired during the Consolidation plan. The Crown, however, did not fully deliver on the promise and only built one road to Tauranga, which it maintained until 1930. Thereafter, it fell into decline. The lack of transportation infrastructure throughout Te Urewera not only prevented the development of a viable, agricultural economy, but also stymied the delivery of other services including education, health, and postal communications.
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There were some attempts in the 1920s and 1930s to address the structural barriers inherent in the land titles and regarding financial assistance. The 1929 Native Land Amendment and Native Land Claims Adjustment Act (section 23) enabled the creation of development systems in which the government provided loans. The administration of these plans, however, was by the Crown via the Native Affairs Department. This did lead to the creation of small dairy operations at Ruatoki and Waiohau along with the initial set-up of a farm for Ngati Manawa. Unfortunately, there were inherent problems with these arrangements in terms of their small size and continued need for capital investment. Some people were successful, but many suffered from an increasing debt burden. After World War II, the government was more interested in debt resolution. This was compounded by limited options for land development. In the 1950s and 1960s the department attempted to address the small size of farms by amalgamating title, though the owners objected. Of the four plans, only Ruatahuna was successful; it eventually terminated the plan and the project is now run by the community.

These plans were generally not successful, but there were some advantages. At Ruatoki and Waiohau, and to a small extent for Ngati Manawa, the schemes provided for the construction of small cottage homes. Over the years, however, the Department of Native Affairs did not maintain or update the housing.

There were other sources of income, though they did not have a significant impact. Money from the alienation of the Waikaremoana block was placed into a debenture, which paid out annual interest to the owners. Unfortunately, the government stopped paying out during the Depression. In 1957, it gave the balance of the debenture
back to the owners, though it did not address the 1930s losses. Secondly, the Crown paid money to make up for reneging on the promise to provide roads. Thirdly, the Crown paid for its lease of the lakebed. The latter two sets of money were managed by a trust board, which was a means to collectively administer Tūhoe assets. There were, however, many community conflicts over the board’s role and actions.

In the situation describe above, one viable option of land use for lower quality lands was exotic afforestation. Title problems still constituted a barrier, but both Tūhoe and Ngati Whare were able to recognize parcels in such a way as to make them available for pine plantations.

There were, however, additional ways in which Crown intervention shaped economic and land-use opportunities in the region. In 1890 the Crown began to enact a series of legislation to protect particular flora and, especially, fauna, in Te Urewera. This narrowed the subsistence base of Native peoples. These policies included restrictions on specific species as well as certain spaces through the creation of game preserves. This had the effect of severely limited traditional sources of protein. Some tribes were affected more than others, though many people probably ignored the new laws.

These polices and reserves were the foundation of the larger and more restrictive Te Urewera National Park, which was established in 1954, and fully encompassed several of the communities. This introduced further problems in terms of land use for adjacent communities. In many cases, they were prevented from undertaking economic activities that would detract from the overall wild and scenic qualities of the park. So, for example, landowners were prevented from harvesting timber or undertaking farming in areas adjacent to roads in order to maintain the overall appearance of the national park as
wilderness. Through both the protective polices described above and the creation of the national park, the recreational needs and conservation-oriented goals of the national populace were placed above the economic and cultural needs of the Native residents. In general, there were few and limited financial benefits derived from the park, though, out of necessity, park management did allow some commercial hunting in the 1960s. The region’s relative inaccessibility was an issue for the park and discouraged tourism, though there was probably great difference of opinion within local communities over whether or not tourism was desirable in the first place. In these ways, Te Urewera Māori were denied the use and enjoyment of their patrimony, which was a further erosion of their *rangatiratanga*.

The impacts of these different constraints were not evenly spread over Te Urewera. Some tribes struggled more than others. While many Te Urewera Māori had alternative lands to develop, Ngati Whare lands were limited to the Te Whaiti region. Their situation was even more difficult because their lands were marginally productive. They, along with Ngati Manawa, had been engaged in raising sheep in the Whirinaki Valley as early as the 1880s. Unfortunately, the same cobalt deficiency that plagued Kaingaroa was also present in Te Whaiti. Such hardship forced many people to leave the area in search of alternate economic opportunity. This only compounded the *iwi’s* problems by creating a shortage of labor to assist with development.
4.3.3 TE TAIRĀWHITI

4.3.3.1 INTRODUCTION

The people of the Te Tairāwhiti region had a few economic opportunities available to them. Unlike Te Urewera-Kaingaroa, this region was immediately capable of supporting agricultural production. There were, however, a number of obstacles to Māori-controlled farming. The lack of financial assistance to develop lands was an issue. Owners could either sell land to raise funds, lease it, or they could vest their lands with the Commissioner of Crown Lands (CCL) of Hawke’s Bay. The latter option meant that owners ceded virtually all decision-making power regarding land management as representatives of the Crown did not think that Māori could manage their own land.66

One of the solutions was to lease land to Pakeha, which was undertaken in many cases. The system whereby Māori land was leased to Pakeha, however, also created problems for land management. The lease structure, typically twenty-one years with no guarantees of renewal, did not encourage lessees to treat rented land well, but rather to extract maximum benefit from it in the time allotted. Lessees often had to save money to invest on starting work on a new farm elsewhere. Consequently, many Māori received their land back in a rundown state. Tangata whenua were unable to secure finance because their land title was under multiple ownership. Private loans were available at usurious rates. As a result, Māori did not have the money to make necessary improvements and their lands continued to deteriorate.67
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There was also some timber harvesting. Local timber was processed for building needs and farm infrastructure, especially after the economic depression of 1920-21. Some timber was exported and some was consumed in the Gisborne area. But, timber was also imported. Many of the buildings in the Waiapu area were built from imported kauri. Sawmilling had largely ceased by the 1960s.  

4.3.3.2 MĀORI FARMING

Contact with Europeans also affected the Te Tairāwhiti region. Introductions of new crops and animals led to changes in land use and dietary consumption during the 1830s and 1840s. Māori added production of crops for market exchange to their existing economic activities. By the 1850s, this region was a major producer and supplier of wheat to Auckland and Australia, which led to greater wealth. Grain and other minor exports, in turn, enabled further changes in consumption patterns as people were able to procure more European goods and tools. This money was also used to modernize farming tools, expand livestock herds, bring more land into production, and to acquire boats for improved goods transport. They did experience some problems with maintaining and using new equipment or with overspending and then facing financial difficulties, but on balance the Natives of this region were highly interested in European style agricultural opportunities and innovations.
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After the New Zealand Wars, during which the people of this region experienced conflict, deprivation, and economic setbacks, the area underwent moderate recovery. Some rebounded more rapidly than others. These improvements continued through the end of the century. The main drive for economic improvements focused on agriculture, especially sheep production, though there was a setback during the 1870s when many of the flocks were infected with scab. Other activities included whaling and storekeeping, the latter gave Māori an alternative to European owned stores, some of which featured inflated prices. These activities would have been layered onto the existing Māori economic pursuits and so while only some were directly involved in these processes, many more indirectly or seasonally participated as well. The profits that were generated would have been employed according to Māori norms to some degree, such as feasting to demonstrate the mana of a tribe, rather than on European style expenditures. Through the 1880s, though foreign spending habits increasingly influenced tangata whenua. This is not to say that all money was spent on hospitality displays. As with other regions, Māori of Te Tairāwhiti faced significant exploitation when attending the Native Land Court, which addressed local land claims during the 1870s and early 1880s.

The last few decades of the nineteenth century witnessed even more changes to Māori economic activities. In the 1880s sheep populations doubled, there was significant increase in pasturage, and further modernization of production techniques. In terms of organization, this period was one in which Māori shifted away from communal production and towards individual farm plots. These changes were not uniformly spread throughout Māori society nor were they equally encouraged by Pakeha society. Instead
this was a situation in which there were complex interactions and conflicts over who
would develop, when, how, and in what way.

There were basic differences between Māori and Pakeha in terms of their attitudes
toward land tenure and these affected land development options. As was generally the
case in other regions, at the beginning of the twentieth century, the creation of title under
the Native Land Court had created many problems with Māori land management and one
of the main problems was a lack of financial options for land development. The goal was
to overcome barriers to development and yet do so in a way that fit within the Māori
cultural framework of social norms and land management. It was not until 1929 that the
government made a specific arrangement to assist Māori in their economic advancement.
In the meantime, Native people in the region developed three different solutions that
included incorporation, consolidation, and leasing. Each of these, while not perfect, did
succeed in making it possible to gain access to credit to finance improvements to farms
and business. Despite these efforts, Māori in the region continued to struggle with a lack
of capital.

In 1929, under the direction of Sir Apirana Ngata, one of the leaders of the Young
Māori Party, another development plan was implemented. While it continued to have
problems here and there, it did represent a significant effort and had its successes.

In the region as a whole there was a great deal of difficulty in achieving high
farming productivity. This was a product of several factors including tenure systems, the
sizes of farm plots, and general management issues. At that scale, Māori farming featured
eamples of high output and standards as well situations in which there were low returns.
The latter case was specific to northern Waiapu and Matakaoa County, which have a
large proportion of Māori-run operations. The evidence, however, indicates that the region is more prone to erosion and a host of other problems that make farming less successful, including the tenurial system, isolation, high cost of transportation, and some social factors. Thus, the correlation of low production and Māori-run operations is closely related to conditions that frequently mitigate against success. What is more striking is the relative success of Native farmers despite these obstacles. Generally, Māori in the region respond quickly to innovations and economic opportunities. In order to improve the overall economic output, it is necessary to rationalize land uses so that certain lands that are less suited to farming, especially in steep, erosion prone territory, are employed for forestry or other appropriate systems.

The Te Aitanga-a-Mahaki tribe struggled with the aftermath of the Native Land Court and its impacts on title. As discussed in Chapter Three, the lands collectively known as Mangatu had passed through the Native Land Court in the 1880s after which parcels 2, 5, and 6 were sold. Over the next several decades the remaining parcels, Mangatu 1, 3, and 4, went through a variety of administrative and land use changes before finally being returned to its owners. At one point the blocks were vested under trustees. The lands became entangled in the New Zealand Native Land Settlement Company. Later, they were placed under the management of the East Coast Commissioner. A variety of legal constraints prevented owners from realizing the full use of their assets. They were forced to lease out land in order to gain an income. The lessees began a period of heavy and rapid deforestation as they converted the land to pastoral production. Pakeha also damaged and removed a lot of cultural artifacts in an effort to
prevent the owners from returning to their property. Haapu describes one of the most poignant and disturbing aspects of these changes:

Trapped by poverty and untrained in the practices of European farming, the owners became manual labourers for the lessees. Shearing, clearing land, making roads and shepherding, the owners improved their own land for the benefit of the settlers, who reaped the benefits of farm profits whilst the owners remained in the same economic position.  

In the late 1940s the owners successfully petitioned to have Mangatu 1, 3, and 4 consolidated into a single entity and returned to their control. The owners, however, continued to face problems in terms of financing development and in reaching agreement on land management. Haapu argues that the changes initiated by the Native Land Court placed extreme pressure on the communal ownership system. This “portrayed the evils of individualisation as owners became embroiled in inter-hapu disputes which had long lasting consequences.”

Many Māori in the region attempted to keep some control over the process of land reform. The Te Aitanga-a-Mahaki leader, Wi Pere, spent many years on this issue. One of these ways was through trusts, which theoretically enabled land management in ways that were consistent with tribal decision-making systems. Parcels amounting to 70,000 acres located around Gisborne, inland between Gisborne and Wairoa, on the Mahia Peninsula, portions of Mangatu, and areas in Te Tairāwhiti were placed under the management of Pere and a lawyer with whom he worked, W.L. Rees. Thus, these included lands from Ngati Porou and from the iwi of Turanga (Poverty Bay).

Unfortunately, Pere and Rees faced many obstacles. The trust started out at a disadvantage for many of the best Poverty Bay lands had already been alienated and thus
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needed to be reacquired. This led to significant debt. Also, they did not have the support of the government. In the legal decision *Pouawa*, the judge ruled that the ways in which the land was being managed were not legitimate. Pere and Rees then pursued a joint venture called the New Zealand Native Land Settlement Company that combined Māori land with investments from Pakeha to finance the division and preparation of said lands. Over 200,000 acres were controlled by the company including “the lease of the 90,000 Mangatu 1 block.”\(^72\) But, the debts from the previous trust, bad decisions, and a lack of government support were serious problems. This was compounded by the economic depression of the 1880s.

Pere and Rees tried various means to meet their financial obligations, but the government refused to assist Māori to run their own lands. Eventually, the Bank of New Zealand, which owned the mortgages, put some of the land up for sale to meet the debt. When the company was dissolved both landowners and investors lost out. In 1892, the remaining lands were converted into the Carroll Pere trust. They still had debt from the previous activities. The Validation Court was established to disentangle the results of land tenure reform. Through that court more land was assigned to the Carroll Pere trust to help with meeting financial obligations. Parliament got involved in the late 1890s and took control of the lands away from Māori. In 1902 the government passed the East Coast Native Trust Lands Act which created a Pakeha-run board to oversee the management of the Carroll Pere trust lands.

The board spent the next several decades resolving the debt burden and managing the lands. In the first few years the board sold one-third of the lands to meet the debt

\(^72\) Tribunal, xxiv.
obligations to the bank. Sorting out the internal accounts and liabilities of the individual parcels too much longer. In 1955 the trust returned the lands to the various owners and paid compensation to those owners whose lands had been sold to meet the trust debts. “The total amount was thus around 27,000 out of the 98,299 acres of inquiry district land vested in the Carroll Pere trust.”\textsuperscript{73} Mangatu 5 and 6 had also been managed by the trust and were returned in 1974.

While Pere and Rees and the other involved in managing the trusts and the Settlement Company made bad decisions at different stages the government was also at fault. The new land policies and legal structures were not designed to facilitate Māori management of their lands. “It was the complex, inefficient, and contradictory system of individual transfer that destabilised the trust’s titles.”\textsuperscript{74} While Crown involvement at the end of the century was needed, the Crown was aware of the problem long before it stepped in. “The failure to intervene earlier, when it first became aware of the problem, resulted in an escalation of the trust debt and ultimately further loss of land.”\textsuperscript{75} Also, the government acted in a paternalistic way. It took power away from Māori; it did not ensure that Māori were represented on the board that oversaw their own lands.

4.3.3.3 PROBLEMS RESULTING FROM DEFORESTATION IN TE TAIRĀWHITI

As noted above in section 4.3.3.1, this region has been prone to erosion. It is important to note that there is a difference between long-term natural changes and

\textsuperscript{73} Tribunal, 549.
\textsuperscript{74} Tribunal, xxv.
\textsuperscript{75} Tribunal, xxvi.
human-induced ones. Human occupation of this region entailed extensive deforestation. This process was initiated by Māori on the lowlands for agriculture long before the arrival of the Europeans. *Tangata whenua*, however, had largely left the hilly areas alone. Coombes contrasts Māori impacts on the land (which were limited to lowlands) with Pakeha impacts. The arrival of Pakeha settlers in the area began a period of significant deforestation on the hill country, leaving all but most inaccessible, steepest portions.

“Analysis of the sediment record of a lake to the south of the East Cape [Te Tairāwhiti] region showed that the natural erosion rate prior to human settlement was 2.1 mm per year but that by the 1990s it had reached 14 mm per year.” These upland clearances were often facilitated by state assistance. The members of the HOMNUTI trust recall the period of rapid deforestation in the area. Tui says:

> But it happened to us like ninety years ago…like 1819 [sic 1919], started, the clearing started. It went hard-core for thirty years.

They recognize that some of the clearances were conducted by their ancestors in an effort to participate in the new market economy, but still they lament the impact of those decisions.

Coombes notes the Pakeha bias towards pastoral land uses above all others meant that native forests were often viewed as a hindrance to “productive” land use. Initially, inaccessibility and the rugged terrain prevented deforestation of the most erosion prone areas; however, later Crown policies and actions enabled the clearance of the steepest
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areas. State subsidies occurred even though the Crown understood the link between upland deforestation and erosion.

The combination of subsidised inputs and the requirements for land transformation led to the indiscriminate clearance of land, irrespective of whether or not the land had the capacity to support pastoral agriculture…Through the tax incentive structure, the Crown created an economic situation in which it was profitable to clear land well beyond its capabilities.

Some of these subsidies were available into the 1970s. Coombes argues that two different Crown policies influenced deforestation: “policies for timber harvesting and policies for land clearance and utilization.” This closely relates to the overall view towards forestry management. The government’s policies on forestry were based on replacement of native timber trees with fast-growing exotic plantations.

As noted above, there was some timber harvesting; however, the primary mechanism of forest clearance was burning. The Waipaoa basin underwent massive vegetation change between the 1880s and 1920s. Currently, primary native forests cover only three percent of this area, though “17% of the headwaters of the Waipaoa have retained its indigenous vegetation cover.” In contrast, the East Coast, which is where the Waiapu basin is located, had remained out of the Native Land Court longer. Extensive Pakeha settlement and rapid deforestation did not commence until the following decade. The most intensive period of land-use conversion was from the 1890s to 1930s. Rau estimates that in the late nineteenth century approximate 8-9000 acres were converted

---
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annually in the Waiapu basin alone.\textsuperscript{85} The Waiapu basin retains twenty-one percent of its primary forests. In the region as a whole, native forests exist on seventeen percent of the land.\textsuperscript{86}

Māori have often been blamed for the deforestation that took place on their lands. Coombes, however, points out that the majority of the land clearances were under the direction of either the CCL or by the lessees, usually with little or no input from the owners.\textsuperscript{87}

### 4.3.3.1 IMPACTS OF DEFORESTATION

Deforestation of the upper reaches of the watersheds of major rivers has completely changed the physical architecture of the region and caused widespread degradation of the environment. This has created a variety of problems for the entire region. On the steeper portions, areas that have lost natural cover are more inclined towards erosion, which can be quite severe in this area.\textsuperscript{88} In terms of the mechanisms

\textsuperscript{85} Rau, 16.
\textsuperscript{87} Coombes, 33-38.
\textsuperscript{88} N.H. Taylor, \textit{Wise Land Use and Community Development: Report of the Technical Committee of Inquiry into the Problems of the Poverty Bay - East Cape District of New Zealand} (Wellington: Water and Soil Division, Ministry of Works, 1970). The authors of the Taylor Report argue that there is a marked difference in the erosive capacity of mudstone country versus argillite country. The former tends to produce finer silts and sediments which do not have long term deleterious effects on the lower lands and also has higher innate fertility, therefore vegetation is more likely to recover quickly and stabilize the slope. Conversely, in argillite country, erosion scars do not recover as rapidly and can continue to contribute sediment to the watershed. In addition, the kinds of material that are produced tend to be larger and heavier. This material does not quickly exit the watershed system. Rather, it tends to get stored in the river beds of the upper portions of the catchment and then slowly get redistributed throughout the system. Thus, argillite country tends to create conditions of aggradation over the longer term.
behind accelerated erosion, one study pointed to the loss of the root system as key. Coombes, however, argues that it is the “transformation of the water regime” that has been most disastrous.  

In particular, he points to the loss of a closed canopy that serves to intercept precipitation.  

This region has one of the highest rates of erosion in the Southern Hemisphere. The Waipaoa and Waiapu each have high suspended sediment loads. The latter is three times greater than the former and it ranks among the highest in the world. This may partly be attributed to higher levels of precipitation in the northern watershed. The Waiapu experiences ninety-four inches of rain annually on average while the Waipaoa only experiences fifty-eight inches on average.  

The overall volume of material that is washed down into the catchment has led to significant structural changes to the river systems including higher stream beds. The transportation of these materials has led to extensive aggradation (deposition) on stream beds, which has reduced the capacity of the streams to hold flood waters. For example, where once the valley floor of the Waiapu was V-shaped, it is now flat and heavily braided (Figure 9). Compounded with the loss of the interceptive capacity of the leaf canopy, the region has experienced far more severe flooding and extensive damage for comparable storm events. Such flooding has led to widespread damage of infrastructure and had a negative impact on economic productivity on the lower lands. There has also been the loss of use of the Waipaoa River for transportation. 
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4.3.3.3.2 IMPACTS OF DEFORESTATION ON MĀORI

Coombes discusses the many ways in which deforestation affected Māori communities. He notes that the forests themselves were important as sources of various products that were key to Māori survival. These include, but are not limited to: food, medicine, valuable trade items, building materials, and fiber for textiles. While the tangata whenua of this region were primarily coastal, the forests were important to community survival. Beyond that there was the intrinsic value of the forests themselves,

Figure 9. Picture of Waiapu River
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which Māori recognized as being connected to them and as being their responsibility under the concept of kaitiakitanga.\textsuperscript{94}

In addition to the loss of forest resources, deforestation affected the lower portions of the waterways. Both the increased sediment load and the changes to riverbed architecture have reduced the water quality of the catchment in the form of increased levels of total dissolved solids (TDS). “Normal turbidity levels are such that the river [Waipaoa] maintains a cloudy appearance even in times of low flow.”\textsuperscript{95} This has had a negative impact on aquatic life resulting in a loss of species diversity and a reduction in total population numbers. Important sources of food have been depleted. Even the species which are more tolerant of low water quality have been affected; ex. \textit{tuna} (eel). Features and structures adjacent to the river have been changed for the worse. Specifically, there has been a loss of seasonal ponds, which were important as fishing sloughs, and reduction in the extent of swamps. These resources were a part of a landscape managed by Māori. Previously, floodwaters would refresh and resupply the sloughs, but now they contributed low quality water and material. Ponds and swamps have decreased in size and depth.\textsuperscript{96}

Decreased water quality and changes to river architecture led to the reductions in numbers and diversity of aquatic life. This ecological impact has been, in turn, a profound loss to local \textit{iwi}, who rely on such resources. While the above describes the specific impacts on the Waipaoa watershed, the importance of the environment for other \textit{iwi} is the same. Writing about the Waiapu, Harmsworth and Warmenhoven write “the catchment is of great spiritual, cultural, physical and economic significance to Ngati

\textsuperscript{94} Harmsworth and Warmenhoven,
\textsuperscript{95} Coombes, 52.
\textsuperscript{96} Coombes, 53-56.
Porou, and the poor health and depletion of resources in the catchment is of great concern.\textsuperscript{97}

In addition to impacts on their economy, there have been impacts on their safety. Aggradation led to increased flooding, which necessitated moving Māori settlements further away from the river. Coombes notes that prior to contact, Māori would have had the flexibility to move as needed.\textsuperscript{98} After the loss of lands, however, their ability to adapt to changing environmental circumstances was severely curtailed. Many Māori have had to purchase lands from Europeans in order to move to a safe distance. The legal problems associated with native forms of land title have impeded Māori ability to secure funds to accomplish much of this.

There have been further economic ramifications in that widespread flooding has damaged or obliterated Māori farmlands. This is a continuing problem as is illustrated by Uncle Dick’s comment:

Just recently I’ve been mustering with stock with a farmer down here on the Waiapu flats. I feel very very sorry for that man. The hundreds of acres that he’s losing on the Waiapu flats is unbelievable. When you ride around with him on a horse on these flats down here and you see the loss of his land, you see it in the man…the river is endless, it just keeping coming...he’s losing hundreds of acres every flood.\textsuperscript{99}

He goes on to describe the impacts at the regional scale:

This is devastation on a huge scale. We’ve got one paddock there that’s 1800 acres where it once produced a lot of stock. It’s just one huge gully, it’s like the color of the rain, grey, nothing on it, just a huge devastation.\textsuperscript{100}

The ongoing erosion limits the ability of people to participate economically.
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4.3.3.3 EARLY OFFICIAL RECOGNITION OF PROBLEMS WITH DEFORESTATION

There were several early indicators of the dangers of upland forest clearance in the Te Tairāwhiti region. As early as 1868, scientists were discussing the connections between deforestation and flooding. In 1895 a geologist, H. Hill, analyzed the issue of erosion in the area. He noted that lands covered in natural vegetation were more resistant to collapse and erosion than those lands which had been cleared and converted to pasturage. Coombes writes that in the midst of the clearances (1890-1910), the Crown was aware of the ways in which upland deforestation affected catchments, yet continued to provide subsidies to aid in land conversion to pasturage.\footnote{Brad Coombes, \textit{Summary of Evidence: Overview of environmental impacts in the Gisborne Inquiry District} (2001).} Crown officials were promoting the idea of protective forests in the upper reaches of river catchments. As early at 1900 there were signs of erosion in the region. In 1920, geologists who analyzed the Waipaoa warned of the dangers of clearing the headwaters forests. They gave specific recommendations for Waipaoa that not only should the deforestation stop, but also afforestation should be pursued. At that point a great deal had already been cleared, but these warnings went unheeded and the clearances continued. At the same time, there were already signs of erosion in Waiapu as well as decreases in soil fertility.\footnote{Coombes, \textit{Ecological impacts and planning history}, 44-47; Rhodes; Rau, 140.}

It took time and extreme events, however, to change popular perceptions. In 1938 a cyclone dropped approximately thirty inches of rain in the region. It caused widespread erosion in the hill country. This was the first major mass movement of the hillslopes. “The bush had been felled off the hills long enough for most of the root system to have
rotted and disappeared and there was nothing to hold those steep hills together.”¹⁰³ A subsequent storm-induced flood in 1946 in the Waipaoa watershed reinforced this reality. Phillips and Marden note that by 1940s the public at large began to recognize that there was a difference in the rates of erosion of those lands under forest and those lands in pasture.¹⁰⁴ Throughout the 1950s and 1960s erosion was a serious problem. It was in this context of extensive erosion as accelerated by deforestation that exotic forestry was introduced into the East Coast. Afforestation was just one of many strategies employed as a flood control measure.¹⁰⁵

4.4 COLONIAL SPATIALIZING STRATEGIES

Colonialism involved imagining the colonies as empty spaces in order to produce them for the benefit of colonizers. Therefore, a necessary initial step was to undermine native ties to the land. This was done through a perceptual distinction between nature and culture, where local people were described as being a part of nature in contrast to colonists, who were held up as superior by their ability to subjugate nature. As was done in Europe with the rise of the capitalist mode of production, European colonialism involved the imposition of private property regimes upon existing property relations. Another element was the settlement of native peoples onto discrete, bounded lots. This enabled greater control over people as well as the acquisition of land for European usage. Along with the division of property, there was the physical creation of signs of the new property relations through the erection of fences and “geometrically distributed farms and

¹⁰³ Rau, 60.
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¹⁰⁵ Rau, 71, 145.
villages.”¹⁰⁶ This was the production of a new landscape that conveyed a European sense of visual order, which in turn validated European activities.¹⁰⁷

This is very similar to Scott in terms of the development of new technologies to control nature. It is about changing relationships between people and nature, the growth of the modern state, and the rise of capitalism. The development of capitalism requires new tools and technologies to better control and manage new property relations; not just for the state, but also for the capitalists/bourgeoisie. This means a privileging of vision and a reconfiguring of space.¹⁰⁸

Geoff Park discusses the application of spatializing strategies to the New Zealand context. As with other colonies, many settlers could not understand the signs of native cultural occupation. Instead, Europeans perceived that they were in a wilderness that was unknowable and an empty space rather than a culturally encoded place. The European willingness and ability to so dramatically alter the environment was taken as a sign that God was on their side. Wrestling control from nature was imbued with a moral imperative and served as a point of distinction between the settlers and the Natives. Land was considered to be a limitless resource. The settler belief that Natives had not invested labor in the land was used as an argument that the latter had not properly established their claim to resources and, thus, removed barriers to land alienation and native dispossession. From the European perspective, land was going to waste under Native care.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁷ Cosgrove, 264-265.
¹⁰⁸ Cosgrove, 254-258.
¹⁰⁹ Park, 39-41, 83.
Vision and visual imagination played important roles in the colonization of New Zealand. Park notes that when confronted with the complexity of native ecosystems, early visitors employed the trope of anticipatory vision. Heavily wooded areas and swamps were described in terms of their potential as plowed fields and villages, neatly sidestepping the issue of native tenure and of significant environmental conversion.\textsuperscript{110}

In contrast to indigenous and non-European ways of relating to the world, Europeans primarily approach the world from a spatial perspective. Byrnes writes that when British surveyors prepared the way for future settlers they had to envision New Zealand as a boundless space upon which they would inscribe their cultural place. According to Western science, space exists prior to place.\textsuperscript{111} “Space, being the most pervasive of cosmic media, is considered that about which we must have general knowledge, whereas we possess merely local knowledge about place.”\textsuperscript{112} Thus, space is constructed as having priority as well as eminence over place. Edward Casey writes “once it is assumed (after Newton and Kant) that space is absolute and infinite as well as empty and a prior in status, places become the mere apportionings of space, its compartmentalizations.”\textsuperscript{113}

The appropriation of land, its surveying and distribution, and the allocation of forest resources are expressions of the spatializing state. Pakeha did not simply come to occupy a blank or empty space. Since Western science treats space as prior, it is assumed that the conversion of a cultural landscape into neutral or empty space is simply a matter
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of erasing cultural ties or going back to a pre-placial, or pre-human, state. Reconstituting
the landscape as space, however, is an imposition of Western logic and thus an act of
colonization that only masks the lived place. Even though land surveyors imagined New
Zealand as an empty space, it was a deeply inscribed cultural place. Despite the efforts of
the Pakeha, this cultural landscape was not obliterated. According to this argument, it is
place which is prior to space. Byrnes likens the result to a cultural palimpsest in which
highly contested and fragmented interpretations play out against one another. In contrast
to the spatializing perspective of the Pakeha surveyors, the Māori relate to their lands
from a placializing perspective.\textsuperscript{114}

As with the spatial practices developed in Europe, New Zealand colonists sought
to impose an abstract and standardized system. There was a belief that a certain logic and
viewpoint were universal and could be transplanted to any location. Using the example of
the European settlement of the Hutt Valley, Park describes the insistence of the New
Zealand Company that the operation could be planned at a distance from Britain.
Unfortunately, the plan was not flexible enough for the hilly reality of the region, and
thus led to the creation of streets that remain steep and uncompromising.\textsuperscript{115}

The tropes of legibility, order, and productivity justified dispossession and
alteration of the land. As with forests, Europeans had cultural anxieties about marshlands
or wetlands. Such places were considered ‘swamps’ that should be drained and converted
to more ‘useful’ places. Cultural attitudes also justified the diversion of rivers,
deforestation, and other efforts to make land available to specific kinds of production.
Settlers believed that these were improvements and pursued a course of “change, not
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adaptation.” The nineteenth century settler was primarily motivated by economic interests. Standing forests were not valued for anything other than economic potential, either as timber or for the soil beneath. Though they despised forests and swamps, these each provided rich ecological capital in the form of timber, fuel, flax, and fertile soil. These were all integral to the productivity of the early colonial economy, which was based heavily in primary economic activity.

4.5 CONCLUSION

This chapter has addressed the integration of Aotearoa/New Zealand into the emerging world economy and has focused on what this meant in terms of resource use patterns and economic opportunities for Pakeha and Māori. It has demonstrated that Māori have, from the beginning, chosen the ways in which they would respond to these new opportunities and that they have sought to participate on their own terms, though these choices varied from group to group and over time. This chapter has also addressed the ways in which environmental transformations set the groundwork for unsustainable timber consumption and land degradation and, therefore, the need for a coherent forest management approach. The next chapter will cover the development of state-led forestry in Germany and England and how these projects were a part of the broader spatializing strategies that facilitated the rise of the modern state. These practices were then exported as a part of the broader systems of empire. They eventually had a strong influence on New Zealand’s forest management, which will be discussed later in Chapter 6.

116 Grey, 160.
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CHAPTER 5. AFFORESTATION:

NEW LANDSCAPES AND SPATIALIZING STRATEGIES

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Scott and Mitchell argue that the modern state required particular systems of knowledge that would enable it to efficiently exert control over people, land, and resources. These spatializing systems are largely preoccupied with the visual, are reductionist, espouse an instrumentalist view of the world, and are predicated on reorganization of the world as a means to achieve legibility, order, and productivity. They are part of the broader globalizing tendencies of European modernity. Scott argues that scientific forestry is one example of the state’s effort to produce legibility, order, and productivity through spatializing mechanisms.

The state’s interests in the forests were fiscal, in terms of how much revenue they would produce, and representational; large forest holdings were an expression of the power of the state. One of the critical features of the modern state was that its bureaucratic system depended on simplified and generalized knowledge. This required a narrowing of vision. “The actual tree with its vast number of possible uses was replaced by an abstract tree representing a volume of lumber or firewood.”

Scientific forestry is an example of a way to confront the multiplicity and complexity of different places and to reduce such variety to a manageable set of variables. The goal of such changes was to create a standardized system that could be
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easily applied to nearly any circumstance. This also entailed the conversion of Nature as habitat to being a source of economic value and ‘natural resources’ and a change from people to taxable citizens.

This chapter will address the development of state scientific forestry management practices in Germany and Britain and their implications for resource use. As both countries participated in imperial activities, these practices were exported around the globe as part of globalizing projects.

5.2 EUROPEAN FOREST MANAGEMENT IDEAS

5.2.1 INTRODUCTION

The management of forests worldwide ranges from local exercise of usufruct rights to hierarchical state authority over forest areas. This section addresses the history of forest management practices, tracing the rise of scientific forestry in Germany and England and the spread of scientific forestry as a spatializing strategy with the growth of European empires. Basically, I argue that the rise of the modern state involves a perceptual shift from ‘nature’ to ‘natural resources’ and the gradual alienation of local communities from land and their environments, including forests.

Many scholars have studied forests and/or scientific forestry. Some look broadly at the history of forests and human connections to them. These works include analyses of the ways in which changing social conditions affect relationships to forests. Another set of research can be described as environmental histories that address the impacts of Old
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World colonial practices and biological exchanges on the New World.\textsuperscript{5} Others move beyond Anglo-centric accounts of environmentalism to explore ways in which environmental consciousness and ideas about conservation developed in various colonies. These also focus on ideas about links between environmental degradation and climate change.\textsuperscript{6} Others focus on exchange of organisms and ideas about science and nature throughout the colonial world. For example, Brockway analyzes the social and political dimensions of networks of scientific research.\textsuperscript{7} Several scholars have critically addressed scientific forestry and associated management practices initiated under the colonial state.\textsuperscript{8} They investigate the social impacts of changing relationships between people and forests in terms of access and control over resources. Further, they highlight the politics of such transformations to the sociocultural setting. An important aspect of several of these works is attention to the politics of representation. Researchers have critically analyzed the ways in which nature has been re-imagined and how foresters have validated their uses of the


forests while criminalizing and excluding non-commercial and non-state uses of the forests.  

5.2.2 ORIGINS

The changing relationships between the state, people, nature, and land led to the alienation of communities from land and from forests. These practices were later exported throughout the colonial world, including New Zealand. While much attention has been given to the rise of scientific forestry in German, Tsouvalis argues that there were already efforts to administer the forests as a state asset in Britain prior to the introduction of German techniques. I begin with a discussion of the historic context of human-forest relationships and then trace how the trees came be viewed by the state as a resource to be managed.

Forests and woods are the center of complex cultural meanings and uses. Harrison notes that a deep-seated ambivalence to forests emerged in Europe during the early Middle Ages. Forests were considered to be the fastnesses of heathens and pagans, and thus was a threat to Christian society. The woods and wilderness represented danger and
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threats to sanity. In essence, the forests were considered to be outside of the safety of civilization. At the same time, however, there was a tradition within the Christian church of mendicants who leave corrupt society to seek spiritual connection to God within the forests.

State management of forests has had a long history. The forests represented royal prerogative. This was another way in which the forests were ‘outside.’ Indeed, the original use of the word forest was juridical and was meant to designate an area that was the property of the King. The probable origin of the word is the Latin foris, which means ‘outside’ and was meant to convey the fact that the forests were outside of the public access and were reserved for the use of the King. Forests became a means for royal and aristocratic recreation, for the display of Crown authority, and to exert control over the populace. “The capacity to hunt deer, and the ability to grant (or withhold) permission for others to do so, were signs of the very highest socio-political status.”

Thus, forests were contested places where power was deployed. Violations of the forest were subject to special adjudication under “forest laws.” In both England and the early German principalities, rulers and princes enacted various laws to restrict access and use of these forests, which were supported by specially established forest courts. However, forests were not places of complete exclusion in that commoners had access to exploit certain resources. This point is key, for there was a certain flexibility to such
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early notions of forests. This flexibility is in contrast to the modern uses for “financial profit and crop production.”

Forests as private property were not solely the domain of the kings and princes. Coates notes that by the middle of the thirteenth century most wooded areas in England were under private ownership. The boundaries between state and private ownership comes vividly into view in the 1630s during the reign of Charles I, who, desperate to raise money, undertook to have the boundaries of his forests enlarged at the expense of several aristocrats and landed gentry.

A designation of forest over an area did not necessarily mean the land was entirely covered in trees. Quite often such areas included fields, pastures, towns, villages, and other open spaces. Afforestation was not about the trees or about planting trees. At that point in English history, it was a matter of zoning, or of restricting certain activities. Specifically, it involved a prohibition against hunting deer or disturbing the habitat of deer. These initial forests could be quite large; some were upwards of 100,000 acres.

In the case of England, while the forests were an expression of monarchical power, it was the deer that symbolized such authority, not the trees. In this context, the trees were only meaningful to the king and to the forests as protective habitat for deer. However, these values shifted over time.

As society changed in Germany and in England, wood began to be put to new uses. Both regions had lagged behind other European countries in the development of
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manufacturing and industry, which meant that these countries remained more heavily forested far longer than their neighbors.\textsuperscript{18}

5.2.3 GERMANY: THE RISE OF SCIENTIFIC FORESTRY

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, Germany experienced major environmental changes as trees were cut down and forests went from being dense and forbidding to relatively open and domesticated as pasturage and as adjuncts to towns and villages. German forests were depleted through wars and through an export industry that supplied various other European countries with naval quality wood. The actual composition of the forests changed as well. Instead of the broadleaved species so characteristic of German lands, landowners followed eighteenth century forestry principles and replanted their lands with fast-growing conifers. While the English and other Europeans were rapidly feeding their trees into their industrial furnaces, the Germans did not develop their manufacturing until the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{19}

The deforestation of Germany led many people to realize the cultural virtues of their forests. As with other parts of Europe, conflicting attitudes about the dangers of the forests existed. These associations have persisted in German society; for example, the stories of the Brothers Grimm abound with dangers that lurk in the dark and dense forests; threats that include murder, dismemberment, and madness. However, these tales also feature a strong element of a cultural sense of community and justice, one that was specifically non-Roman in form. Such ideas can be traced back as early as 98 A.D. in the
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Roman Tacitus’ commentary on the German people.\textsuperscript{20} His description likens the Germans to being savages as a result of their close connections with their forests, marshes, and bogs. There is, however, already an element of ambivalence in his depiction for he ascribes a certain pure nobility to the Germans as opposed to the decadence of cosmopolitan Rome, which in itself had its mythic origins in the forests.\textsuperscript{21}

For the Germans, the wild barbarism that had successfully repelled the Romans was a source of pride and central to the German Romantic movement, which was a rejection of French rationalism and the Enlightenment. Identity was closely wrapped up in nature, nobility, virtue and was most closely associated with the oak tree. However, the depictions of the forests were not of dense wilderness, but of managed woodlands that were a source of agricultural abundance, hardy people, and German authenticity. Similarly, the view of the ideal German was domesticated from the fierce and violent wildman to the ‘noble savage.’\textsuperscript{22}

Later, the forests and forester became powerful symbols that served as the antithesis to the corrupt capitalistic individualism of the 1850s. Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl, fearing the destructive effects of unchecked industrialization, argued that the protection of the woods was not just a matter of “patriotic sentimentality” but essential to the future of Germany. He successfully convinced the public and the state of the value of forests and oversaw the establishment of forestry as a science in Germany. Later practitioners of forestry assisted in making forest management a matter of government concern. This was

\textsuperscript{20} As discussed in Ibid., 81-94.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 95-107; Harrison, 164-177.
\textsuperscript{22} Schama, 93-103.
not a matter of maintaining the ecosystem; instead it was a combination of economic production and protection of national identity. 23

Lowood 24 and Scott 25 argue that the rise of scientific forestry can be traced to the latter half of the eighteenth century, primarily in Prussia and Saxony. During that time, there was a change in the way government was run. This was part of the overall project of modernity, an outcome of the Age of Enlightenment. One of the key developments of this new approach to governance was a reliance on quantification of information deemed essential to state interests. The goal was to make the administration of the state more efficient. People believed that efficiency related to a scientific approach to numbers. These methods are categorized as “cameral sciences.” This involved the rational measurement and quantification of different types of information. Among these new sciences was forestry, which was crucial to the state’s economy.

Wood was a key resource before the development of coal as an alternative fuel. It was important for shipbuilding, infrastructure, and for heating and cooking needs of citizens. Wood was also an important source of revenue. State bureaucrats wanted to know how much money could be extracted from forests. The early modern state focused on the amount of board feet and cordwood that an area produced. It was not interested in the non-commercial aspects of the forest. So, faunal relationships with the forests and

23 Ibid., 112-116.
25 Scott, 14.
human uses of the non-timber trees, bushes, plants, and non-commercial parts of trees were not of interest to the state.\textsuperscript{26}

The science of forestry arose as a response to the increased consumption of wood combined with perceived impending timber famine, which was informed by the economic impacts of the Seven Year’s War (1756-1763). Forest officials looked to find more efficient ways to use wood. But, more importantly, they were concerned with how to expand the forest estate. In order to do so, they had to develop a systematic program with schools, books, and manuals to train people in the skills necessary to manage the forests.\textsuperscript{27}

The first task was to define the forest. It was a question of how to convert a complicated ecosystem into an object for calculation, quantification, and ultimately manipulation by state agents. This required a particular kind of gaze. In order to achieve control over the output of forests, foresters required a narrowing of vision where one focused on the produce itself rather than the overall system of the forest as a complex whole. This is evident in the kinds of language used to organize the forests. Valuable items were designated “crops,” “timber,” “game,” or “livestock” in comparison with non-valuable entities which were classified as “weeds,” “pests,” “trash,” or “predators.” These kinds of terms reflect human attitudes towards the environment and a view of the forests that was “abstract and partial.” The state is not that different from other people in terms of its view of nature. The state’s focus, however, is much more narrow and entails a shift from nature as habitat to economic resource. Further, Scott points out that the important

\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 11-13; Lowood, 318-319.
\textsuperscript{27} Scott, 11-13; Lowood, 318-319.
issue is that the state had the will and means to impose this narrow view upon the world. This entails a shift in thinking where ‘Nature’ becomes ‘natural resources.’

The state had developed various approaches to the management of forestry over time. Initially, forest practices were domainal, or “area-based management.” This method was based on an understanding of how long it would take for a forest to regenerate. Foresters would divide up the forest into the amount of same-sized plots equal to the number of years needed for the forest to reach maturity. Each year one plot would be cut. This worked for forests with short growth cycles; however, high quality timber took a long time to produce. Domainal forestry was limited because it could not provide an accurate measurement of the quantity and quality of the produce. Also, it was not responsive to changing conditions of supply and demand. Variations in terrain required foresters with the capacity to carefully measure the area. This required a standardized approach to measurement, which was not developed until the 1780s.

By the mid-eighteenth century, there were various efforts to more accurately evaluate the forest produce. Johann Gottlieb Beckmann sought to establish the average amount of trees of various species and sizes in an average area of forest in order to determine the average amount of wood mass per average unit of forest. He argued that foresters should focus on wood mass in order to allow for a standardization of the quantification and management of the forest. This involved a heavier reliance on mathematics. Despite resistance by some foresters to the use of math, gradually more techniques and calculations were developed that enabled more precise measurements of the forest. These efforts overcame the need for foresters to individually count and
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evaluate each tree. Another key idea here is that of the average forest, or Normalbaum. Nature has never been discrete; variations in the wood continued to confound foresters. But, foresters would ignore these variations and just assume an average forest.\textsuperscript{30}

The importance of these efforts at abstraction was that they facilitated the standardization of forestry information and more efficient bureaucratic management of the forests. The data generated from these more careful systems of measurement could be compiled into tables and charts, which enabled foresters to evaluate and manage the forests at a distance. Eventually, government agents were not even interested in the wood mass, but on the revenue produced from an average area. Again, this entailed a focus on an abstract concept, the economic value, rather than the actual trees. By the end of the eighteenth century, quantification was firmly entrenched in forestry.\textsuperscript{31}

There are three key aspects to German forestry: “minimum diversity,” “balance sheet,” and “sustained yield.” With “minimum diversity,” it was not about measuring actual wood, but about standardizing information. This enabled the forester to take basic measurements, projecting the overall monetary value of an area, and producing usable information more efficiently. The idea of “balance sheet” emphasized the relationships between forestry and the fiscal health of the state. This meant keeping control over trees and revenue generated. The goal of sustained yield was “always deliver the greatest possible constant volume of wood.”\textsuperscript{32} Taken together, these ideas of scientific forestry

\textsuperscript{30} Scott, 14-15; Lowood, 325-333.
\textsuperscript{31} Scott, 14-15; Lowood, 330-333.
\textsuperscript{32} Lowood, 338.
were based on the idea that careful planning and the application of scientific principles would achieve reliable results.\footnote{Scott, 15; Lowood, 333-339.}

In analyzing the history of forestry, McManus notes that German ideas about forestry were heavily influenced by the concepts of the Enlightenment and that they eventually developed into a system of applying rational science to the control of Nature.\footnote{Phil McManus, "Histories of Forestry: Ideas, Networks and Silences," Environment and History 5, no. (1999), 190-192.} While there are different theories about the motivations underlying the emergence of forestry as a science, the end result was that forestry was not about extracting or mining trees so much as it was about ‘farming’ them and shaping nature to meet the needs of the state. The initial belief was that wood was an “essential material.” Only later did wood become a commodity. These changes in human attitudes about wood were important to shaping later forest policy.

During the nineteenth century, the emphasis on cameral sciences was replaced by a focus on economic liberalism, though the importance of science remained. An outcome of this change was to reduce the complexity of nature and reshape it to suit the needs of the state. This involved imposing the idea of average forest, or the Normalbaum, onto Nature. In other words, nature was reshaped to suit the needs of the state. As both consumption and state demand increased, foresters in Germany advocated the planting of conifers, which were fast-growing. This was despite a cultural affinity for oak. This meant that the state extended control over more land and trees.\footnote{Scott, 15-22; Lowood, 340-341; Schama, 102.}

Rather than deal with the messiness and complexity of nature with all of the varieties of trees, plant life, and animals, foresters decided to create a human-made forest.
They did not see their work as ‘mining’ of nature, but rather as creating artificial reproductions of nature that could be ‘harvested.’ Foresters eliminated “trash” trees that otherwise appeared to be taking up valuable minerals and space which could otherwise be allocated to “timber” trees, or commercially valuable species, often in monoculture. Then, they imposed a rational grid on the earth by planting in uniform, even-age rows and columns that were efficiently spaced for maximum output. This arrangement also aided in eliminating barriers to maintenance.36

This new forest gave many great advantages. Uniformity made the forests much easier to manage, allowed for easier experimentation, and permitted standardization in the training of forest workers. The forests also became a “powerful aesthetic” that conveyed a sense of visual order. The plantations were likened to armies of trees under the command of the nation. These new forests offered forest managers geometrical order. Forest volume could be assessed simply by adding up the acreage. Scott writes that this new forest “did not even have to be seen; it could be “read” accurately from the tables and maps in the forester’s office.”37 By asserting control over these trees, the foresters were able to create a certainty and reliability to their management and extraction. The forest had become legible.38

But, there were many drawbacks to these forests. Peasants who depended on the natural, broadleaved forests for wood, pasturage, food, thatching, and other products were disenfranchised by the coniferous plantations. People resisted these abrogations in various ways: they continued to collect fuel and material, graze stock, and otherwise
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continue their relationships with the forests. Also, the uniform forests were vulnerable to massive windfalls, pests, and disease as well as a number of other threats, including human. Furthermore, monoculture destroys the natural nutrient cycle leading to decline in the quality of subsequent crop rotations.39

Germans continually came up with new techniques to overcome the problems of monoculture. They applied chemicals and manipulated tree species. Scientists would also introduce certain insects and animals that were deemed essential to a healthy forest in a process Scott40 describes as “restoration forestry” while at the same time adhering to the production of the forest as commodity. This amounts to a refusal to recognize diversity as key to the health of the forests. Tsouvalis makes an interesting point: though the output is a plain and uniform entity, the amount of work through trial and error that goes into the production of even-age monocultures is immense.41

The problems with the rationally managed forests led to a growing opposition to scientific forestry in Germany. By the end of the 19th century, there was a movement to recognize the forest as a complex system. Despite these changing attitudes, an emphasis on quantification remained, especially the idea of sustained yield.42

However, given the slow growth cycle of timber trees, about eighty years, these concerns did not surface immediately and the initial triumphs of these ideas soon made them very influential. It appeared that scientific forestry was an incredible asset of the state. News of its success spread and the German model was exported throughout the colonial world. Regardless of the problems, the success of the German practices

39 Scott, 19-21.
40 Ibid.
41 Tsouvalis, *A Critical Geography of Britain's State Forests*, 68.
42 Lowood, 342.
convinced people that careful management could produce reliable results. As a result, there were many efforts to make Nature increasingly simple and easier to run.\textsuperscript{43}

\textbf{5.2.4 ENGLAND AND SCIENTIFIC FORESTRY}

In contrast to the situation in Germany, the forests in England underwent changes at a much earlier point in time. By the mid-thirteenth century, the emphasis of the Royal Forests had begun to shift. The main symbol of the monarch went from deer to the oak. England pursued domestic economic development during the mid- to late sixteenth century under the Tudors, specifically Henry VIII, who sought to make his country self-reliant in iron production, and Elizabeth I, who oversaw a vast transformation of the economy and the development of a powerful Royal Navy. Oak was especially critical to the latter. Many monarchs disafforested areas, which meant ending their restricted status, in order to cut or sell trees.\textsuperscript{44}

While these changes secured England’s technological advancement, and arguably its place at the forefront of the Industrial Revolution, there was a high price in terms of trees and woodlands. The production of glass, salt, dyes, iron, copper, ships, and munitions all relied heavily on wood. The manufacture of these goods set off an increasingly expanding economy that sought to consume more and more wood. As a result, the Elizabethan era is noted for “more destruction and waste of woodlands than in any other preceding period.”\textsuperscript{45} This led to a rapid increase in the price of wood, which placed inordinate burden on the commoners, who continued to rely on wood fuel for

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 341-342; Scott, 19.
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cooking and heat. For example, the price of wood increased 400 percent from the 1550s to 1580, while the price of wheat only increased by 80 percent. This scarcity also affected the Royal Navy, which expressed concern that the wood consumption of the various industries would put the production of ships at risk. Elizabeth I made an effort to protect the navy’s supplies while also encouraging industry.\textsuperscript{46}

The changes in domestic production also affected social relations, specifically an end to manorial systems and the beginnings of a market-based economy. As wood became indispensible to various processing industries, vast forests and tree-scapes fell under the ax. Competition and increasing scarcity drove up the price of wood. The manorial system had been based on self-sufficiency and resources were managed for long-term use by tenants and lord. But, with prices high, landlords often preferred to sell the trees to outsiders for a profit. The tenants did what they could to secure wood to consume or to sell. Deforested areas were typically converted for agricultural production. Meanwhile, the forests quickly declined. The Elizabethan era is noted for being one of unprecedented deforestation.\textsuperscript{47}

These changes were not without their conflicts. As wood and forests became highly valued commodities, they were more intensely contested, which altered their social value. As privileged classes sought to exploit these areas and commoners resisted the abrogation of their customary rights, the forests became sites for ideas of social justice and social order. Manufacturers needed it to produce their goods. Landowners exploited it for monetary gain (either to fuel their own industries or to sell to producers); rulers needed it for financial reasons as well as to supply their navies. The meaning of

\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., 164-188.
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forests had shifted from places of subsistence, pleasure, and power to primarily being the location of a scarce resource. Place was critical in shaping local outcomes as economic, political, social, and cultural interests collided. These competing claims and meanings have continued to inform cultural understandings of trees and forests in such divergent ways as a place of safe haven for outlaws, the representation of the strength and longevity of the state, forests as places of idyll, of authenticity, and as other.⁴⁸

As wood became increasingly more valuable and the forests become more important to the state’s needs, there were various efforts to manage the wood supply. These early efforts tended to be haphazard. The year 1543 marked the first time a law was passed to protect trees. This legislation required that twelve trees were planted for every one cut down and established minimum sizes for harvesting. Another avenue was to limit cutting by establishing legal protections over woods. Despite earlier efforts, however, Parliament would not support laws to protect local town and village wood supplies until 1581. High costs and scarcity encouraged conservation measures as well as efforts to find a replacement, which was eventually found in coal. Unfortunately, the impurities in coal prevented it from being used by all industries. Efforts to encourage replanting were also stymied. Even though wood was valuable, few people replanted cleared forests as profits could also be made through agricultural rents. In both England and Germany, conversion of deforested lands to agricultural uses often triumphed over

reforestation efforts. The other problem was that most of these were piecemeal endeavors and they were met with a great deal of resistance.\textsuperscript{49}

The lack of wood had wider impacts on the populace. Many commoners were forced to burn straw, weeds, and dung for heat instead of using them for fertilizer, which caused declining crop yields. The loss of woods also meant a loss of grazing habitat for pigs, which meant that people diverted grain from their tables to feed their livestock. Both of these changes created famine. While the Stuart monarchy supported efforts to protect the forests, a lack of money, conflict between the monarchy and Parliament, and the continued expansion of industrial production all served to accelerate deforestation in England as well as extend it to Ireland.\textsuperscript{50}

Judith Tsouvalis observes that while the development of scientific forestry has largely been attributed to the Germans who introduced it to the British through forest service practices in India during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Britain did have its own forms of scientific forestry as early as the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{51} She notes that these early practices were based “patriotism, notions of ‘improvement’, and certain aesthetic and cultural ideals”\textsuperscript{52} and were partly a reaction against the timber shortages of the seventeenth century. These efforts at large-scale plantings were executed by local landowners or monasteries, often at the encouragement of central authority, until the early nineteenth century when the State began to undertake its own systematic plantings (with German influences), though these involved their own conflicts and problems.

\textsuperscript{49} Tsouvalis, \textit{A Critical Geography of Britain's State Forests}, 14; Perlin, 183-189.  
\textsuperscript{50} Perlin, 191-213.  
\textsuperscript{51} Tsouvalis, "State management and 'scientific forestry'," 87-89.  
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., 87.
Private landholders had been involved in tree planting for several centuries. Experimentation with exotic trees was particularly important from the sixteenth century onwards. Private afforestation became popular among the aristocracy during the eighteenth century. There were a variety of motivations that included commercial benefits, patriotism, as well as an inherent belief in the benefits of planting. This trend in planting was also closely linked with the Picturesque and Romantic movements and associated attitudes towards nature. In addition, it was linked to the eighteenth century spread of ideas from Scottish-trained surgeons, especially those from the British East India Company, who argued that there was a causal link between deforestation and climate change.\[^{53}\]

The private planted forests had a particular structure and composition. This involved a specific vision of tree-scapes, which were primarily based on broad-leaved trees. In contrast to other forms of wood management, with an emphasis on multiple consumer uses, the trees on aristocratic estates were allowed to reach their full height. This limited the undergrowth around the trees and restricted the kinds of uses for the area. These plantations were a combination of hardwood and softwood trees. There was, however, a widespread resistance to the foreign conifer, which was seen as a symbol of social change. Thus, these managed forests were meant to convey certain social values.\[^{54}\]

Meanwhile, the central government struggled over the idea of forest management. The year 1660 marked the change in popular support that was so necessary to passing forest management laws. Upon the request of the navy, the Royal Society commissioned John Evelyn to conduct a survey on the state of the nation’s forests. He published the

\[^{54}\] Ibid., 17-25.
results in 1662 in a work entitled *Sylva*.\(^{55}\) In it, he argued for extensive reforestation, and included detailed information on what kinds of trees should be planted, their uses, and how best to approach the work. At this point, the word afforestation changed from a legal designation to mean the planting of trees. By 1667 the vast majority of the country was united behind the reforestation idea. Yet continued changes in industrial technologies and diminishing wood stocks led to yet another shift in public attitude, and one that confounded forest management efforts. This had serious ramifications for the navy. Finally, in 1808, the government created an official policy to plant 100,000 acres of oak. However, the long growth cycle was a significant barrier. The mid-nineteenth century development of iron as a replacement for oak eliminated the need for the slow-growing hardwood. Increasingly, softwood trees were planted instead of hardwoods.\(^{56}\)

By the late nineteenth century, there were calls in Britain for formalized and standardized forestry education. However, forestry efforts in the colonies were also important to the overall development of forestry in the metropole. The appointment of Germans to prominent British forestry posts in South Asia was one of the main means by which German forestry ideas were spread to Britain. Interestingly, a few of the Scottish surgeons working in South Asia were influenced by indigenous forestry techniques rather than German ones. In addition to employing Germans in India, two German foresters were integral to the establishment of forestry schools in Britain. Despite the influence of German forestry, there was controversy over which particular approach to forest management would be employed. Proponents of French forestry preferred the more
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complex forests that appeared more natural while German advocates argued for the utilitarian value of the regular and even-age conifer forests.\textsuperscript{57}

Changes to the political economy of Britain during the shift from feudalism to capitalism altered the context in which forests were managed. The power of the landed aristocracy declined during the mid-nineteenth century. Financial hardship forced many landowners to sell private forests and there was a reduction in the number of Royal Forests. This change is extremely important because economics become central to forestry management. With the rise of capitalism, trees were commoditized and forest management went from private estate forests to large-scale commercial ones. The emphasis on the economic value of forests lent more force to the argument for the German scientific forestry approach. The German model was based on a belief that a strong, central government must assume control over forestry rather than allow individuals to develop their own methods. Proponents also argued for a long-term approach to forestry management.\textsuperscript{58}

Geopolitics also altered public attitudes to the forests. During WWI, shortages of wood created widespread support not only for increases in wood production, but also for state intervention in private forests. Key concerns regarding forest management included: the creation of a “strategic reserve of timber” to meet national needs and reduce state reliance on imports; the creation of jobs in rural areas; and forests as a driver of overall economy. With these emphases added onto the economic concerns, the cultivation of forests for other uses became less important.\textsuperscript{59}
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As a result of these various changes, the state was able to assume widespread control over the production of forests. The establishment of large timber reserves required the creation of a new governmental agency. The Forest Commission (FC) was created when the Forestry Act of 1919 was passed. Under the FC, the German scientific forestry ideas were implemented; however, these methods were adopted uncritically. Tsouvalis\textsuperscript{60} and Lowood\textsuperscript{61} note that as the German ideas were gaining currency abroad, the problems with the rationally managed forests were becoming apparent and led to increasing opposition to scientific forestry within Germany. This led a modified approach which sought to balance the view of a forest as a complex system against the economic reductionism of monoculture. The British, however, did not deviate from the pure monoculture approach.

The new state-driven forestry involved many changes to the management of trees. Under the FC, the meaning of the forests and forestlands had changed. The push for a quick return on investments gave more force to the displacement of mixed woods, which were considered an outmoded and wasteful management system. Areas that were occupied by old, broad-leaved woodlands were reclassified as ‘waste’ and ‘unproductive.’ As a result, woodlands produced through the old forestry methods were often cleared to make room for the new plantations. These places were to be made productive by establishing a plantation forest on them. While before the term forest conveyed an area outside of the realm of civilization, through scientific forestry it has
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been reconfigured to describe an area of waste that has been brought into productive use.\textsuperscript{62}

The structure of the forests was also markedly different. Agriculture and forestry were in direct conflict for prime arable land. Priority went to agriculture with the result that the FC frequently had to contend with poor quality soils and environments. This meant a reliance on fast-growing, exotic conifers, which were capable of growing under such conditions. This entailed a shift away from the mixture of hardwoods and softwoods. The outcome was that over eighty percent of plantation forests in post-war Britain were foreign conifers. Tsouvalis makes an interesting point: though the output is a plain and uniform entity, the amount of work through trial and error that goes into the production of even-age monocultures is immense.\textsuperscript{63}

In various ways, the practice of forestry continued to be political. As before, forestry management was closely wrapped up in the exertion of power over people and was influenced by ideas of social stratification. Tsouvalis notes that it was used as a means to reinforce control over India’s populace as well as lower classes in England.\textsuperscript{64} One of the ways in which this occurred was through forest workers’ housing in England, where “class distinctions soon came to be inscribed in space.”\textsuperscript{65}

\textbf{5.2.5 MEANING OF SCIENTIFIC FORESTRY}

There are several important outcomes of these changes in forestry practices in both Germany and Britain. Power relations continue to inform the practice of forestry.

\begin{itemize}
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The state viewed the management of forests as essential to its own fiscal security. By extending its authority over woods and forests, the state enabled its agents to develop standardized methods of management. The rise of capitalism entailed a shift in relationships between people and trees in which agents of the state sought to narrow their view of the forests.

Through abstraction, trees were taken out of their socio-environmental contexts and treated as resources. Eventually, even the idea of trees as units of wood mass was insufficient and foresters sought to produce economic values. Thus, mathematics and economics became a basic aspect of forest management. Under economic liberalism, a continued reliance on science and an increased emphasis on the trees as commodities led to the imposition of the forest ideal, the Normalbaum, onto the diversity of nature.

It took several years for the problems of monoculture to become apparent in Germany. The German public eventually reacted against the uniform plantations, and this led to a modified approach to forestry with a greater effort to balance nature against science. These adjustments, however, were not incorporated into British practices. Instead, the unmodified German model became firmly entrenched in FC policy.

Tsouvalis notes that through scientific forestry state employees are converting a rural practice into a highly efficient modern system and thus “industrial.” These changes in forestry management are not just predicated on the rise of the strong centralized, modern government, instead they are part and parcel of the modern government in that they are a part of a new way of managing a country. This was part of a broader way of viewing the world.
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News of the success of scientific forestry spread and “by the end of the nineteenth century, German forestry science was hegemonic.” It was quite influential in Britain. The rise of Britain’s state-run forestry and the need to develop its own strategic reserves was communicated to its colonial empire. Poole notes that these wartime shortages and concerns over wood supplies spread throughout the British Empire and had an influence on New Zealand’s forest management policies. Thus, the characteristics of Britain’s forest policies came to influence New Zealand. As scientific forestry spread over the globe, it carried with it certain ways of understanding the world.

Many scholars have studied the ways in which forestry management practices have been implemented around the world. But, several seek to develop alternative critical readings of forest histories. Rather than celebrating ‘great men’ and focusing on the accomplishments of forestry in terms of production for the state or industry, they seek to uncover the origins of forest ideas, the meanings behind forest management, and the ways in which forestry ideas are adapted to new situations. The next section addresses some of the ways in which scientific forestry traveled across the globe and meaning of these movements.

5.2.6 TREES AND EMPIRE

The spread of forestry ideas was not a simple process of sharing notes and policy. The colonial metropoles and frontiers were stitched together in a variety of complex interconnections where the actual exchange of ideas and then their practical applications
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varied widely. Phil McManus\textsuperscript{70} and Anna Lowenhaupt Tsing\textsuperscript{71} each have developed important ideas on the concept of network and movements of ideas. McManus traces the influence of German scientific forestry ideas on forest regimes throughout the colonized world, arguing that these concepts were translated (adapted), rather than transmitted. In so doing, he is able to chart how constructions of nature change as well as to show the ways that forestry ideas moved between Germany, France, England, Scotland, India, Burma, the United States, Canada, and Australia. He emphasizes that each of these places features unique forest histories. While these ideas also influenced New Zealand and South Africa, McManus is interested in comparing British Columbia and New South Wales.

McManus uses a variation of Actant Network Theory (ANT), which has been developed by Bruno Latour, John Law, and Michel Callon.\textsuperscript{72} ANT seeks to disrupt anthropocentric studies by drawing attention to the ways in which a particular phenomenon is connected through space and time as opposed to confined to a particular locale. Rather than a structural explanation, ANT focuses on the relationships between different actants. An actant can be composed of multiple individuals. ANT is also dynamic; it looks at how power is deployed through the network of relationships and is developed through connections between actants. This draws attention to the dynamic qualities of history, showing it as a process that unfolds. By focusing on such relationships, ANT allows the researcher to move beyond a specific place.

\textsuperscript{70} McManus.
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McManus, however, notes some limitations of ANT. While it could draw attention to non-humans, few scholars have sought to do so. He acknowledges that his interests are in forest administration and so does not move beyond the anthropocentric in this particular paper. He is also dissatisfied with the way that ANT relies on the actants to lead the way to different events and points of significance. Instead, McManus employs a modified ANT approach. He recognizes that people who study a phenomena, in this case forest histories, are making subjective decisions about what to address and why. This allows him to move beyond the constraints of the actants’ vision of forestry.

A modified ANT focuses on “power, modesty and the translation, rather than transmission, of ideas.” This is important, for the adoption of forestry ideas in Australia, or for my purposes, New Zealand, is not a wholesale replication of forestry practices from the origin country, but an ongoing negotiation of ideas as meditated by the trees, technologies, people, events, and the places themselves. Using a Modified Actant Network Theory, McManus draws attention to the dynamism of forestry histories and the networks of people, materials, events, and texts that make it possible to ideas to be translated from Germany to India, North America, and Australia where “specific social, economic, political, cultural, and ecological conditions” affect how forestry ideas are implemented in each locale. In other words, factors such as cultural perceptions of forests and land, levels of consumer demand, environmental conditions, types of industry, political appointment of foresters, and population pressure affected the ways in which each place used European forestry concepts.
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McManus traces the impact of several key figures in forest history; however, he is not just interested in the prominent people, but in the relationships and networks which created the opportunities for these forestry appointments in the first place and which enabled the movement of ideas across time and space. He focuses on Sir Dietrich Brandis, who was a German forester employed by the British Forestry Department in Burma and then in India. Brandis, among others, was instrumental for incorporating German techniques and ideas into British systems of practice. But, the networks in which Brandis was enmeshed are critical. In addition to the family connections and odd events that led Brandis to his position, there are also the professional connections, training schools, conferences, correspondence, institutions, and interactions which made it possible for German principles to first spread to England, America, and the rest of the world. Furthermore, those networks sustained the development and change over those ideas over time. These connections are a part of the overall system through which German and British ideas were eventually incorporated into New Zealand practices.

Tsing’s metaphor of “friction” is again useful here for analyzing the interactions of people, plants, animals, and ideas in place over time. Tsing’s writings resonate with the ideas of McManus. She also writes that when ideas are exchanged, the local exerts its own influence; it is not a case where colonial ideas are simply imposed onto a blank canvas. Similar to McManus, Tsing de-centers the human perspective by focusing on the network and she emphasizes the connections between different entities. Also, she seeks to move beyond a single place to show how such interactions and linkages exist across space, as well as time. Tsing argues that studying a phenomenon and how it is connected

---
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through networks across space and time, as well as how it evolves, can be a study in globalization. The metaphor of “friction” is helpful in that it draws attention to the ways in which the linkages between entities, or actants, is negotiated, and thus the outcome of such connections may vary.

I derive several important concepts from McManus and Tsing. First, the spread of forest management ideas involves the belief in the power of the rational mind over the world. Second, the interactions involved in the extension of forest management are closely bound up in the politics of power. The rise of forest management involved a reconfiguration of relationships between the state, plants, and people. Many different actants influence the outcome. McManus notes that it is important to broaden the scope of study beyond the perspective of the actants themselves. Finally, it is important to recognize that the movement of ideas from one place to another is not about transmitting those ideas, but rather it involves “translation,” where ideas are adapted to new situation and there are various aspects of resistance or “friction,” either by nature, by plants, by local people, or by demands of the state.

As both McManus and Tsing argue, the unique contributions of place must not be underestimated. This is particularly significant when considering the limits and opportunities that are specific to the New Zealand context. As I will show, forestry policy is a product of the combination of many factors. Among other things, these include: the regeneration demands of native tree species and ecosystems, the legacy of colonialism on native land tenure, the primacy of agriculture over forestry, the need to develop employment, and so forth.
The new colony did not exist in a vacuum. There are a variety of ways in which New Zealand's relationships to global circuits of commerce and science affected the developments of forestry. Distant events and military practices influenced New Zealand in terms of early European exploration, trade, and settlement. British interest in spars and masts and worldwide demand for wood influenced New Zealand’s forest practices as did later local demand for agricultural land.

The young colony was closely tied into networks of forestry information. When planting trees for shelter belts or aesthetic reasons, people used exotic seeds from metropoles and other colonies. This was crucial to the development of forestry management plans as the successful exotic species were easy to establish and matured within decades. While California *Pinus radiata* was not considered valuable at the end of the nineteenth century, it soon became the basis of the SFS afforestation program and was closely tied to the development of New Zealand’s timber and wood products industries.

Other key players in New Zealand’s developing forestry management reflected the international nature of the system. When promoting what became Forest Act 1874, Julius Vogel supported his legislation with a report by Captain Campbell Walker, who was then Deputy Conservator of Forests, Madras, which addressed forestry management in other countries. In 1876 Walker himself was invited to become the first Conservator of Forests and to review the State’s assets, though he was considered unpopular and left after a year. In 1879, retired French forester, A. Lecoy, advocated that New Zealand’s forests should be managed for the benefit of state revenue. Sir David Hutchins who had worked for the British Colonial Service as a forester was hired to promote the virtues of
forestry in 1916. Leon McIntosh Ellis, the first Director of Forestry for the newly formed SFS was trained in Canada.\(^79\)

The development of the pulp and paper industry relied on international connections. Both private and state interests were dependent on foreign laboratories to test the paper qualities of indigenous and locally grown exotics. Adamson was an English consultant on pulp and paper industry who visited in 1925. His ideas were instrumental to the formation of state processing plans. U.S. consultants were retained to assist in the design of the manufacturing plant and much of the equipment had been fabricated abroad based on foreign technological innovations. Entrican, who was a long-time SFS employee and the Director of Forestry in the 1940s and 1950s, also spent a great deal of time traveling: to Australia and the U.S. to investigate options for the paper industry and to Scandinavia to look at sawmilling technology. Scandinavian technology was used in various mills, including Waipa, which was established in 1941.\(^80\)

New Zealand forestry reflects the interaction between colonial systems of knowledge and local factors. As mentioned above, several foresters, including Ellis, promoted classic scientific forestry. The unique conditions of New Zealand, however, both in terms of social values and native forest characteristics led to a significant departure from established forest practices.

5.3 CONCLUSION

As the modern state emerged it required new relationships with territory, nature, and people. The latter were reconfigured into resources that could be drawn upon for

\(^79\) Poole, 7-8, 11.
revenue, material, and conscription. These new relationships required new technologies to support them such as new land tenure systems, inventories, censuses, surveying, and mapping. This had an impact on woodlands and forests, which became important sources of material and revenue. Through these changes, the state circumscribed historic rights to wooded places in order to guarantee state uses. These new relationships between state and forests are important as they have been exported around the world as part of an idealized package of forest management practices.

This chapter has addressed the origins of scientific forestry practices and their overall relationships to the exercise of the functions of the modern state. The export of these technologies and ideas is a part of the globalizing projects associated with empire and the spread of capitalism. As Tsing and McManus note, however, projects are not merely imposed on places or the local. The next chapter will discuss different aspects of the New Zealand context that shaped the implementation of scientific forestry, thus leading to unique formations of people, trees, and practices in place. It will also discuss why and how *Pinus radiata* became the dominant species of industrial forestry.
CHAPTER 6. THE NEW ZEALAND EXPERIENCE

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Forest management worldwide ranges from local exercise of usufruct rights to the imposition of hierarchical state authority over forest areas. The preceding chapter examined the changing relationships between people and forests historically and drew attention to the modern state and its management of woodlands and forests. These new uses involved separating local peoples from their resources and making timber and forest lands available for national use. The management of forests is part of a broader approach to governance that can be described as spatializing strategies.

This chapter examines the introduction of large-scale forestry to New Zealand. Before contact with Europeans, Māori lives were closely connected with forests. As discussed in Chapter One, this involved cultural and spiritual connections in which trees were viewed as relatives. As noted previously, Māori now own about thirteen percent of all land covered in exotic forests, though prior to the Treelords deal this number was closer to one percent. In addition to owning forests or leasing forest lands, Māori relate to the industry in a variety of ways, such as management and labor. This chapter charts the changes in uses of forests in New Zealand, government policies, and the ways in which Māori relate to trees and forests.

Plantation forests involve bringing humans and non-humans together in new relationships which Tsouvalis describes as “meaningful, composite formations.”\(^1\) In order to understand how the modern industrial forests of New Zealand emerged as unique formations, this chapter looks at what the creation of forestry has entailed as well as the
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different developments and conditions that are a part of that country’s own forestry histories. Following the arguments of Judith Tsouvalis\(^2\) and James Scott,\(^3\) I contend that New Zealand’s forestry, in terms of practices, technologies, epistemologies, and relationships to wider society, can be characterized as scientific forestry that has its roots in eighteenth and nineteenth century Britain as well as nineteenth century Germany and the birth of modern statecraft. Employing the ideas of Jones and Cloke, as well as those of McManus and Tsing, I also note the particularities of New Zealand’s situation. Its place characteristics have considerable influence on the actual trajectories of forestry and are critical for establishing how modern understandings and meanings of forests have come about. In the case of New Zealand, colonial relationships with forests continue to inform modern scientific forestry practices, but are modified by place. Before discussing the practice of forestry, it is important to theoretically foreground trees and their relationships to people.

6.2 POLICY AND FOREST MANAGEMENT

The use of wood was so widespread in New Zealand society that steps were taken to protect wood and forests for public use. There was recognition of the dangers of unregulated deforestation in the mid-1800s, but structural limitations, such as licensing practices and a lack of harvesting infrastructure, cultural attitudes, and a lack of widespread public support made it difficult to change popular practice. The utilitarian attitudes to nature, as described above, were deeply entrenched. Even once forestry


management was incorporated, there were problems. Policy tended to be piecemeal and was more heavily focused on afforestation rather than careful management of existing forests. Furthermore, the actual management of forests was under the jurisdiction of the Department of Lands and Survey, whose purpose was to promote the settlement of people on land and therefore created a basic conflict of interest.4

During the nineteenth century, the government was primarily interested in clearing land. As a result, timber licenses were cheap. When Julius Vogel served as Treasurer, he attempted to raise timber license fees. But the goal was not to restrict cutting as much as to generate more state revenue to finance the construction of a transportation system. Even people who were experienced in forest management were unwilling to press for change. For example, Campbell-Walker served as Conservator of the Forests. As early as 1877, he recognized the waste generated in logging and processing, but felt that people would become more efficient as supplies became more limited.5

Most were still opposed to restrictions on forestry. People had a ‘use it or lose it’ attitude. Some people said that it was too difficult to preserve forests in that they were prone to burning. Millers argued that settlers’ fires posed a threat to merchantable timber, so the forests should be harvested before they burned. Many of those who felt that the forests should be saved argued that it could not be done and objected to limitations on cutting. In 1896, Prime Minister Seddon expressed concerned over the wasteful

---

5 Fleet, 82, 90.
conversion of forests, but he defended the necessity of those same practices for the development of New Zealand’s nascent economy.⁶

Through the latter half of the century many people began to acknowledge that forests were not limitless and spoke out in favor of conservation, but they were not able to influence wider public opinion. Some, including Dr. von Hochstetter, T.H. Potts, Anthony Trollope, and Charles O’Neill, expressed fear that kauri would become extinct. Others, such as Dr. Leonard Cockayne and C.E. Douglas, were more worried about the overall loss of habitat. Most people, however, were focused on the economic dimensions of the forest clearances. Advocates like Sir James Hector and George Perrin, who was Conservator of Forests in Victoria, Australia, argued against the loss of natural resources. As early at the 1840s, the British government was worried about its ability to rely on New Zealand’s supplies. There were also people like A. Lecoy, a retired French forester, and G.W. Williams, who drew attention to the connections between deforestation, erosion, flooding, and damage to agriculture. Frederick Peppercorne, an engineer, discussed the impact of deforestation on climate change and precipitation patterns.⁷

Support of forest management waxed and waned. During upswings in public support for regulation, various pieces of legislation, including Forest Acts 1874, 1885, and 1908, were passed. The early efforts tended to be piecemeal rather than comprehensive. In 1871 the Forest Tree Planting Encouragement Bill was passed to foster private afforestation of exotic trees. The 1874 Act provided for the creation of State Forests. In 1876, Captain Inches Campbell-Walker, was brought in from Madras to evaluate New Zealand’s forests. He advocated for the creation of a national agency to
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oversee cutting and the distribution of licenses, an afforestation system, and the designation of reserves. There was insufficient public support, however, and the recommendations and the legislation was quickly shelved. Reserving land and afforestation were the only popular forest conservation practices.\textsuperscript{8}

The reservation of land was closely tied with the scenic preservation movement. Many of the preserves were located in the uplands. Not only were they less economically viable as farmland, but their preservation would prevent erosion in sensitive headwaters. The 1877 Land Act set aside 200,000 hectares. In 1881, the summit of Mt. Egmont was reserved. In 1900, that area was expanded to 33,000 hectares and Egmont was gazetted as a national park. In 1894, Tongariro National Park was created, eventually comprising 66,000 hectares. The Land Act 1892 gave the Lands and Survey Department the power to reserve forests for scenic value or “the preservation of native fauna.” The 1903 Scenery Preservation Act gave the agency the power to buy private land for reservation. Several reserves were created in the South Island.\textsuperscript{9}

In 1885, public support of forestry was again on the rise and the 1885 State Forests Act was passed. This endorsed the creation of an agency within the Lands Department to take charge of the management of forestry and agriculture. The Act also provided for the creation of forestry training schools and several State Forests. Professor Thomas Kirk was designated Chief Conservator of Forests, but within two years the onset of the Depression resulted in the closure of the agency.\textsuperscript{10}

\textsuperscript{8} Fleet, 96-97; Poole, 16; Wynn, 112-113.
\textsuperscript{9} Fleet, 97-101; Wynn, 113.
\textsuperscript{10} Fleet, 101; Wynn.
In the 1890s, the Liberal Party was in power and supported forestry management. In 1892, the government created the office of the Commissioner of Forests; however, it was still a part of the Lands Department, whose primary mission was to settle people on land. The Seddon government convened the Timber Conference in 1896 to figure out how to manage the timber industry. George Perrin, the Conservator of Forests in Victoria, was asked to evaluate New Zealand’s forest situation and give his recommendations. He advocated for immediate improvements to fire protection systems and argued that the government must control licenses on standing timber. In 1897 the State Forest department was created, but, its primarily role was afforestation and it was still a part of the Lands Department. Moreover, much of the land that had been set aside as state forests were reallocated for settlement. Over 20,000 acres (8000 hectares) were cleared in 1897.11

The government continued to struggle with the issue of forestry. In 1913, a Royal Commission was charged with reviewing the state of forests. The commission was headed by Dr. Leonard Cockayne. It recommended reorganizing forestry into a single systems. Up to that point, the different aspects of forestry were divided among various governmental agencies and departments. The report also recommend more planting. However, one of the most significant impacts of the report was its revised estimate of remaining timber stocks. Earlier in 1905, research had estimated that the forests would last seventy years at existing rates of cutting. However, the 1913 commission concluded that the forests would be exhausted within thirty years. Aside from timber production, there were additional longstanding concerns regarding deforestation. These included flora

11 Fleet, 101-112; Wynn, 114.
and fauna protection, scenery preservation, and soil and water conservation, especially as the latter were affected by clearances on steep headwaters. However, the primary concern for the state was timber. Then, shortly thereafter, World War I made itself felt on timber production; this time it was a labor shortage that led to low timber output. These shortages added to general concerns about future scarcity and finally created sufficient public support for systematic forest management.¹²

Poole argues that it was the experiences of Britain and New Zealand during WWI that cemented the belief that forests needed management.¹³ Poor national forest assets and limited external supply during the war led Britain to realize that it needed to implement long-term forestry policies, that resulted in widespread planting programs. These attitudes spread throughout Britain’s empire and had particular resonance in New Zealand, which had faced its own shortages. This, combined with the 1913 estimates of thirty-year limits on total wood supply, led to widespread concerns within New Zealand of imminent timber famine. The New Zealand state began to take action. Restrictions were placed on export of timber, market prices, and imports to protect local industry against American products. The second step was to promote more afforestation. Yet, the lack of a dedicated agency still prevented comprehensive management.

Significant changes in the organization and powers of state forestry were needed. In 1917, the New Zealand government agreed to establish a new department of forestry that was separate from the Department of Lands and Survey. Sir Francis Bell was named as the new Commissioner of State Forests. Bell’s approach emphasized sustained yield of


¹³ Poole, 13-16.
native forest with some afforestation, an end to native exports, expansion of state forest holdings and of protection forests. The government hired a Canadian-trained forester, Leon McIntosh Ellis, to serve as the Director of Forestry. Another significant change was the Forests Act 1921-2, which granted sufficient authority to pursue management. State agencies were reorganized to vest responsibility for the forests in a newly created State Forest Service (SFS). Key to this was the unification of afforestation, indigenous timber harvesting, and management of reserves which until then had been separate entities under the Lands Department.14

Ellis recommended and implemented a series of measures, many of which shaped the long-term policy and structure of state forestry. In 1919, there were 306,888 acres set aside for scenic reserves and 1,654,214 acres set aside for state forests. By 1925 Ellis had overseen the expansion of permanent state forests to two million acres with a further five million acres of provisional state forests. In addition, he increased plantations (see below). Regulations were imposed on the cutting of timber on Crown lands and licensing was improved so that the state earned more money, though harvesting on private lands were largely left alone. Fire protection systems were also revamped. In addition, Ellis encouraged private afforestation. One of Ellis’ most important moves was to initiate New Zealand’s first professional assessment of its forest resources, the National Forest Inventory, which was critical to his development of sustained-yield production.15

Following the established practices of scientific forests, the basis of Ellis’ initial policy was the rational management of natural forests. He gave a low priority to exotic

14 Fleet, 111-113; Poole, 5, 14-17; Roche, 185-187.
afforestation. Other forestry experts supported this approach. As mentioned above, the Commissioner of State Forests, Sir Francis Bell, also emphasized sustained yield, as did Campbell-Walker, A. Lecoy, Prof. Thomas Kirk, and Sir David Hutchins, formerly of the Indian Forest Service, who had been employed to conduct a forest inventory of New Zealand in 1916.16

But, several factors specific to New Zealand combined to work against the international paradigm of forestry. Classic scientific forestry practice for sustained-yield was dependent on certain social and economic factors. However, the realities of New Zealand’s situation created a number of obstacles for Ellis as well as later foresters who proposed sustained yield. Not only did indigenous timber production lack stable demand and protection from imports, but also it competed with agriculture, afforestation, and scenic preservation interests for desirable land. For example, Ellis’ attempt to implement his policy at Waipoua, which was one of the few remaining kauri forests, was later defeated by preservation interests. Roche points out that the controversy over the fate of this particular forest included the participation of expert scientists on both sides of the debate which highlighted the political nature of science in New Zealand.17

Another major problem that frustrated natural forest management was the nature of indigenous regeneration was still largely not understood. As previously mentioned, podocarps were one of the dominant tree species of New Zealand. While certain podocarps grew in poor soils, they required high quality soils at the beginning of their life cycles, which brought them into direct competition with agriculture. Also, they generally

took a long time to grow, some required several hundred years to reach maturity. By comparison, exotic trees grew well on marginal soils and reached maturity in a few decades. From another perspective, the native forests of New Zealand were quite different from those of Europe and North America which tended to be dominated by a few tree species, were open, and had minimal undergrowth. By contrast, New Zealand forests had no natural browsing animals and therefore developed into complex, multi-story, closed canopy forests with dense lower stories and a tangle of vines throughout. This made it particularly difficult for the forests to be maintained for long-term exploitation, especially when compared to those in the Northern Hemisphere. From an economic standpoint that included the demand for timber and the agricultural potential of converted pastures, management of indigenous forests did not compete well with afforestation. Logging practices tended to be wasteful and frequently damaged remaining trees. Fires were also frequent on cutover land, thus inhibiting regeneration.\footnote{Fleet, 111-113; Poole, 30-31, 53-56; Roche, \textit{History of Forestry}, 188-196; Roche, "The State as Conservationist, 1920-60: 'Wise Use' of Forests, Lands, and Water," 187-191.}

In addition there were social reasons behind the rejection of classic scientific forestry. First, local experience was valued over outside expertise. Secondly, New Zealand was a young country and nature was seen as the basic building block for developing an economy and advancing the peoples’ interests. Though people witnessed first hand the degradation and impacts of land conversion, they viewed it as progress not destruction.\footnote{Poole, 30-31, 53-56; Roche, "The State as Conservationist, 1920-60: 'Wise Use' of Forests, Lands, and Water," 187-191; Wynn, 115-116.}

The problems with sustained-yield management as well as future increases in demand led to a major change in strategy. In 1925 Ellis abandoned sustained yield in
favor of exotic afforestation as the core of SFS forestry. At that point, the state had over 13,000 acres of exotic plantations. His new policy called for the expansion of the plantings to 300,000 acres by 1934.\textsuperscript{20}

\textbf{6.2.1 AFFORESTATION}

Which particular species should be planted had already been largely determined by earlier afforestation practices in the mid-nineteenth century. Even at that early stage, many people began to suspect that the rapid pace of deforestation in New Zealand would soon result in timber famine. These practices had again developed in the context of wider colonial events. The initiation of New Zealand’s settlement phase occurred during the great botanical craze of the colonial world, which greatly facilitated the exchange of seeds and seedlings. These trees included European, North American, and Australian species. State plantation experiments included: \textit{P. ponderosa}, \textit{P. murayana}, Douglas fir, \textit{Cupressus lawsoniana}, \textit{Sequoia sempervirens}, and \textit{Eucalyptus obliqua}. These experiments also included \textit{Pinus insignis}, also known as \textit{Pinus radiata}.\textsuperscript{21}

At the 1896 Timber Conference, thirty-seven different exotic species were identified for New Zealand planting. Even though it had been introduced to New Zealand in the 1860s, \textit{Pinus radiata} was not among them. Initially, therefore, it is not surprising that initial afforestation by the Lands Department in the 1890s placed a low premium on


\textsuperscript{21} Fleet, 96, 108; Poole, 37-38, 56-61; Roche, \textit{History of Forestry}, 196-210; Roche, "The State as Conservationist, 1920-60: 'Wise Use' of Forests, Lands, and Water," 186.
radiata. By the time, however, the State Forest Service was created the recognition of its ease of growth and value as timber made *radiata* one of the top choices for plantings.²²

California *Pinus radiata*’s success in New Zealand has to do with its various attributes. Recall that native tree regeneration was complex, lengthy, and not well understood. Although exotic trees grew more quickly, many of them still took a hundred years or more to grow. Radiata grew much more rapidly than most other Northern Hemisphere trees under similar conditions; it reached maturity in thirty years. In fact, outside of the open windy plains of the South Island, radiata thrived. These attributes made radiata a useful shelter belt tree and it was widely planted. Initially, however, it was not commonly viewed as valuable for timber because many believed that it lacked durability. Because of the early plantings and its rapid growth, however, it had been incorporated into the lifestyles of many farmers as a readily available source of timber. These people, in turn, wrote many letters to the Royal Commission of 1913 extolling its structural virtues. These letters were important for convincing the Commission to consider radiata for large-scale plantings. Another issue that influenced the decision was the cost and availability of seed stock. Research conducted at the time determined that “Of all the trees in the State Plantations, none can be grown so cheaply and readily as *Pinus radiata*, or can be planted out at so early an age.”²³ Also, tests eventually revealed that Monterey Pine had superior structural qualities to other fast-growing exotics.²⁴

The private planting of exotic trees had been encouraged by the state as early as 1871, but the policies were inconsistent and not integrated with the management of existing tree stock. Though there were long-lasting tensions between the primacy of land for agriculture and the need for timber there was no move to replace wood with alternative materials. Instead, the solution that was pursued was afforestation. Poole makes the point that protection of native forests was seen as distinct from planting of exotic trees. The former was nearly impossible to effect during the nineteenth century, but the latter was not seen as contradictory to settlement desires and had already been undertaken throughout the treeless grasslands of Canterbury and Otago. This conceptual distinction was encouraged by the earlier separation of afforestation, timber harvesting, and reserve management into distinct entities under the Lands Department (see above). The promotion of afforestation in the 1870s through various Acts, both local and national, gave the public the perception that forestry was about afforestation rather than management of indigenous resources.

The state had previously pursued its own afforestation. After the creation of the 1885 State Forests Act, Prof. Thomas Kirk oversaw the planting of indigenous and exotic trees at Te Kauwhata and Whangarei. The program continued for two years until the Depression forced its termination. In 1897 the Forestry Branch (under Lands and Survey) was reopened. Nurseries were set up at Seddon, Rotorua, Whakarewarewa, Hanmer, Ranfurly, Whangarei, Tapanui, and Eweburn. By 1921, the branch had planted 38,461 acres of exotic trees in thirteen different locations around the country. The three largest,

25 It should be noted that these early plantings were largely geared to serve as shelterbelts or landscape improvement.
26 Murray Chapman and R. Gerard Ward, "Forestry and Forest Industries," in New Zealand's Industrial Potential New Zealand Geographical Society, 1961), 57-58; Fleet, 96; Poole, 8-13, 21; Roche, History of Forestry, 90.
Whakarewarewa, Waiotapu, and Kaingaroa, comprised sixty-four percent of the government’s planted area.²⁷

Following Ellis’ new program, the state pursued a rapid planting policy. Between 1925 and 1934 over 400,000 acres of Crown land were planted in exotic trees with a further 272,326 acres planted by private companies, far in excess of Ellis' original 300,000 target. By far, *Pinus radiata* was the main species planted. The trees were planted in neat, regular rows and columns planted at intervals of eight feet (see Figure 10).²⁸ The SFS plantings were located at: Riverhead, Tairua, Maramarua, Kaingaroa, Erua, and Karioi on North Island and Golden Downs, Hanmer, Westland, Balmoral, Eyrewell, Blue Mountains, and Pebbly Hills on the South Island. The largest forest was Kaingaroa (see Figure 11). This area, which is located in Te Urewera-Kaingaroa, was characterized by fairly flat, tussock covered, pumice lands. It had initially been earmarked for Pakeha agricultural development; however, stock that was grazed on those lands had fallen sick or died. By the late 1890s, people were avoiding its use as rangeland. It was not until the 1930s that the cause was determined to be a cobalt deficiency, which could easily have been addressed. By that time, however, the trees were well-established.²⁹

The investment in exotic afforestation was also important for the development of a pulp and paper industry. The SFS had been alerted to the possibility of developing

²⁷ Fleet, 101-110; Poole, 31; Roche, *History of Forestry*, 210; Roche, "The State as Conservationist, 1920-60: 'Wise Use' of Forests, Lands, and Water," 186-188.
²⁸ Initial plantings were spaced four feet apart with the intention that the trees would be thinned. After 1925, however, state practice was to plant trees at eight-foot intervals.
another end-use industry for trees since 1920. Ellis was looking for a means of utilizing the waste from milling practices. Alex Entrican had been hired on at the SFS to conduct research into development of forest products as well as improved technologies. In 1925 William Adamson from England, who was on his way to Japan to consult on paper and pulp production, visited New Zealand. Ellis instructed Entrican to consult with Adamson. The latter believed that New Zealand could easily develop a large-scale pulp and paper industry that could produce competitive international exports.  

---

Paper had been produced in New Zealand since 1876 using a combination of local waste such as rags, sacking, rope, sails, and used paper along with scrub plants and flax. It also relied on imported pulp and materials. These early industries did not have the expertise and infrastructure to use indigenous wood, but invested a lot of time and research into possibilities of expanding the industry. The SFS and private companies separately enlisted scientists in North America and Australia to conduct research into the potential of using indigenous and exotic woods. Indigenous woods were deemed
unsuitable as they produced dark paper. *Radiata* was identified as a good candidate. Tawa was a possibility when mixed with *radiata.*

Adamson’s recommendations had a significant impact on the development of the industry. He argued that only one large, integrated plant should be built so as to avoid unnecessary competition. An integrated mill would be capable of processing raw logs into sawn timber as well as producing pulp for export and various paper and wood products. The idea behind such a mill would be the cost-savings from sharing a single power source, transportation system, and labor force. He also stressed the point that the industry should be slowly developed. Lastly, he argued that processing was in itself a goal of forestry, not simply a by-product of it. This last point led to the expansion of the first planting goal in order to have a supply specifically for pulp and paper. Entrican took the first and second ideas to heart. The SFS took many years to implement its plan. Meanwhile, private companies were interested in developing industry. But, they were frequently blocked so as to prevent another large plant from being built. This led to a great deal of friction between the state and commercial interests.

Several private interests looked into the production of pulp and paper, but only three really emerged as successful. Whakatane Paper Mills Ltd. built a cardboard and ground wood facility in Whakatane, which went online in 1939. It expanded during the 1950s and added a semi-chemical plant. In 1940, New Zealand Paper Mills, which was the 1905 incarnation of the merger of three milling companies, was granted a license to produce paper. It had already been processing imported pulp into paper. Soon after,

---

Henderson and Pollard started producing plywood. In 1940, New Zealand Forest Products started to make fibreboard at Penrose near Auckland. Later, in 1943, the government granted it the right to process Kraft pulp and paper. In the following decade, New Zealand Forest Products created the first private integrated forest production plant at Kinleith near Tokoroa. The plant manufactured pulp, paper, and sawn wood.\(^{33}\)

Following Adamson's advice, the SFS pursued plans for their processing facilities; this took place over several years. Ellis' successor, McGavock, was not interested in wood processing, which added to the delay. In 1939, Entrican replaced him as Director of Forestry and revived the project. In looking at location options one of the main considerations was having it near the major centers of population, which were on the North Island. The plant also needed to be near a wood supply and transportation systems. Entrican wanted the government to be in control of the development of the industry as he felt both that private companies lacked the necessary expertise and that the scale of the industry required regulation. He envisioned it as a joint arrangement of state and private interests. The plant would involve the construction of a rail/transportation system, power source, port facility, and a company town for workers.\(^{34}\)

As the project proceeded it underwent many changes. One of the problems was the friction between state and private interests that had developed as a result of the state's attempts to prevent the creation of competitive plants. While Entrican wanted the state to oversee the implementation of his long-cultivated plans, that did not eventuate. The project would be realized under the helm of a private group called Tasman with the state providing the trees at a subsidized rate and the actual felling undertaken by a third entity:

\(^{33}\) Kirkland and Berg, 76-86; Roche, *History of Forestry*, 303-313.
\(^{34}\) Kirkland and Berg, 76-86; Roche, *History of Forestry*, 266-317.
Kaingaroa Logging Ltd. The plant, which was built in the mid-1950s, was sited at Kawerau instead of the government's choice of Murupara.\textsuperscript{35}

By the end of the 1950s, Entrican felt that future demand would outstrip available forest supplies and so initiated a second planting boom with a goal of 1.2 million acres by the end of the century. The second boom began in 1960. The plan was to have half of the target achieved through state plantings and half by farmers and private interests. The total acreage was to be planted over a longer period of time in order to have a broader age distribution. In practice, the goal was met within twenty-five years. The main areas that were afforested were Rotorua, Nelson/Marlborough, and Hawkes Bay. The secondary areas were Otago, Northland, and Te Tairāwhiti. Another aspect of the second boom was that it included the new goal of producing export products; previously, the foreign market was only seen as a "convenient outlet for surpluses."\textsuperscript{36}

There were several difficulties during the second planting boom. While the goal was supposed to be shared evenly between the state and private interests, the actual ratio was about 20,000 per year by the state and 5,000 by others. The SFS wanted farmers to plant trees around the edges of their properties since such an approach would be less costly than establishing new, large plantations. Still, there was a major farming bias against forestry that inhibited the full participation of many farmers.\textsuperscript{37}

One of the main problems was acquiring land for forests. The SFS wanted to emphasize 'regional distribution' of the forests around the country, but it was difficult to

\textsuperscript{35} Kirkland and Berg, 76-86; Roche, \textit{History of Forestry}, 266-317.
\textsuperscript{36} Kirkland and Berg, 89. See also Chapman, "The Impact of Forestry and Forest Industries on Kaingaroa-Galatea", ii; Kirkland and Berg, 90; Roche, \textit{History of Forestry}, 211-214, 325-390; Roche, "The New Zealand Timber Economy, 1840-1935," 305; Roche, "The State as Conservationist, 1920-60: 'Wise Use' of Forests, Lands, and Water," 188-198.
\textsuperscript{37} Roche, \textit{History of Forestry}, 327-333.
acquire suitable land in many target areas, especially near ports. Those parcels that were available often needed to be cleared of secondary growth, which was costly and time-consuming. The government could not exercise eminent domain as it would have been poorly received by the public. The SFS could not convert cutover indigenous forests to exotic production as it was expensive and had become politically unfavorable. These various obstacles made leasing Māori land one of the few viable options. For a variety of reasons, many having to do with difficulties of obtaining financial assistance, a great deal of Māori land was not in production. The state thus viewed leasing native land as a solution to its problems and an economic improvement for undeveloped native land. The Tarawera Forests Act 1967 led to the afforestation of a combination of Māori, state, and private lands.38

Interestingly, as mentioned above, the state had opted to have Pakeha farmers undertake their own plantings on their lands, a move which the SFS viewed as more cost-effective than creating its own plantings. With Māori, however, the state pursued a course wherein it and private companies would exercise control over the production of the forests.

6.3 THE MĀORI EXPERIENCE

6.3.1 INTRODUCTION

The loss of their most productive lands propelled many Māori into the timber industry, both native and exotic. The industry became an important source of employment for many tangata whenua, both local and from outside the region. The

38 Roche, History of Forestry, 327-335.
introduction of scientific forestry and exotic trees led to many changes for Māori. Native employment in the industry often necessitated extensive absences from their communities, and thus presented yet another barrier to development by depriving the īwi of labor necessary to work what marginal lands remained under their control. Māori were employed in various sectors of timber production such as the State Forest Service (SFS), State mills, bush camps, and Māori-owned and operated mills. Employment by the SFS included preparing land, planting, harvesting, and maintenance of infrastructure. In Te Urewera-Kaingaroa, Māori comprised significant portions of the population of several forestry towns including Murupara, Minginui, Kaingaroa, Matahina, and Kawerau.39

The progressively industrial and scientific nature of forestry with the creation of geometric plantations, and the increasingly vertically integrated industry affected Māori in a variety of ways. The transition into industrialized work on their former lands was a painful experience for Māori in many ways. The government demand for labor and the recognition of Māori as an important source of that labor led to a close though fractious relationship. Walzl notes that the incorporation of tangata whenua into the forestry system was occasionally coercive; frequently Māori were forced to move off of their traditional land.40 This often meant a loss of connection to one’s turangawaewae. Quite

often, tangata whenua had few economic alternatives to forestry work. McClintock and Taylor write that

the changing work processes and occupational structure of the industry, had a significant impact on forestry towns in terms of individual and family welfare, and social stratification. These are but local manifestations of much wider economic and technological changes as the industry adapts its operations to the constraints of a global market.\footnote{Wayne McClintock and Nick Taylor, \textit{Pines, Pulp and People: A case study of New Zealand Forestry Towns} (Christchurch: University of Canterbury and Lincoln College, 1983), 56.}

This was especially the case for those from Te Urewera-Kaingaroa, many of whom were employed in the exotic planting work during the 1920s. The exotic forestry industry became an important source of work for Ngati Manawa and increasingly influenced the pace of life.\footnote{Evelyn Stokes, J. Wharehuia Milroy, and Hirini Melbourne, \textit{Te Urewera Nga Iwi Te Whenua Te Ngahere: People, Land and Forests of Te Urewera} (Hamilton: University of Waikato, 1986), 265-267.}

In order to encourage Māori participation, many government officials and forestry business representatives promised that participation would establish an industry that would support workers and the community indefinitely. In return for adapting to the difficulties of an industrialized work regime Māori would receive a good wage, higher standard of living, good work conditions, job security, and jobs for future generations. Furthermore, this work served the nation as a whole, which would lead to a sense of pride on the part of the workers. This promise was reiterated so often and was so powerful, that it did result in widespread participation. MacLennan, writing in the Rotorua Social Impact Review, describes this as the creation of a social contract.\footnote{Barbara MacLennan and Laurie Durand, \textit{Regional Social Impact Review: Rotorua} (Rotorua: State Services Commission, Social Impact Unit, 1987), 265-267.} Walzl goes further, he
argues that this promise was not just a social contract, but an agreement made between Treaty partners.\textsuperscript{44}

The success and growth of afforestation led to a renewed demand for Māori land. Some forestry officials argued that as native lands were not being utilized, this justified their sale. In some cases, the lands in question were Native Reserves, which had been allocated by the courts. Despite entrenched resistance, forestry officials continued to press for alienation; some of them made threats by referring to the Public Works Act or declaring freehold lands adjacent to state forests as posing fire risks.\textsuperscript{45}

This model of using purchased land to meet afforestation needs continued into the 1960s. The 1963 annual report of the Department of Māori Affairs (DMA) is one of the earliest mentions of an alternative, wherein Māori land would be leased to the Crown for afforestation purposes, thus avoiding the alienation to which Māori were so opposed. This came out of conversations between the Forest Service and the DMA on how best to utilize ‘idle’ Māori land. In this way, tangata whenua could be seen as willing participants in the national economy, but in a way that did not strip them of what little they had left.\textsuperscript{46}

During the second planting boom a large portion of Māori land was leased and planted in exotic pines. These areas were managed by the state or private companies. This meant Māori did not have direct control over the management of those lands. For example, the Tasman Pulp and Paper Company leased 76,000 acres of Māori land for

\textsuperscript{44} Walzl, 910-16.
\textsuperscript{45} Walzl, 901.
\textsuperscript{46} Walzl, 544; BBFZ 4945 25c, Afforestation of Maori Land, 1960-1983.
afforestation purposes and the majority of Northern Pulp’s forests were established on Native land.  

6.3.2 PLANTING ON PURCHASED AND LEASED LAND

6.3.2.1 ON CROWN PURCHASED LAND

The Crown had acquired a significant amount of land from Māori; much of which was used for exotic plantations. These areas were planted for different reasons. Blocks of land in Te Urewera-Kaingaroa included Kaingaroa No. 1 from Ngati Manawa and Te Whaiti, which belonged to Ngati Manawa and Ngati Whare. Kaingaroa became the centerpiece of the SFS plantation system (see Figure 12). Areas near Rotorua including Waiotapu, Whakarewarewa, Galatea, and Murupara were also planted. A few of the research participants commented on the planting. Maurice says:

I was looking at the forests, some forests in our area was planted in 1919, the first lot. But, the majority of it was planted in 1930s during the Depression.  

Rena, Eliza’s mom, reflects on how her own father was involved in planting:

Pine, yeah ‘cause dad helped to build plant all the pine at the back of Minginui.  

This illustrates the length of time during which these individuals and their families have been influenced by forestry.

In Te Tairāwhiti, the Crown afforestation project was focused on a combination of erosion control and production forestry (see Figure 13). During the early 1960s, the Crown acquired parts of Mangatu from Te Aitanga-a-Mahaki, John Ruru’s tribe. He

---

47 Roche, *History of Forestry*, 335.
Figure 12. Map Showing Existing Forest Cover in Te Urewera-Kaingaroa

Map by K. Harris. Scale: 1:730,000.
Map by K. Harris. Scale: 1:830,000.
discusses some of the politics during the negotiations leading up to the State Forest Service-driven purchase:

In 1959, I was working in Rotorua…Quite often when I’d be back in what we called our conservancy office based in Rotorua, I went up for a cup of tea. And the senior members of the Forest Service were talking over a cup of tea about this land over in the East Coast [Te Tairāwhiti] and how important it was to retire farming from this country and put it into erosion control based on this report. Some derogatory remarks were being made. Course they suddenly realized that I was standing there. I didn’t know what they were talking about and they switched the subject completely. And I didn’t really take any notice of it and when I was in the kitchen about it and was thinking about it I knew why, because they were talking about the very land that I was eventually to become a shareholder in. But, my ancestors were holders in that land, and I didn’t realize that. It wasn’t until much later on when I realized that the government set up by the commission of the crown lands, which was Lands and Survey, to negotiate with the Maori land owners that they were retiring that land from farming and putting it into pine trees.\(^{50}\)

The above statement describes an awkward moment in the SFS office. John notes that the senior officers felt that his relatives, the Māori owners of Mangatu, were an obstruction to erosion control. As a Māori employed by a state agency, John is in the position of having competing interests and mandates. At the time though, he was not in a decision-making position. In fact, he points out that he was not completely aware of his own relationship to the land in question. After a portion of that land was acquired, it was planted in exotic forests.\(^ {51}\)

6.3.2.2 ON LEASED LAND IN TE UREWERA-KAINGAROA

The concept of the long-term forestry lease became an important model that influenced exotic forestry development and Māori land use. In their paper on Māori and

---

\(^{50}\) John Ruru. 2007. Interview by author. Gisborne, N.Z. November 27,

forestry, Miller et al. note that a significant amount of forested lands are owned by tangata whenua. Citing a Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry survey, they write that 588,000 acres (238,000 hectares) of Māori land is planted in exotic forests, which represents fourteen percent of the nation’s timber plantations. Māori, however, only manage and own one percent of the nation’s forests at 49,400 acres (20,000 hectares).

According to New Zealand Forestry “the forest industry contributes significantly to Maori employment and economic advancement…10% of the Maori economic base is in the forestry sector.” The majority of the forests on Māori lands are managed by state or private companies who have long-term leases with native peoples. This next section addresses some of the characteristics and concerns of long-term forestry leases.

The attitude that lands were best used when they were producing an economic benefit continued to influence government policy and public opinion. There was much pressure to subject Māori land, which was in some cases exempt, to taxation (or rates in New Zealand terminology). The argument for taxation of native lands was that the land should be made to be productive and that taxation would create an incentive to do so. Also, there was the concern that idle land allowed the growth and spread of noxious weeds, which would then pose a threat to adjacent lands. The Department of Māori Affairs (DMA) was closely involved in developing Māori land. In the 1970s, however, the agency underwent a policy shift wherein farming was no longer viewed as the

52 Robert Miller, Yvette Dickinson, and Alan Reid, Maori Connections to Forestry in New Zealand (Brisbane, Australia: Fenner School of Environment & Society, ANU College of Science, 2007), 13.
54 John Hutton and Klaus Neumann, Ngati Whare and the Crown, 1880-1999 (Wellington: Crown Forestry Rental Trust, 2001), 569. Hutton and Neumann point out that because of a lack of financing, many Māori were unable to afford to develop their lands and so leased them out to Pakeha farmers. In many cases, these Pakeha treated the land poorly as they reached the end of their leases.
primary desired land use, and was actually unfeasible for some places. Working in conjunction with the Forest Service, the DMA sought to develop leasing as a land use option for Māori landowners. This enabled Māori to retain control of their land while getting some return from its use. When A.L. Poole was Director General of Forests, he argued that afforestation was socially better for Māori in that it was more profitable than agriculture. For the DMA, leasing was beneficial because it would provide more employment than agriculture, make “idle” land productive thereby eliminating pressure to alienate, and provide income to the owners. The DMA sought help from the Forest Service (FS) because it was not ideally placed to develop plantations, whereas the FS had expertise.55

Many Māori took these opportunities because there were few economic options open and they were struggling with taxes and other costs. Several of the participants confirmed the limited economic options available to their families. Willy Newton, whose father oversaw the drafting of many leases, reflects upon the tough choices that had to be made:

Willy: Never sell. With the farming they were starting to get behind with the rates and you know things weren’t going well so they thought they’d secure the land by putting pines on and getting the rental and you know and keeping everything. Pine wasn’t anything to them.

Chris: They weren’t keeping up with the rates? Because…business wasn’t working?

Willy: Yeah, the business wasn’t and there were areas up there that was too steep for farming so they were planting trees, up the steeper hills cause they were uneconomical for farming. That block there was 99 years, three thirty three, see the rotation was thirty something years so that was three rotations. So we can’t do anything until those three rotations are finishing, changing.56

55 Hutton and Neumann, 566-569; Walzl, 704.
Faced with the dilemma of how to make an income, Willy’s family decided that pine plantations would prevent them from having to sell yet more land. Maurice’s tribe faced a similar dilemma:

Maurice: No, [3,000 hectares] that’s in pine. And some native. That’s our own land, you know the old people put it in pine ‘cause it was just sort of, it’s used to be an old farm...the land we weren’t allowed to access it, so they had to pull all the animals off and it just went back to blackberry and gorse and stuff. So, they just come and talked to the old people and they got it developed and put in, took the native [trees] out, and put in all these other...That’s under Maori ownership and I’m on that trust, I’m a shareholder there.

Chris: Which trust?
Maurice: Ngaoinga Motu Moku. See that Ngaoinga, the names you know tell you something. Meeting place for our people.57

Willy and Maurice’s respective ancestors made those decisions during the middle of the twentieth century.

While this changed the relationship between Māori and various government agencies, Hutton and Neumann note Māori were still marginalized by leases.58 There was pressure placed on Māori owners to lease their lands for afforestation purposes. The main function of long-term leases was to achieve commodity production. Cultural and subsistence concerns such as maintenance of hunting grounds or eel habitats was not a part of interdepartmental discussions of lease possibilities.59

The actual design of leases required negotiations over how best to frame them and who would retain legal control. One issue was whether or not to have trustees manage the lease. The legacy of the imposition of the private property regime also created a barrier. Complicated and fragmented titles had yielded a patchwork of small parcels of land.

Forestry officials argued that leasing required large blocks of land in order to be

57 Toetoe.
58 Hutton and Neumann, 577, 580-583.
59 Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne, 281.
worthwhile. Different government agencies and Māori owners argued the merits of different ways of changing legal title that included amalgamation, incorporation, or retaining individual title.60 Predictably, Māori expressed great concern over changes to their title, reasonably fearing further losses. A serious issue was that under existing legislation, it would not be possible to have a lease long enough for a timber crop to mature. Some people (such as the Secretary of Māori Affairs) opposed the idea of special legislation to address this limitation.61

There was also concern about the benefits forestry would bring to Māori, including whether or not to include private financing or deal exclusively with the government. While the historical relationship with the government was often fraught with injustice, many Māori felt that investing with the Crown was a safer and more reliable path. Other discussions revolved around how money should be returned to owners, whether it be through peppercorn rental or stumpage.62 There was conflict over how to balance short term cash needs against the long-term investment of afforestation. Lease discussions also focused on how many tree crop rotations to plant and on how market changes would affect timber revenue. In addition to an income, Māori were eager to develop an employment base through forestry.63

60 Walzl, 690-699. Amalgamation and incorporation involved different ways of converting small, individual pieces of property into larger units owned by a tribe or sub-tribe, with each owner receiving a share or portion of ownership as well as voting rights on the use of the lands. This was contentious and complicated especially when owners or their descendants were no longer in residence, and thus contact. Another alternative involved transfer of title in exchange for shareholder position as with Tasman joint venture with Crown and Māori, but this was an exception. Typically, leases were used.

61 Hutton and Neumann, 589-593; Walzl, 704-723.

62 Peppercorn rental meant a regular payment or rental paid out to owners. Stumpage payment meant that owners would receive a fixed percentage of the value of the trees upon harvest. Each involved a trade-off. The former would ensure a regular income, but it was typically very small. The latter meant a bigger payoff, but given the growing cycle of the trees (25-33 years), owners would have to wait an extended amount of time for their monetary return. Some leases involved a mixture of the two.

63 Hutton and Neumann, 589-597; Walzl, 704-723.
Leases commonly included several provisions to protect the interests of Māori landowners. Burial grounds and sites of significance were catalogued and made known to the FS with the understanding that there would be no impact upon them. Any remains and artifacts that were discovered would be given official respect and reported. Fishing reserves were to be protected and enhanced. The leases also stipulated that there would be reviews to adjust for land value; some were five-year, others were annual. The contracts addressed who would be responsible for paying costs of survey. Leases also discussed employment provisions, control of noxious animals, and easements of access. Owners were to be granted priority in receiving hunting permits. Millable timber would be the property of the landowners. Another important characteristic was the requirement that management plans keep owners informed of the ways in which their lands were being utilized.64

Lease arrangements had their share of problems. Rentals were paid out to individuals and at small amounts instead of to the community. This made it difficult to convert the income into a means of financing community development. Sometimes local county councils would threaten to revoke Māori land from a tax-exempt status, thereby subjecting Māori to the collection of back taxes or land in place of taxes as a means to leverage owners into signing leases. Māori were frequently at a disadvantage when it came to negotiating leases as they had few viable alternatives. There was a lot of concern over land management, as Māori were not pleased with the idea of having no direct control over how land being used. This was not only a cultural issue, but one that might impinge upon future returns. In response to demands for share in management, the FS

64 Hutton and Neumann, 597, 603, 613-614; Walzl, 721.
said that the owners must trust in the government’s ability. This is an interesting position given the fractious history between Māori and the Crown.65

Contracts with the government and with private companies each had problems. The problems with government leases often revolved around a lack of communication between communities and the state. In many cases, Māori felt that the state implemented decisions that affected their communities without due consultation. This is illustrated by changing government attitudes about land development. The government had long promoted farming as the preferred land use and often gave grants to assist farmers develop their lands, but not all received such help. In the case of Te Whaiti-Nui-a-Toi, tangata whenua were interested in farming their lands and had sought funding from the government as early as the 1930s, but to no avail. Later, the DMA decided that afforestation was ideal. Coordinating with the DMA, the Māori Land Court obstructed local efforts to bring small areas into production as farms and sought to amalgamate titles in the region. Hutton and Neumann note that there is evidence that the courts had decided what was best for Ngati Whare and acted on those perceptions without consulting tangata whenua. Ngati Whare initially objected, but later agreed because they felt that the lease would provide jobs and, without financing, they had no other options.66

Creating and finalizing a lease often took a long time and was sometimes characterized by a lack of transparency. With Ngati Whare, once they consented to amalgamation, the land was placed under the authority of the Māori Trustee, who was charged with negotiating with the government on behalf of the īwi. While six advisory trustees were also appointed, they were far less involved in the process. Different

65 Hutton and Neumann, 569, 580, 593, 598-599; Walzl, 700, 727.
66 Hutton and Neumann, 571-579, 584, 590; Walzl, 730-732.
elements appeared and then were cut from the lease. In the case of Ngati Whare, at one point the stumpage calculation was based on an exchange of land between government and iwi, though this exchange never eventuated. In addition, a profit-sharing clause disappeared from the final version of the lease and the stumpage percentage declined from an original offering of 17.5 percent to 12 percent. In the end the owners felt that they had been marginalized during the negotiations and stuck with a lease which they felt was for far too long of a time period and to the advantage of the government.\footnote{Hutton and Neumann, 587, 601, 607; Walzl, 730-732.} Later, Ngati Whare were able to get provisions made to the lease to reflect their interests. The following is an excerpt from a lease between them and the Forests Service:

That the lessee will by ordinary and reasonable standards give priority of employment in the forestry operations to be carried out on the said land to the beneficial owners and children of the beneficial owners of the said land who are at the time of employment residing within a radius of seventeen miles of the former Post Office Store at Te Whaiti.\footnote{Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne, 282-83.}

In addition, while the lessee can use any means to “control and remove wild animals by any means including commercial and/or public hunting” the owners and their kin have first right of refusal in such matters.\footnote{Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne, 282-83.} This is another significant provision that recognizes the complexities of modern subsistence systems.

In the case of deals with private companies there were also problems. Companies used various forms of pressure to induce Māori to sign leases. Private forestry companies occasionally worked with local officials to apply taxes and rates in order to pressure Māori into afforestation. Walzl cites another example in which a group was pressured by Tasman company and a judge to amalgamate. Some companies also offered minimal

\footnote{Hutton and Neumann, 587, 601, 607; Walzl, 730-732.}
\footnote{Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne, 282-83.}
rents. The different methods of calculating rentals were not clearly explained, limiting the capacity of communities to carefully weigh their options. In one case a group received an offer of 9 percent stumpage only to discover later that the Crown was offering 18.5 percent stumpage. Finally, leases brought the expectation of employment. But, in some cases Pakeha, as opposed to local tribal members, were brought in to do the work. While the leases were meant to be partnership, there was often a feeling that companies were getting the best end of the deal.\textsuperscript{70}

In addition to conflicts between lessor and lessee over afforestation contracts, there were also internal disagreements. In 1970, the Tūhoe-Waikaremoana Māori Trust Board began discussions with the government to develop an agreement for afforestation. The negotiations involved three separate government departments\textsuperscript{71} and the amalgamation of title of 164 parcels of land into four large blocks that covered over 88,000 acres. The discussions also addressed long-term land lease exchanges between Crown and Tūhoe, job creation through afforestation, Tūhoe acquisition of farmable land, and financing for land development. The deal was initiated as a means to compensate Tūhoe for government imposed prohibitions on timber milling in the area dating from 1956. The whole agreement, however, took over eight years to negotiate and led to a great deal of internal conflict for Tūhoe over amalgamation, and several other aspects of the exchange. During this time official opinion regularly shifted. At some points, government officials argued that the exchange was essential in order to protect soil and water values of the lands under timber felling ban. At other times, officials argued that

\textsuperscript{70} Walzl, 726-729.
\textsuperscript{71} Initially, this included representatives from Department of Lands and Survey, Department of Māori and Island Affairs, and the New Zealand Forest Service. However, as National Water and Soil Conservation Council were involved in imposing the initial timber ban they also played a role in the discussions.
the proposal was not in the interests of the Crown. The lack of agreement within the government paralleled the diversity of opinion among tangata whenua.\textsuperscript{72}

Another example of this kind of community level diversity of opinion occurred in the mid-1980s when some Ruatoki Tūhoe staged a series of protests over a contract between a forestry company, Tasman, and the Tūhoe-Waikaremoana Māori Trust Board to clear and afforest lands on Taiarahia Mountain. Specific complaints against the arrangement were that removal of native plant cover would lead to environmental degradation and loss of kiwi and kokako bird habitat, cause water supply contamination, provide insufficient protection for cultural sites of significance, and that the loss of control of land involved an attendant loss of mana (prestige). An environmental group took the side of the protestors. The argument involved competing narratives where Taiarahia was depicted as a sacred mountain that needed protection, while the Trust Board focused on the need for economic development. As an aside, the Tasman manager made an interesting point that kiwi birds can be found in exotic forests, thus offering some counter to the argument over loss of habitat.\textsuperscript{73}

During the 2007 interviews, Eliza Cairns and James Kiel discussed the conflicts within the Ruatahuna Tūhoe community over the planting of eucalyptus.

Eliza: At Ruatahuna you know you look at [they actually fought] to bring the eucalyptus trees. That whole area, because it was all native, and what they done is they put, planted those eucalyptus eh?

\textsuperscript{72} LINZ 6900 20/1513 pt. 3; LINZ 6900 20/1510 pt. 1 & pt. 3; Te Puni Kokiri 58-2-8: Afforestation of Māori Land, Tuhoe Lands, Afforestation and Utilisation, 1974-1985; MA 26/21. Tuhoe Timberlands, Possible Exchanges With the Crown, 1974-1977. An interesting provision of the final deal was that the government would pay for the survey and legal costs of the exchange. This is in marked contrast to the previous experiences of Māori, who were frequently forced to pay for such work. In situations where Māori did not have cash to pay for the surveys, they were forced to give up parcels of land as payment.

\textsuperscript{73} ABJZ W4644 869 26/2 Pt. 1 Box 71; BHT 5118/74b.
James: Like, it was all paddocks and scrub. Because they never farmed it much, put it all into trees…it was a lot of work for a lot of people out there.\textsuperscript{74}

But, the Cairns note that it is still a source of contention within the community. While it does provide jobs, George notes that it has had a deleterious effect on groundwater. He says:

They shouldn’t have planted them there. Because it [the eucalyptus] lives it lives off water and those trees, eucalyptus, they love water. So, they just about crippled themselves.\textsuperscript{75}

These comments reflect some of the difficult choices with which Māori have been faced.

There was also much conflict about the role of Māori Trustee and whether or not the Trustee was truly acting in the interests of Māori. Hutton and Neumann argue that the Crown had a responsibility to help Māori develop their lands, but refused to do so on terms that \textit{tangata whenua} wanted. For example, some landowners requested that they be given farmable land in exchange for those deemed suited to afforestation. In other cases, Māori asked that, when appropriate, pieces of land within designated plantation tracts be reserved for market gardens. In both situations, they were denied. There was also concern about the impact of afforestation on the land in terms of potential to return to farming. In some cases, there was a sense that the deal was to the disadvantage of the lessors, but that they were not in a position to negotiate a better contract.\textsuperscript{76}

\textsuperscript{74} Cairns et al.  
\textsuperscript{75} Cairns et al.  
\textsuperscript{76} Hutton and Neumann, 612-622. In the Te Whaiti-Nui-a-Toi lease, Hutton and Neumann argue that Ngati Whare got a bad deal. A profit sharing clause that had initially been intended to benefit Ngati Whare, was ultimately removed without explanation. Overall the owners did not get very high rents based on land value and had an unusual clause of rental based on Consumer Price Index.
Stokes et al. cite another case where Māori desires for land management came into conflict with afforestation leases. On Kiwinui block several diverse interest groups were advocating different uses for the land. At one point the owners organized together and attempted to pursue their own management of the land with a mixture of forestry and farming. Ultimately the bulk of the land was leased to Caxton Printing Works, which was involved in forestry, to plant in exotics.

Māori land continued to be important for afforestation. By the 1980s there were 140,000 acres of Māori land leased by the government or private interests for afforestation and a further 200,000 acres that could potentially be planted. Interest in afforesting Māori land continued; however, the ways in which it should be approached were changing. One legislative act regarding forestry served to phase out Forestry Encouragement Grants for production forests, which was to the disadvantage of Māori. Another piece of legislation, however, the Forestry Rights Registration Act 1983 served to legally define a forestry right and how it could be managed. Through this act, a forestry right was made distinct from an ownership right in land. In a letter from May 1983, Tom Parore, a District Officer of the DMA discusses forestry leases in Northland. He writes “it is interesting to note that these leases have each been negotiated separately with little or no attempt to adopt a common approach or goal.” Writing in 1987, Parore notes that there is plan to carry out a national review of Māori land to determine the potential of forest development and intent to create national policy for how to address such lands.

77 Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne, 281.
In addition to coming up with a more systematic approach, there were efforts to expand the forms in which forestry was practiced. This included multiple use of land, including agroforestry which might involve grazing stock in forests and/or using legumes to fix nitrogen and to provide feed between rotations. There were also efforts to promote smaller and more flexible plantations, such as woodlots and shelterbelts – in effect, microforests. These new developments also involved looking to grow trees other than radiata which would have a higher value of return for owner.\textsuperscript{79}

Writing in 1986, Stokes et al. note that leases had changed over the years.\textsuperscript{80} They write that, for the time, recently designed contracts frequently carry provisions that more carefully reflect the desires and interests of the owners. One example is specific provisions for employment and hunting. The following is an excerpt from a lease between the Forests Service and Ngati Whare:

That the lessee will by ordinary and reasonable standards give priority of employment in the forestry operations to be carried out on the said land to the beneficial owners and children of the beneficial owners of the said land who are at the time of employment residing within a radius of seventeen miles of the former Post Office Store at Te Whaiti.\textsuperscript{81}

Another example from a lease for lands near Rotoiti also illustrates the efforts to address continued owner usage of lands:

Hunting rights are guaranteed in forestry leases in an attempt to ensure that established forest uses by local people are allowed to continue.\textsuperscript{82}

This is interesting because it demonstrates a recognition of some of the ways in which the land is important to people and, further, that a particular parcel of land may have multiple

\textsuperscript{80} Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne, 282-283.
\textsuperscript{81} Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne, 282-283.
\textsuperscript{82} Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne, 282-283.
use rights from the Māori perspective. Thus, a lease may grant a forestry right, but not
grant full unencumbered use of the land. Stokes et al. refer to the lease for Te Whaiti
which grants the right to control and remove wild animals, by commercial or public
hunting. This is another significant provision that recognizes the complexities of modern
subsistence systems.\textsuperscript{83}

Several other features are worth noting. More recent leases frequently required
carefully laid out management plans for the approval of trustees, granting greater
transparency in how the land was actually being utilized. Most carry stipulations for the
protection of graves and other sites of cultural significance. Another change is the length
of the contracts. While earlier leases were typically for 99 years with 2-3 crops, newer
agreements were more commonly for only one rotation. The Te Manawa-o-Tūhoe lease,
which began in 1981, is only for 32 years. Another characteristic of the newer leases is
more careful allocation of land use to protect pockets of indigenous forest that exist on
portions of land. What this demonstrates is that the owners have more power vis-à-vis the
lessee in crafting their contracts. It also reflects the desire to balance protection of
indigenous forests against an economic need for jobs and income.\textsuperscript{84}

There were several criticisms of the lease model. Within the DMA, the argument
was advanced that previous leases had been “iniquitous” and “effectively disinherit the
owners from their land (for up to 99 years) and remove them from any say in
management or control of their turangawaewae.”\textsuperscript{85} New objectives were that forestry on
Māori land should be “Maori owned and dominated.” With initial help from the Board of
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\textsuperscript{85} BBFZ 4945 26a, Afforestation of Maori Land, 1984-1989.
Māori Affairs and the DMA, the argument was that “Maori forestry should be a self-sufficient, independent but integral part of the New Zealand forest industry.” In addition to assistance from the government, DMA officers were looking down the road for private sources of funding. A variety of different models were proposed that could involve joint venture, a fifty-fifty sharing of profits, and/or training of owners in management with the intent to have them take over operations later. This change in attitude might reflect changes in the department’s staff.

One of the driving forces behind these changes was the success of Māori operations at Taitokerau (Northland). This experience was cited as an ideal model for other Māori forestry ventures. However, it is important to note that this model involved separation of forestry rights from other aspects of land ownership, was owner controlled, and addressed cultural and environmental concerns.

The shift to afforestation was of limited economic benefit to Māori. *Tangata whenua* wanted to engage with the global economy. For various reasons, farming did not work, which meant that their land was lying idle. While exotic forestry was a lucrative production system, Māori were prevented from being directly involved in the management of the plantations. This meant that they did not realize the majority of profits. This was also problematic because owners were marginalized on their own lands. Māori have been dissatisfied with this arrangement. As a result, owners have increasingly and successfully sought direct control over the management of their lands.
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6.3.3 PROTECTION AND PRODUCTION FORESTS IN TE TAIRĀWHITI

In contrast to Te Urewera-Kaingaroa, the creation of exotic forests in Te Tairāwhiti served a dual purpose: to protect against erosion and to create a commodity. Deforestation of the hill country of the Te Tairāwhiti region led to significant erosion and downstream flooding, which necessitated state intervention. After several different methods to halt erosion and prevent flooding, the government implemented afforestation.

The problem of flood control had been recognized from the beginning of the twentieth century. The first attempt to systematically address it was the Rivers Board Act of 1908. This legislation enabled the creation of flood management boards to address the issues of aggradation on the flats. The initial efforts in the region were concentrated in the Waipaoa watershed under the direction of the Poverty Bay River Board, which was formed in 1912 after serious floods earlier in the century. The emphasis was on protecting Gisborne and taxpayers, which excluded Māori. One of the main problems of this board was that its jurisdiction was limited, as was its budget, and the board members approached flood control in a piecemeal fashion that focused on downstream riverbed management rather than as a program that integrated upslope erosion control with the flats. This can partially be explained by the limited authority of the board, which did not extend over the entire watershed, let alone the region as a whole.88

After new legislation, the Soil Conservation and Rivers Control Act of 1941, a new type of management system was created. For the Te Tairāwhiti region there was the Poverty Bay Catchment Board (PBCB), which covered Waikohu, Waiapu, and Cook counties along with Gisborne. This board employed a variety of engineering and

88 Coombes, 70-108.
vegetative tactics including straightening the river and adding or strengthening stopbanks (river levees) as well as strategic planting of willows and other trees. As far as controlling the flow of material down into the lower basin, the PBCB pursued various physical structures to retain or restrain movement such as debris dams and sediment fences, but these were ineffective. All of this resulted in deleterious effects to Māori. There was no effort to involve them in the design of the plan or to implement small changes that could have reduced the overall impacts.\textsuperscript{89}

Recognition of the importance of forests as a stabilizer for erosion prone soil prompted some early efforts to test the merits of forestry. By 1948, the Forest Service had established a large-scale forest around the areas of erosion in the Waipaoa headwaters to test the merits of afforestation. Several nurseries were built and various trees were tested. Planting forests on the upland was far more successful at mitigating against erosion than the downstream efforts to control flooding and riverbed movement. These first efforts at afforestation were crucial in that a variety of tree species were planted, including conifers. In addition to government plantings, thousands of young trees were sold to farmers at subsidized rates.\textsuperscript{90}

By the 1950s, the local management board recognized that their downstream efforts were insufficient and that erosion needed to be addressed at the source. The board asked for help at the national level from the Soil Conservation and Rivers Control Council. In 1955, a group (“the Panel”) was convened to conduct an expert survey. The Panel recommended that those areas that were most inclined to erode should be

\textsuperscript{89} Coombes, 70-108.  
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afforested. These areas totaled 14,000 acres of land in the crushed argillite area, including nearly 9,000 acres of Mangatu Incorporation. The Board and its supporters requested that the Crown purchase highly erodible lands and then have the FS reforest them. The Crown then set about acquiring those lands which would form the basis of Mangatu State Forest. The intention was to use 5,930 acres for production and 6,900 acres for protection. Thus, at the very outset, there was a combined use.

The area in question represented a combination of Māori-owned lands and those owned by Pakeha. The former included the native Mangatu Blocks 1, 3, and 4 which together comprised 8,550 acres (3,460 hectares). The remaining 8,870 acres were from two farms owned by Pakeha: Tawhiti and Waipaoa Stations. Despite resistance on the part of Māori who did not want to lose what little lands had been left to them, the bulk of Mangatu blocks was purchased as was Tawhiti Station. The Pakeha owners of Waipaoa Station, however, which had also been earmarked for afforestation, insisted on retaining most of the land while only selling a portion to the Crown. Planting of these areas took place during the 1960s and 1970s.

A later survey indicated that the targeted area was insufficiently small to achieve erosion goals so another investigation was undertaken to determine how the government should proceed. Central government became more involved in the erosion control effort. It ordered the creation of a Committee of Inquiry to study the problem and identify potential solutions. The results were published in what has come to be known as the Taylor Report. This report was based on land use assessment. Phillips and Marden note
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that “this report became the baseline document for an understanding of the relationship between land use and erosion in the region.” The main goal was to determine the best course of action to protect agricultural production. The report, however, focused on the importance of afforestation not just for protection, but also for production. More importantly, afforestation was viewed as a means of economic development.  

The authors came up with five different plans ranging from making no changes to an extensive acquisition of land for the purpose of large-scale afforestation. After investigating the region, the committee identified the areas that it felt were the worst eroding. It created a demarcation known as the ‘Blue Line’ to separate those areas that were worst eroding (the Critical Headwaters Area) to the west of the line from those that were still highly productive and could remain in pasturage. This line extended north from Te Karaka, through Waiapu and out to Hicks Bay, thus dividing the uplands of both the Waiapu and Waipaoa watersheds from their respective coastal regions. These lands that fell under the latter category were designated The Pastoral Foreland. The targeted area of afforestation contained the most erosion prone areas. However, the line was somewhat arbitrary in that there were lands within the Critical Headwaters Area (CHA) that were not high risk for erosion. In the Waipaoa catchment, the CHA contained much Māori land while in Waiapu the majority of Pakeha land was in the CHA. It was also some of the most productive land in that watershed.

The government chose the most radical plan of extensive afforestation on 247,100 acres. The plan was for full afforestation behind the ‘Blue Line’ and the creation of a dual-purpose protection/production forest that would be bigger than Kaingaroa. The
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government announced a plan to buy all lands west of the Blue Line, beginning with 12,000 acres of Waiapu land that it purchased from some Pakeha owners. The problem was that the economic benefit from protection/production forestry would be delayed and might not be as much as those from farming. Public reaction to the Blue Line was divided. Those farmers on the downstream were happy with the plan as it would protect their assets, while those farmers who fell behind the Blue Line were angry that their lands were targeted for purchase and afforestation. They were also highly critical of the arbitrary nature of the line. Nevertheless, the government approved the afforestation plan.96

Over the ensuing years the SFS bought and afforested approximately 6-7000 acres annually. This next stage in plantings was called the ‘East Coast Project’ and ran from 1968 to 1987, when the Forest Service was restructured. Two major state forests were established in the Waiapu region: Ruatoria and Tokomaru. Together they cover over 32,100 acres. There are also a number of smaller ones. An additional 29,650 acres of Māori leasehold, Crown, and private land were earmarked for future afforestation.97

In addition to state plantings there were several private forests. Two companies jointly established Hikurangi Forest Farms and afforested lands in the northern portion of Cook County at a rate of 2-3000 acres of exotic forest per year. In 1984 Hikurangi purchased the 10,000-acre Waipare block from Lands and Survey for forestry purposes. In addition, there are parcels around the Cape Runaway area that were leased in the 1970s to forestry companies.98
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As the plantings were under way, however, the public continued to oppose the Blue Line approach. This led to a second investigation, which took place between 1977 and 1978. The second investigation culminated in what has been called the Red Report. This focused on developing a more nuanced assessment of regional land use rather than an arbitrary demarcation. The authors of the Red Report found that the ‘Blue Line’ was “too broad” and created a more detailed definition of land quality and use. The authors, however, supported the general principle of afforestation. The NZFS went ahead with its afforestation plan as based on the Blue Line. However, a new problem emerged with the restructuring of the NZFS in 1987; this changed the direction and nature of the afforestation system.99

These forestry projects have had some successes. The higher density of tree plantings in the region has sped up the time to reach closed canopy, which is crucial for offsetting landslide risk from storms. In terms of off-site benefits there has been an improvement in water quality, reduced sedimentation, and improved flood control. There have been, however, many criticisms of the afforestation projects.100

In contrast, Coombes notes several problems with the afforestation approach.101 The economic emphasis had not left the equation. The approach to erosion control was very limited in scope. It only sought to address the most unstable areas (those underlain by crushed argillite) even though research indicated that the entire upper catchment should be retired and afforested. This emphasis on protecting farming interests rather than addressing broader ecological and cultural impacts limited the capacity of this
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approach to erosion control. From the outset, these forests were to serve a dual purposes, protection and production. Initial research in the area raised the criticism that protection and production should be kept separate and that erosion prone areas should be for protection only. There was a great deal of controversy within government over whether the Forest Service should focus on protection or production. Local NZFS staff wanted more protection while officials higher up pushed for production. Despite these various conflicts, the Forest Service went ahead with afforestation.  

6.3.3.1 IMPACTS OF AFFORESTATION ON MĀORI

The introduction of the afforestation scheme ushered in a new era of dispossession for Māori. Coombes argues that an emphasis on farming interests rather than broader ecological and cultural impacts limited the capacity of the Board’s approach to erosion control. There was no understanding of tangata whenua desires to keep their historic homelands. Though the Prime Minister promised that meetings held to discuss the purchase of lands would be inclusive, no Māori were present, only a Crown appointed representative.

Māori were treated prejudicially in the negotiations leading up to the government’s acquisition of lands in the area. Paternalism and racist bias against Māori were deeply entrenched in the legal system, media, and government. Certain groups depicted tangata whenua as the cause of erosion, which completely overlooked the fact that most deforestation had been achieved by Pakeha lessees without Māori consent while
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in other cases, it had been forced upon them.\textsuperscript{104} This became the basis for arguing that \textit{tangata whenua} were incapable of “responsible management” of land and yet unwilling to give land to those who could save the situation. At the same time they were criticized for not using land productively according to European standards. This demonstrated a lack of awareness that the relatively undeveloped state of Māori land had roots in the restrictions of the Pakeha legal and financial system.\textsuperscript{105}

This common theme of ‘Maori wastage’ of land was particularly ironic: heavier stocking rates in the hill country would have undoubtedly increased the rate of erosion, thereby threatening agricultural productivity through deterioration of soil resources. Yet, any land which was not developed to the fullest was considering to be lying idle…The growing paternalism of the Maori Land Court after World War II and the difficulty of obtaining development capital for Maori land has been well-documented by a number of authors. In public discourse, however, lack of developmental progress on Maori land was attributed to racial and cultural disposition rather than to structural underdevelopment.\textsuperscript{106}

The odd reality was that Mangatu farm was economically profitable. It was also the largest landholding in the area.

Interestingly enough, while the Panel had recommended the afforestation of 14,000 acres, it understood that Māori would be resistant to selling land and a series of alternatives to outright sale were discussed. The Conservator of Forests recognized that it was best to work with the landowners. One option was that Māori would retain ownership while the NZFS administered the land. Another option was a long-term lease of the land. A third option was that Mangatu Incorporation would finance and execute the afforestation project on its own. Despite advice from its own employees, however, the Crown insisted that the Forest Service own the land and have full control over the project.

\textsuperscript{104} The government stipulated terms of lease to Pakeha farmers did not encourage conservation or responsible land use.
\textsuperscript{106} Coombes, 111.
In response to this, the owners of Mangatu requested a land swap rather than an outright sale. In this way, they hoped to retain access to lands for their own sustenance and development.\textsuperscript{107}

With this belief that Māori must be made to part with their lands, the Crown and the media levied pressure against Mangatu Trust to sell the land in order to advance the greater public good. Recognizing that an outright confiscation would be problematic, government officials pushed for a ‘voluntary sale’ while also making it clear that the land could be ‘compulsorily acquired’ through the use of the Public Works Act. As noted, Mangatu 1, 3, and 4 were the bulk of what remained to Māori following the alienations of the late nineteenth century. Māori owners were loathe to part with any more land because of the impact it would have on their īwi. In addition to this, Māori did not want to be held responsible by their descendants for further alienations.\textsuperscript{108}

Despite Māori attempts to explore routes other than sale, the Commissioner of Crown Lands (CCL) had fixed upon the idea of government ownership. The owners of Mangatu then announced that they would not sell though they anticipated that that would lead the government to compulsorily acquire the lands. Between 1955 and 1961, Māori were barraged with criticism over their apparent intransigence. Māori owners knew that if the lands were compulsorily acquired under the Public Works Act that they could not be held at fault by their descendants for having given up more of their ancestral lands. They also understood that compulsory acquisition would mean that the Māori Land Court would set the compensation prices, which might be higher than if the land was sold directly to the Crown. The Crown, however, then denied that it would use compulsory
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acquisition. Faced with mounting public pressure and no alternatives and at the same time saddled with serious internal conflicts over management, Mangatu Incorporation finally agreed to sell noting that they were doing so in the interests of the greater good. While they did get a pretty good price for the lands, the representative of the landowners pointed out that the lands’ value went beyond monetary consideration. The end result was that the owners of Mangatu were forced to give up the bulk of what little lands remained to them.  

In contrast to Māori landowners, Pakeha landowners in the area were encouraged to continue to try alternative methods of mitigation despite the fact that evidence against their utility. The Board helped Pakeha owners of Waipaoa Station explore whether afforestation was truly necessary in their area even though the evidence indicated that such alternatives were inadequate. Unlike with Māori owners, the government did not use “compulsory acquisition” as a possibility when negotiating with Pakeha. Coombes notes that “for Mangatu lands, agencies of land administration and environmental regulation would only accept the option of ownership transfer while, for Waipaoa Station, a mix of supervised land management with some land transfer was considered to be appropriate.” He attributes this to the fact that the Board believed that Pakeha were inherently better at managing their lands.

Afforestation was initiated in the 1960s and ran through the 1980s (smaller projects continued afterwards). Coombes notes that while Māori were singled out as incompetent land managers and forced to give up those parts of their holdings that were
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most erodible, which were then planted as Mangatu Forest, those Pakeha farmers who refused to accommodate afforestation undermined the mitigation plan. Some Pakeha farmers never parted with their lands. While the afforestation has reduced erosion in planted areas, it did not have an effect on the flats as so much displaced material was already stored in upper rivers and would continue to be transported. For example, only six percent of the Waipaoa headwaters were planted, but it would have taken thirty percent to make a significant impact on erosion.\textsuperscript{112}

With regard to the Red Report, Māori were again excluded from participating in the study or the decision-making process. This lack of inclusion of Māori in important decision-making undermined the success of the plan because they needed the active participation of landowners in the implementation of afforestation. The Forest Service was not able to get Māori to agree to the project, and so they did not increase afforestation nearly enough. Only 76,600 acres of the erosion-prone area was afforested while 185,330 acres stayed in pasture.\textsuperscript{113}

Several authors have criticized the lack of inclusion of Māori in the afforestation process. Much of the process has been top-down, from either the national level or the local government level. While more many local people have been able to influence the process to their advantage, these people are usually Pakeha. While the East Coast Forestry Project attempted to address Māori concerns these were dropped after the 1998 review. Māori communities have largely been excluded for planning and decision-making.\textsuperscript{114}
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6.3.3.2 CHANGING ATTITUDES TOWARDS AFFORESTATION

One of the main problems with leasing and with exotic forestry is that it usually involved an exclusion of Māori from the management and kaitiakitanga of their lands. As such, it is a further loss of autonomy and tino rangatiratanga. Writing in 1978 Everts explains:

A meaningful involvement in the management of their lands is becoming the paramount factor in the lease negotiations. Presently once a lease has been signed, the owners have virtually no say in the use of their land for 99 years. Profit maximizing companies are not keen to have the land owners partake in the decision making process.\textsuperscript{115}

Rau, writing about the Blue Line recommendations of the Taylor Report, notes that the people in the Waiapu portion of the Te Tairāwhiti region were initially hostile to the idea of retiring so much land from agriculture:

The whole community, farmers from both sides of the line, the whole Maori population whose minds were filled with land rights and traditions, were in complete opposition to the scheme even to the point of some actually developing a hatred for the pine trees, classing it as something in the line of the world of noxious weeds.\textsuperscript{116}

Eventually various people were more open to the social, environmental, and economic benefits that forestry would bring. But, it would seem that a lot of the early opposition to forestry emanated from the idea that these people were being told what to do by outsiders and did not have a say in the management of the lands in their region. This makes sense in light of the heavy-handed way in which Te Aitanga-a-Mahaki were treated when it came to Mangatu.

Conversely, as people have been included in the process, allowed to retain ownership of their lands and management of those lands, their views on forestry have
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changed. In the 1993 Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAF) report on the impacts of forestry on rural communities the authors note that recent trends in forestry involve increased focus on the development of small-scale forests.\textsuperscript{117} Citing Murray they write:

This growth in Agroforestry is changing the attitudes of the rural community towards forestry, away from fear towards acceptance. The change in attitude has come about [because] farmers have been allowed to retain control of forestry development.\textsuperscript{118}

While this generally applies to rural peoples, this has particular resonance for Māori who have continually expressed a desire to have control over their land management.

6.3.4 THE RESTRUCTURING OF THE NEW ZEALAND FOREST SERVICE

The forestry sector underwent massive restructuring in the 1980s. The New Zealand Forest Service was replaced by the profit-oriented Forestry Corporation (FC). The NZFS had often operated with a social mandate in that it provided jobs to underserved regions. Many of these elements were phased out. This had a deleterious effect on forestry towns. The populations of these were frequently young, rapidly growing, and predominantly Māori. Murupara’s population was 76 percent Māori at that time; Kaingaroa and Kawerau had similar proportions.\textsuperscript{119}

6.3.4.1 TE UREWERA-KAINGAROA

Restructuring was particularly difficult for Te Urewera-Kaingaroa because so much of the region was built around the forestry sector. The region had already been
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struggling with an inability to meet the needs of its rapidly growing population. There was a dearth of jobs and housing as well as increasing crime rates. Social service agency officials argued that the impacts of the downsizing could not be isolated from a wider socio-economic context of “employment, housing, education, health and social welfare.” Moreover, the effects would be long-lasting and severe.¹²⁰

The authors of the report remark “that the social impacts of restructuring are falling heavily on small predominantly Māori populations in this District.”¹²¹ Māori from Kaingaroa Forest reported several social problems affecting all age groups; “disenfranchised youth, of older people too proud to go on the dole [unemployment benefits] and of people giving up education plans to stand by family.” They also noted the great amount of difficulty that Māori were experiencing as they attempted to navigate the bureaucracy when filing unemployment claims. Another issue was that many tangata whenua would be unwilling or unable to move for work. Partially this can be attributed to lifestyles that integrated wage based employment supplemented by subsistence hunting and fishing. Another consideration was the integrity of the social community, which was an important social support system. In addition, one quarter of the workforce resided in state or subsidized housing system. In order to maintain the housing arrangement, Minginui and Kaingaroa were both earmarked to be transferred from Forest Service management to that of Māori Affairs.

One of the strategies for assisting the newly unemployed was the Enterprise Opportunity Scheme. This was established to help people set up small business or set up contracts to work in forestry. While many people took advantage of these opportunities,
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there were many questions about the long-term viability of these new jobs. There was
evidence of strains between contract workers and their employers.122

The creation of the state afforestation system and its attendant processing
industries led to massive changes to the landscape in terms of ownership, access, and
relationships. This involved new infrastructure, new towns, and the resettlements of many
people, including Māori. Native peoples have often been subjected to a mixture of
coercion and cooperation, and State actions have often affected Māori connections to
land. While MacLennan and Durand have described the promise of job security and good
wages in return for tangata whenua labor as a social contract, Walzl argues that these
agreements must be contextualized within the broader framework of Treaty of Waitangi
relations. He notes that while the transfer of forestry assets was recognized as a Treaty
issue, the dismantling of the Forest Service and the attendant redundancy of so many
employees, most of whom were Māori, was tantamount to a new breach of treaty
principles and mistreatment of Māori. He notes that of the 1500 people who were
eliminated from FS employment, at least eighty percent were Native. The very same
people who had experienced such extensive and disruptive changes as a part of the
creation and evolution of the government’s forest industry were also the ones who
suffered from its privatization.123

The full time employment and changes that were brought about through the
development of the production forestry industry made it seem like the sale of Kaingaroa
had been worth it. People in the area experienced a high standard of living and
educational opportunities for children. In terms of the restructuring of the forestry sector,
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the privatization of the 1980s was built on changes that had already been under way.

From the 1960s to the 1980s the government had gradually reduced its involvement in Kaingaroa Logging Company until the company was wholly owned by Tasman.

Attendant with this change in ownership structure was a shift from “a totally caring, even paternalistic employer to a more businesslike approach.”124 When the Labour Government implemented its changes in 1987, this was in line with what had already been happening. When people were fired from the Forest Service, the unemployment rate in Kaingaroa Village went from “nil to 90%.”125

One of the concerns about the restructuring was that several towns in the area were single-industry locales which were based around forestry. Kaingaroa, Murupara, and Minginui were all heavily interdependent on forest work. Further, both Kaingaroa and Minginui were largely company towns, where the employer also provided the majority of housing. In both of these towns, there was serious concern about whether or not the community would be able to continue and who would ultimately be responsible for administering the town. In the case of Kaingaroa Village, the Crown decided that Ngati Manawa were the historic owners and it was to them that management of the hamlet would be transferred.126

Unemployment continues to be a significant problem in the area. According to one report, “in 1991 only 25% of Murupara adults were in full time employment

and…86% of the population [was] Maori.” As Paul and Paul point out, one of the main sources of bitterness is that current forest companies frequently employ outsiders. Considering the years of loyalty that tangata whenua had provided, this is unacceptable to them.

The end result is that tangata whenua of this region have a long, messy history of relationships with the Crown and with forestry. They have lost lands which now support pines, they own many lands which are leased for forestry, they have been involved as direct employees of the forestry industry, and, more recently, they have lost jobs from forestry. Given the many changes that Māori in the region have experienced, this next section focuses on some local perspectives on the system of forestry and its impacts.

6.3.4.2 TE TAIRĀWHITI

There was concern over how restructuring would impact the erosion control program known as the East Coast Project. Because the new Forestry Corporation (FC), the branch responsible for afforestation, was supposed to be primarily profit-oriented, this would eliminate funding for East Coast Forestry Project unless government agreed to continue subsidizing it. The NZFS restructured in March 1987. By that time, the agency had afforested approximately 89,200 acres of land. It had also been responsible for giving grants to private landowners for further afforestation as well as subsidizing other soil conservation measures.¹²⁸

The severity of the 1988 Cyclone Bola had an impact on the government’s decision regarding involvement in erosion control and afforestation. While on the whole

¹²⁸ Phillips and Marden, 530.
the afforested areas survived the storm, not nearly enough lands had been reforested to offset extreme erosion. The damage from flooding and erosion on pastoral lands was so extensive that the national government decided that it had to continue with afforestation. 129

This led to the establishment of further forestry projects. The first was the East Coast Conservation Forestry Scheme, which operated between 1989-1993. Interestingly, this was meant to create strictly protection forests. It operated for 5 years, during which time 33,550 acres were planted. The East Coast Forestry Project (ECFP) replaced that project in 1992. This was the first comprehensive project to address the needs of the entire region rather than focusing at the level of the catchment. Initially, this project focused not only on erosion control, but also social concerns such employment issues and advancing Māori economic interests. It was under the ECFP that Ngati Porou Whanui Forests (NPWF) was formed; though the actual process was fraught with difficulties (see Figure 15). The project was meant to achieve 17,300 acres of plantings per year in order to reach 494,200 acres by the year 2020. After a review in 1998, however, the goals were revised to again focus on soil conservation. Writing in 2004, Phillips and Marden note that the project has only achieved approximately half of its intended goal in the amount of time allotted. 130

Coombes is critical of the impacts of restructuring on the goals of erosion control. 131 First, those plantings prior to dissolution of the NZFS had not been extensive enough to address the landslide risk. Yet much of that forest was sold during the NZFS

129 Phillips and Marden, 531-532.
130 Phillips and Marden, 531-532., 532-533.
131 Coombes, 138-139.
restructuring for production purposes. In the 1990s, about 250,000 tons of logs were harvested from Mangatu on an annual basis. This was the very same Mangatu that the government had coerced Te Aitanga-a-Mahaki to part with for the good of the nation.

The original objectives of the afforestation schemes, especially erosion control, have been irrevocably altered by the intrusion of commercial enterprise... Put simply, production and profit objectives conflict with the goals of erosion control.  

Figure 14. Photo of Ngati Porou Whanui Forests
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133 Coombes, 138-139.
The cutting rights of the forests have been sold and there are few protections built into the contracts to ensure that protection against erosion continues to be implemented.

Coombes also notes several flaws with the erosion mitigation efforts following restructuring.\textsuperscript{134} The plantings that took place after the dismantling of the NZFS coincided with a general ‘third planting boom, which commenced in 1987. The problems of Cyclone Bola had revived an interest in protection forestry and the government was to provide subsidies for people to plant trees on own lands. This emphasis on protection was short-lived before a return to the protection/production combination. Eligible landowners were to given a subsidy for the plantings. The subsidy was ninety-five percent of cost, however, it was only available for \textit{radiata}. The point is that the renewed emphasis on forestry was specifically that of commercial forestry, not strict protection afforestation. Also, the projects emphasized the economic values of afforestation in terms of regional development.

Another major problem with the new efforts was that they led to the clearance of secondary growth native bush. From 1993 to 1997, about 3360 acres of mature scrub were removed in preparation of afforestation. Research indicates that native scrub such as manuka and kanuka achieve a closed canopy in fifteen years at which time they are as effective as eight-year old pine stands in achieving soil stabilization. In 2000, a new provision eliminated subsidies for scrub clearance. However, the grants had become a means to get government to subsidize the development of unproductive lands. What ended up happening was that was afforestation on areas that did not need it while other areas that did need erosion control were not afforested. Only a small portion of the

\textsuperscript{134} Coombes, 136-137.
seriously eroding land in the headwaters was planted. While 378,000 acres of Te Tairāwhiti land has been planted in forests, only half of that was on severely eroding land.  

Though the government did continue to invest in afforestation, the restructuring placed a heavier financial burden upon landowners. It was so expensive to afforest lands that many farmers sought private financial help through joint ventures, but then the inputs were so high and there was so much pressure to make a profit that the emphasis became more about profit than about conservation goals. So, these efforts really focused on the lands that were less eroded, which were less in need of afforestation in the first place.

Afforestation is not a perfect solution. Pasture is four to sixteen times as likely to erode under storms as compared to mature forests. While trees do stabilize soil, it takes a few years to establish the forests. For the first eight years after planting, afforested areas are not significantly more protected from erosion than are areas in pasture. The key change occurs when the canopy closes. Coombes is also highly critical of the choice of pine for afforestation as opposed to a broadleaf. There are major flaws with pine or conifers.

Broadleaf species were generally more suitable for erosion control because they intercept and transpire more water than such production species as pine. In New Zealand conditions, pine does not self seed, so it needs to be replanted at considerable cost. Moreover, trees in pine plantations typically reach maturity and die at the same time, meaning that after about 50 years erosion control benefits are lost en masse…In these justifications for radiata it is obvious that the commercial aspects of afforestation had become the undeclared intention, even if publicly the

---
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NZFS and the PBCB continued to advocate for afforestation on the basis of soil conservation.\textsuperscript{138}

Another issue is water usage. Radiata plantations do reduce water flow, though it can be argued that this is necessary in the East Coast. Last, there is the issue of whether or not the bias towards radiata reduces biodiversity at the same time monoculture increases vulnerability to pest, disease, and windfall. There have been arguments that radiata forests do have increased biodiversity over the years. However, the main reason behind the push for radiata is economic. It is less expensive to establish it as opposed to native trees (not so-called ‘scrub’). Also, a great deal of research that has gone into the preparation of radiata as well as marketing. This kind of argument discounts any of the ecological or cultural values that would be associated with restoration of native species.\textsuperscript{139}

With regard to the overall social and economic impacts of restructuring, there have been many changes. One of these has been a shift towards more foreign ownership of forests and/or forest assets. In terms of private ownership, the trend is towards small-scale over corporate ownership. However, estimates with regard to the East Coast indicate that non-locals are over-represented as employees in the area. Despite an initial intention of addressing Māori socio-economic issues, this was dropped in 1998.\textsuperscript{140}

### 6.4 TREES AND PLACE

The materiality of place is central to its formation. This includes lands, waters, animals, plants, and people. Since trees are particularly large presences on the land, they

\textsuperscript{138} Coombes, 133.
\textsuperscript{139} Phillips and Marden, 531-540.
\textsuperscript{140} Phillips and Marden, 538-539.
are significant to human interactions with place. This next section discusses the relationships between trees and place in terms of tree discourses and how trees and place mutually co-constitute one another.

Before delving into the cultural meanings of forests and woods, it is important to detail some of the ways in which they were used. Langton notes that prior to the shift from human dependence on animate and organic energy to a reliance on hydrocarbons, people expended a great deal of their time in subsistence production. This left a very small amount of resources for producing surplus or for travel. As a result, people were highly dependent on their localities for their needs; Langton refers to them as ‘ecosystem people.’ This is opposed to the situation following the Industrial Revolution wherein the ‘mineral based economy’ enabled a transition to ‘biosphere people’ who consumed products from around the world. It is in this pre-Industrial Revolution context that early relationships between people and tree-places developed.

Forests and woodlands were complex ecosystems that served as habitat for animals and provided essential subsistence needs for humans. Forests continued to serve as important sources of other material needs even after people developed agricultural skills that eventually supplant hunting and gathering. Forests provided basic needs such as fuel in the form of wood, “peat, gorse, heather, and bracken” for cooking and heating homes, timber and material for homes and tools. People used a variety of different forest products, not just the wood alone. Scott lists the following:

Foliage and its uses as fodder and thatch; fruits, as food for people and
domestic animals; twigs and roots, for making medicines and for tanning;
sap, for making resins; and so forth.143

Woodlands were an important source of fish, fowl, other animal protein, and fur (though
this depended on the laws regarding hunting). Forests were also important for grazing
cows and swine. As such, for many people, forests provided various material items that
were essential to survival. Beyond these material needs, the woods served a variety of
cultural purposes such as “magic, worship, [and] refuge.”144

Jones and Cloke develop a more “closely theorized and firmly grounded analyses
of the interconnections between nature-society relations and place relations” arguing that
it is the unique specificity of places that shape these relationships.145 Their main focus is
on how trees actively contribute to the formation and production of place in ways that are
culturally, temporally, and spatially specific. As mentioned above, places themselves are
sites of contested meanings. As trees are a part of the fluid fabric of place, the ways in
which they are experienced and understood are also sites of contestation. Jones and Cloke
use the term ‘arbori-cultures’ to describe the symbolic and material aspects of trees and
how they are interpreted and negotiated by people in place.146

Jones and Cloke argue that not only do cultures change, but so do cultural
constructions of the natural world.147 They write that the “‘geographical and ecological
features of community are rarely incidental to political and cultural struggle: they

143 Scott, 12.
144 Scott, 13, See also pg. 12-13; Coates, 46-47; Perlin, 168, 191-193.
145 Owain Jones and Paul Cloke, Tree Cultures: The Place of Trees and Trees in Their Place, (Oxford:
146 Jones and Cloke, 1-22.
147 Jones and Cloke, quoted on pg. 20. see also 19-46.
contextualize – enable and constrain – relations of power’.\textsuperscript{148} Using James Duncan’s concept of the landscape as text, which employs an ‘iconographic approach’ to interpret the symbolic meanings of landscapes, Jones and Cloke draw attention to trees. They argue that “tree-landscapes are bound up with all manner of powerful cultural constructions, not least national identity.”\textsuperscript{149}

Several authors elaborate upon some of the varied, overlapping, and contradictory meanings which are attached to trees in terms of tree-places.\textsuperscript{150} Jones and Cloke note that representations of forests and woodlands can range from deeply held cultural fears about forests as the ‘other’ to civilization to more positive resonances where woods are places of freedom or safe haven.\textsuperscript{151} They compare these with valuations of individual trees, which can acquire venerable status as ‘veteran’ or ‘champion’ trees or be considered nuisances, often based on certain qualities and location. The specific characteristics that affect tree meaning can further be attributed to species differences. One example of some of the unique associations of species is the oak, which in England is a symbol of refuge for outlaws, a haven for kings, and the heart of a seafaring nation, to name but a few.

With regard to tree species, there are material and symbolic meanings derived from the relationships between tree biology and culture. The former relate to a set of dualisms associated with trees that include: native/alien; deciduous-evergreen; young/old. Each of these are associated with a variety of cultural constructions. Even these are not straightforward for if a species has become embedded in a culture long enough, this may

\textsuperscript{148} Whitt and Slack quoted in Jones and Cloke, 20.
\textsuperscript{149} Jones and Cloke, 20.
\textsuperscript{151} Jones and Cloke, 23-36.
negate an ‘alien’ status, such as orchard trees in England. The latter encompasses the different ways in which trees are implicated in myths, imagination, aesthetics, and traditions. “In differing cultural settings, trees are symbols of life-cycle rituals, the human body, environmental efficacy, green politics, vitality, strength, cultural identity, history, and self-generating power.”152 These symbols and meanings can be found in national, regional, and local cultures, and when it comes to identity, these representations can often be in conflict with one another.153

Trees also play significant roles in society in terms of production and consumption with ‘working trees’ being distinguished from one another as ‘cropped’ (cut down), ‘harvested,’ and ‘deployed’ (in landscaping).154 Jones and Cloke note that there are close connections between the aesthetics of landscaping where “trees represent nature in built-up space” and where trees have therapeutic effects on people or on contaminated lands.155 Trees can also be working trees in terms of conservation where trees serve as habitat for wider ecosystems, though this should not obscure individual trees which are conserved for their own sake.156

Using Casey’s concept of embodiment where knowledge is generated by the body’s immersion in the world, Jones and Cloke argue that trees given their size and material form are major generators of sensations, spaces and perspectives with which, through our senses, we engage with place and with nature. These engagements once more represent to us a very significant elision of materiality and culture, bound into everyday encounters of local places.157
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Thus, it is not just the cultural meanings attached to the physical characteristics of trees, but also their physical presence where trees are not passive features on the landscape but active creators of the world around them. Trees by their very presence change and shape the characteristics of place and by their size and scale impress themselves upon us vertically where they may dominate or occlude visibility. Trees also influence the senses in a variety of ways for different trees have different colors, shapes, textures, sounds smells, and filter light differently. Moreover, these attributes change depending on the seasons, the time of day, and the life stage of the tree. Trees can also capture characteristics of place such as direction of prevailing winds, the existence of hardpan, heavy snow loads, or evidence of general neglect. These are some the ways in which trees shape place independently of people. This issue of the power of trees has particular salience to this dissertation in that I address the ways in which the extensive presence of exotic trees may or may not contribute to qualitatively different characteristics of place.158

Typically active engagement with the world has been attributed to beings that have agency, namely humans. We tend to think of how we influence the world as though all non-humans are just the stage of our work, but the non-human world also shapes us. Jones and Cloke carefully demonstrate that agency also exists in Nature and work to disassemble agency, particularly in terms of trees.159 With an expanded conceptualization of agency, they demonstrate that trees are routine and transformative, display purpose, and have the capacity to act. One of the ways they do this is by drawing attention to those

158 Jones and Cloke, 88-94.
159 Jones and Cloke, 47-71.
different temporal rhythms of the world that largely get ignored by humanity, such as circadian, seasonal, the life cycle of different plant species (such as trees), glacial, etc. By considering different paces of time, it is possible to see how trees, which can be extremely long-lived as compared to human life cycles, can shift through different relationships with people and thus different cultural connotations. One example they give is of trees planted in a formal, ordered cemetery which eventually exceed their allotted spaces and begin to self-seed and colonize the tight spaces between grave stones, eventually converting a Victorian place of orderly burial to an ecologically diverse ‘wild’ area and thus subverting original human intentions. Human interactions with trees, as with other non-humans, is greatly influenced by the innate disposition of the other. Jones and Cloke offer the example of pruning, which they note “is not an arbitrary process imposed on trees. It is an accomplishment which has evolved over a long period of time, where the desire to control the tree is shaped by the biology of the tree.”\textsuperscript{160} Regardless of human activity, trees have a form of agency that is “transformative, purposive and reflective.”\textsuperscript{161}

Trees and forests have a prominent role in Māori culture. They are essential for various material and consumptive needs. They are also closely tied up with tangata whenua spiritual and cultural considerations. In the Māori worldview, the god who produced the forests and its inhabitants, Tane, was later responsible for creating the first human, Hine-ahu-one. Trees and forests are, therefore, closely related to people. Forests are also considered to be sacred not only because trees as viewed as the “hair” that

\textsuperscript{160} Jones and Cloke, 68.
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occupies the body of Earth-Mother, *Papatuanuku*, but because burial grounds and other cultural sites of significance are located in them.

In addition to the forests, the lands they occupy are of significance. As previously discussed, maintaining control over tribal lands is the means by which Māori achieve *mana whenua*, or power and authority associated with lands. A link with territory is also wrapped up in social connections with kingroups, genealogy, and the wider cosmos. The strength and authority of a person, family, or sub-tribe are derived from these associations. The land is also the source of knowledge and identity. Thus, caring for and keeping ties with it are essential to various aspects of Māori society and are central to the issue of *tino rangatiratanga*, or having control over one’s own concerns.

The introduction of large-scale exotic plantations dramatically changed the physical landscape. Some areas were devoid of forests, such as the Kaingaroa Plateau, but other places were deforested for timber or other building materials and replanted in pines. In addition, the presence of the trees meant new economic relationships.

These changes have not been imposed on passive peoples.162 In some cases, the economic opportunities that the trees provide have been welcome. But, the primacy of forestry in local economies made them vulnerable to the outside market. This especially became a major concern with the restructuring of the industry and the dissolution of the State Forest Service.163 Many Māori would like to maintain indigenous forests on their land, but some are subject to tax and do not generate income. Even then the decision to lease land for exotic forestry is not simple. Some people question whether or not it will
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actually provide many long-term jobs. There has also been criticism of the planted forests.

There are some in the community who bemoan the loss of indigenous forest and feel some resentment of the commercial pressures which force owners into forestry leases…Some of the elders point to [problems with previous plantings] and suggest that proper respect was not shown for urupa [burial sites] and wahi tapu [sacred sites] there.164

When asked whether the “rigid rows of pine saplings” affect the balance of the forests, Hohepa Kereopa answered

I think it does. But then, I have to readjust my own thinking about balance, because it will be a long time before they stop planting these trees and they bring jobs and development to lots of our people. So until we are all on the same level of thinking, and until we all see that we might not need all this extra development, then it will go ahead. So my focus is on the land that has not been developed – the land that is still how it was in the old days, and that is where there is still this balance. The only risk I can see is that if more land gets turned into pine forests, then the balance is lost…But for me, the pine trees represent the selfish side of things, and they are a challenge to the natural world that we understand.165 166

One of the main problems with leasing and with exotic forestry is that it usually involved an exclusion of Māori from being involved in the management and kaitiakitanga of their lands. Not only does this prevent Māori from meeting their cultural obligations to care for the land, but it is also an alienation from land as place with all of its connotations about family, social connections, and historic occupation. In addition,

164 Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne, 154.
166 Mary Louise Pratt, "Transculturation and autoethnography: Peru, 1615/1980," in Colonial Discourse/ Postcolonial Theory, ed. F. Barker, P. Hulme, and M. Iversen (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994); Mary Louise Pratt, Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation, (London; New York: Routledge, 1992), 7-9. Hohepa Kereopa’s descriptions are a form of autoethnography, wherein he represents his world in ways that engage with the colonizer’s own terms. It is critical to note that my citations and interpretations of his ideas are not autoethnography.
this entails a further loss of autonomy and *tinorangatiratanga*. Writing in 1978 Everts explains:

> A meaningful involvement in the management of their lands is becoming the paramount factor in the lease negotiations. Presently once a lease has been signed, the owners have virtually no say in the use of their land for 99 years. Profit maximizing companies are not keen to have the land owners partake in the decision making process.  

Rau, writing about the Blue Line recommendations of the Taylor Report, notes that the people in the Waiapu portion of the East Coast-Gisborne region were initially hostile to the idea of retiring so much land from agriculture:

> The whole community, farmers from both sides of the line, the whole Maori population whose minds were filled with land rights and traditions, were in complete opposition to the scheme even to the point of some actually developing a hatred for the pine trees, classing it as something in the line of the world of noxious weeds.  

Eventually various people were more open to the social, environmental, and economic benefits that forestry would bring. But, it would seem that a lot of the early opposition to forestry emanated from the idea that these people were being told what to do by outsiders and did not have a say in the management of the lands in their region. This makes sense in light of the heavy-handed way in which Te Aitanga-a-Mahaki were treated when it came to Mangatu.

> Conversely, as people have been included in the process, allowed to retain ownership of their lands, and involved in the management of those lands, their views on forestry have changed. In the 1993 Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAF) report on the impacts of forestry on rural communities the authors note that recent trends in
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forestry involve increased focus on the development of small-scale forests.\textsuperscript{169} Citing Murray they write:

This growth in Agroforestry is changing the attitudes of the rural community towards forestry, away from fear towards acceptance. The change in attitude has come about [because] farmers have been allowed to retain control of forestry development.\textsuperscript{170}

While this generally applies to rural peoples, this has particular resonance for Māori who have continually expressed a desire to have control over their land management.

Taken together, these different strands of the discussion on trees and place reveal some of the many complicated ways that trees and people interact in place through time. These are central to issues of Māori autonomy, relationships to place, and place as a source of identity. Thus, the large-scale exotic plantations are not simply a matter of a foreign presence in the midst of a cultural context, the trees actively shape place. Another important consideration is what these tree relationships can illustrate about broader social issues and trends, such as role of society in global warming, indigenous relationships with the state, environmental concern over rapid harvesting and replanting, and economic relationships with the land.

This chapter has addressed the particularities of scientific forestry as it developed in New Zealand. Though it was produced through the combination of imported ideas, foreign peoples, and based around a California tree, many factors specific to New Zealand were integral to the trajectories of the emerging Forest Service. This chapter has also addressed the peculiar aspects of \textit{Pinus radiata} that enabled it to successfully dominate industrial forestry. In addition, the chapter has addressed questions about how

\textsuperscript{169} University of Otago Consulting Group,  
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the new industry affected Māori in terms of employment opportunities, social relationships, and access to lands as well as how Māori have responded to these new conditions. Another aspect of forestry was that its success relative to the preeminence of agriculture created a land shortage that brought undeveloped Māori land to the attention of various government agencies. This led to the long-term leases of Native lands for the purpose of establishing more plantations. All of these developments meant a variety of relationships between tangata whenua and the new forests. The next chapter will address individual Native perspectives on these changes and the exotic tree farms.
CHAPTER 7. “FRICION”: THE IMPORTANCE OF PLACE IN A GLOBAL WORLD

7.1 INTRODUCTION

In the first chapter, I introduced theory, key questions, and my methodology. In the second chapter I discussed the theoretical framework, which is grounded in the interplay or “friction” between forces emanating from the global and local levels. The subsequent chapters then addressed the introduction to Aotearoa/New Zealand of spatializing strategies as applied to property rights, landscape transformation, and forest management, and also dealt with Māori struggles to retain autonomy, or tino rangatiratanga, in the face of these changes and their responses to new economic opportunities. Recognizing that Māori cultures are grounded in place-based consciousness and relationships with land and yet that all cultures feature dynamism and hybridity, this chapter is devoted to Māori responses to these changing conditions and their perspectives on land. These issues can be best illustrated by the observations of the actual participants from Māori communities. To that end, I conducted a series of in-depth conversations with selected Māori about their attitudes towards exotic forestry.

This chapter presents my findings from the two case studies and analyses of their meaning in the context of changing relationships between the global and the local. The main portion of this chapter is a discussion of extended quotes from conversations with the participants who were first introduced in Chapter One (see Table 1 for a list of the interviewees, their regional and tribal affiliations, and their relationships to forestry). While talking to the selection of tangata whenua about their experiences with exotic forestry several key themes emerged. These include: landscape change, income vs. access, settlement claims, and source of identity. Woven into these themes are broader
Table 1. List of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renee</td>
<td>Te Urewera-Kaingaroa</td>
<td>Ngati Whare/Ngati Manawa</td>
<td>Law student/daughter of forestry worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaru</td>
<td>Te Urewera-Kaingaroa</td>
<td>Ngati Whare/Te Arawa/Tūhoe/Tuwharetoa/Ngati Manawa</td>
<td>Librarian/chair of forestry trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapata</td>
<td>Te Urewera-Kaingaroa</td>
<td>Tūhoe, Ngāti Ruapani, Te Arawa</td>
<td>Lecturer/Has shares in trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Toetoe</td>
<td>Te Urewera-Kaingaroa</td>
<td>Ngati Manawa</td>
<td>Semi-retired logging contractor/Has shares in trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliza Cairns</td>
<td>Te Urewera-Kaingaroa</td>
<td>Ngati Pikiao</td>
<td>Logging contractor/Has shares in trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Cairns</td>
<td>Te Urewera-Kaingaroa</td>
<td>Tūhoe</td>
<td>Logging contractor/Has shares in trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamati Cairns</td>
<td>Te Urewera-Kaingaroa</td>
<td>Ngati Pikiao/Tūhoe</td>
<td>Logging contractor/Has shares in trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renata Marsters</td>
<td>Te Urewera-Kaingaroa</td>
<td>Ngati Pikiao</td>
<td>Has shares in trust/Has copy of family lease contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Kiel</td>
<td>Te Urewera-Kaingaroa</td>
<td>Tūhoe</td>
<td>Maintenance at Te Puia Springs/Has shares in trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willy Newton</td>
<td>Te Urewera-Kaingaroa</td>
<td>Ngati Pikiao</td>
<td>Logging contractor/Has shares in trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett Newton</td>
<td>Te Urewera-Kaingaroa</td>
<td>Ngati Pikiao</td>
<td>Logging contractor/Has shares in trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ruru</td>
<td>Te Tairāwhiti</td>
<td>Te Aitanga-a-Mahaki</td>
<td>Former NZFS forester, forestry consultant/Chair of trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kopua</td>
<td>Te Tairāwhiti</td>
<td>Ngati Porou</td>
<td>Retired manager of Ngati Porou Whanui Forests/Has shares in trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Te Tairāwhiti</td>
<td>Ngati Porou</td>
<td>Retired manager of Ngati Porou Whanui Forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tui</td>
<td>Te Tairāwhiti</td>
<td>Ngati Porou</td>
<td>Lawyer/Member of community trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haro</td>
<td>Te Tairāwhiti</td>
<td>Ngati Porou</td>
<td>Member of community trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>Te Tairāwhiti</td>
<td>Ngati Porou</td>
<td>Member of community trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makere</td>
<td>Te Tairāwhiti</td>
<td>Ngati Porou</td>
<td>Member of community trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncle Dick</td>
<td>Te Tairāwhiti</td>
<td>Ngati Porou</td>
<td>Affiliate of community trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

issues of ancestral and cultural connections to place, relationships with forests, and the economic viability of Native communities. In other words, how these indigenous people...
continually negotiate and balance cultural needs and values with the everyday realities of living in an industrialized nation. The quotes are presented thematically in order to give a sense of the variety of ways in which these individuals perceive different aspects of industrial forestry. I expect that these interviews will highlight diversity of opinion between Māori, the dynamism of culture, and some of the variety of relationships with forestry.

7.2 LANDSCAPE CHANGE

The first theme is landscape change in terms of the physical presence of pines. Forests are important within Māori culture, not only as a source of food and resources, but in a deeper sense of cultural connection. As a holistic or integrative peoples, the relationships between Māori and trees are closely tied up with their metaphysical worldview. The trees themselves hold a special position within the Māori imaginary as well as within their genealogy. As such, trees have a particularly powerful role in structuring their sense of place. No less important is the fact that many forests contain sites of cultural significance including ancient battleground, fortresses, and burial sites.

7.2.1 NATIVE VS. EXOTIC

Most Māori with whom I spoke feel that there is no comparison between a native forest and an exotic one (Figure 15 and Figure 16). The idea actually seemed illogical to them. But, this becomes important where plantations are such an extensive presence, as in Kaingaroa. In many cases, the pines were established on scrub tussock land. In other
Figure 15. Photo of Native Forest
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Figure 16. Photo of Mature Exotic Plantation
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cases, however, they were planted on cutover lands that had once been covered in native forests. Even the idea of scrubland is problematic. While these may not be considered ecologically or aesthetically viable from a western or European point of view, their biological and cultural values should not be ignored.

Maurice, the Ngati Manawa logger, comments on the importance of native land to him and his ancestors. He says:

Native trees, it’s uh, it’s just got a different personality. It’s just got a different…feel and thing about it, you know native tree?¹

He goes on to describe why people spent time in the native forests:

Maurice: Medicine, food. Just spiritual healing, they just went. Why do I have to you know if I want to go somewhere why do I have to stop? I mean, we don’t go there to ruin the place, we go there for spiritual healing, you know, all sorts of healing.

Chris: Connect to the land?
Maurice: Connect to the land. Connect to the old people, you know, all that stuff. Why should I go to IGEA [grocery store]…Why should I have to go to the IGEA and get food, you can’t [get] what we like anyhow. You can’t get tuna [eel] there you can’t get pikopiko [fern frond] there…Every spare weekend I go up there hunt and gather.

Chris: Can you do that in the exotic forests as well as the native forests?
Maurice: Nah, not really, nope.²

Anaru, the tribal trust chair and librarian, has a similar response:

I go there every so often for recharging my batteries. It’s so peaceful…You can hear the wind whispering through the trees. It’s wonderful. Plus you get all the wildlife that live in the natives. Pigeons, kereru and all the native birds like tui. The small streams that run through. So, it’s a good place to go.

When asked whether or not there are any native birds in the exotic forests, Maurice replied:

¹ Maurice Toetoe. 2006. Interview by author. Murupara. December 18, 2006,
² Toetoe.
You see a few. A lot of introduced species: quail, pheasant, but you never see the bush robin or anything. You might see the odd pigeon flying there certain time of the year in the Douglas Fir. But, nah, they don’t live there, they don’t nest there.³

Here are a few comments by people about their perceptions of the exotic forests.

James Kiel, who works at Te Puia, and his aunt Eliza Cairns, who runs a logging company with her husband and family, have the following to say about their perceptions of the exotic forests versus the native forests.

James: It feels different in the native forests.
Eliza: Yep, the feeling ay James. You know you're from that area.
James: It’s, I don’t know, how do you explain that sort of a feeling? I can walk into a pine forest and it's just a pine tree. Doesn't mean nothing to me. [But in a native forest] you can identify a lot of native trees. The birds will be fat in may or whatever, the pigs [are] around when that tree is blooming, the deer will be here in such a such a time, I don't know what they're going to live on in a bloody pine tree, it's the same all year round. It's just, I can explain it that sort of feeling.⁴

This speaks to Jones and Cloke’s description of tree agency as it relates to a sense of place in terms of how trees create a different feel and structure to a place through their shape, height, color, texture, smell, sounds, and the ways in which they filter light.⁵ The resonates with Hohepa Kereopa’s discussion of the ways in which different trees and different forests have different energies and feelings.⁶ This is echoed in Maurice’s comment below.

To me they all look the same, they’re monotonous to me. Monotonous tree. And then every year they blanket you with this yellow stuff. Make me sick, eh…As you say, it just seems to be a repetitious thing, eh? With native we’ve got so many species, got different characters, different food source you know? I mean what can you in on a pine tree? Can’t even eat

---

³ Toetoe.
⁵ Owain Jones and Paul Cloke, Tree Cultures: The Place of Trees and Trees in Their Place, (Oxford: Berg Editorial Offices, 2002), 88-94.
the cones. Nothing. The native you can eat the berries. I mean…the bark if you’re hungry enough [laughter].

This recalls Jones and Cloke’s description of English fears of plantation forests where “the martial ranks of conifers marching across hillsides invoked scarcely settled fears of invasion as well as of cold war communism.”8 Maurice also discusses the physicality of the trees and describes some of the various ways in which native and exotic forests are different. To him, Pinus radiata are all the same. He notes the difference in the animal life between native forests and pine plantations. There are some birds in the exotics, but Maurice contends that not many indigenous birds can be found there as they need to be near their food sources, and those are not typically found in the planted forests. This calls attention to the importance of the native forest as a source of food, medicine, building materials, etc.9

Maurice adds that, unlike native trees and forests, exotic plantations lacks wairua (spirit) and mana (power).10 This implies that Pinus radiata is not from the genealogical system that structures the Māori world. According to Hohepa Kereopa, “in the old days, our people treated all trees and plants as if they were of the same family as them, but just in different forms.”11 Maurice’s comments suggest that the exotic trees create a space of

---

7 Toetoe.
8 Jones and Cloke, 32.
10 Moon, 136-151.
11 Quoted in Moon, 151.
production and science rather than a place of cultural connection. In this sense, *Pinus radiata* has limited value; its worth is primarily economic.

The members of the HOMNUTI trust do not view the pine plantations as forests.

Haro says:

They’re not forests…exotic plantations, and we need to be very clear in the communities who use these terms, a forest is a *ngahere* [native forest] and some old growth traditional native species.\(^{12}\)

Anaru describes the exotic forests in this way:

There’s nothing attractive in a Māori sense. If we owned the pines that might be a different story because of the economical benefit to the people.\(^{13}\)

Despite the fact that the native forests have powerful cultural connotations for Māori, many Natives partook in logging. When asked about whether or not there was a difference between logging in the native forests versus the exotic ones, Maurice had this to say:

Maurice: Yeah, native, native forestry was, it wasn’t, how can I put it, exotic forest was, the focus was on the production. Production. Dollars per ton, dollars per tons, dollars per ton. Exotic forestry was, was sort of, not more laid back but you didn’t have that production focus on native you know. And in the native there was sort of, karakia you know. You didn’t just go in there and…

Chris: Take.

Maurice: No. If you were in a place, let’s say Ngati Whare’s, you went to them and got the blessings from the eldest people, landowners. Exotic forests it’s just, you know that focus is not there.\(^{14}\)

Willy Newton, the logger from Ngati Pikiau, describes it in this fashion:

Well, it was only, at that time you knock one two three trees down it was a day’s work. [laughs] Now couple hundred trees. Yeah, it was just one tree you see it was so huge. Two trees and you get it onto a skid, it suited the
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\(^{12}\) HOMNUTI Trust. 2007. Interview by author. Ruatoria, N.Z. January 16,

\(^{13}\) Anaru Te Amo. 2006. Interview by author. Rotorua. December 4, 2006,

\(^{14}\) Toetoe.
time when labor and time was no factor, in those days. Today it’s about production.  

George Cairns, Eliza’s husband, also comments on the meanings associated with the different forests:

All those people own the lands, all those forest companies own the trees, and that’s all it is, it’s just money. But you’ve got a cultural difference between the native and the pine. More people will, especially the people out there, got nothing to do with forestry, will go towards to the native because it’s their heritage. Pine isn’t. You grow pine trees in twenty-five years. You can’t grow native in twenty-five years. And that’s the difference, one is spiritual and one is not.

George and Eliza’s son Tamati says:

Yeah, it’s a bit tricky that one cause I like native trees and that, but if I didn’t have the pines you know I wouldn’t be working.

For these people, the planted forests are basically tree farms. This demonstrates hybridity; they participate in a capitalism-based system, but their cultural values influence their decisions. The Cairns have adapted to changing circumstances and see forestry as a means to participate in the economy. They do, however, note that the situation is not ideal. In addition to earning money through their contract, they have ownership shares in land that is leased to forestry companies. They recognize that such arrangements do not benefit the owners as much as the lessees. This speaks to McManus, Lowood, and Scott’s discussions of the ways in which scientific forestry has converted forests into human-made spaces of production. These comments on the ways in which the trees affect the

---

16 Cairns et al.
feeling of the place resonate with a quote recorded in Walzl, which is from a man who entered the plantations as one of the early forest workers.

I couldn’t get over the silence when we opened the bus door, and hopped out. I went into the older stands of pine and it was the same there. I would talk to my mates about this and say ‘It’s like death.’ There were the forests of death. This was the land of death. It was all silent and the ground was covered by pine needles except for the occasional ugly little toadstools. And I said ‘And that’s our land. If you wanted to run away here, what would you eat.’ I just couldn’t believe it. I thought the forests would sustain food, life, but it doesn’t. The others all referred to the pines as weeds. They were not our trees. Walking amongst the pines was a deathly feeling.¹⁹

Thus, James, Eliza, Maurice, and the members of the trust are drawing a clear distinction between native forests and the pine plantations. This is evidence that trees contribute to the uniqueness of place and actively produce place in ways that are culturally, temporally, and spatially specific.²⁰ These quotes also demonstrate relationships to place that are predicated on a sensual experience of it. This resonates with phenomenological understanding of place. From their perspectives, the native forests are an extension of them and their genealogical connections to lands. In contrast, the exotic forests are ‘monotonous’ and are the outcome of state desire to produce legible, productive spaces on unproductive lands.

But, not all of the people whom I interviewed reacted as negatively to the pines. John Kopua, the retired Ngati Porou Whanui Forests manager, also views the pines as clearly distinct from forests.

The native forest eh, I think it’s closer to nature as such. And if you walk into, from my point of view, if I walk in a pine forest, a mature pine forest, I enjoy it. But, my enjoyment actually walking in a native forest is far greater. The size of the trees, the different colors, it’s not as uniform, you

²⁰ Jones and Cloke, 1-20.
know the variety in the native forest is way greater. And which is to be expected, because you know a pine forest is basically a commercial plantation as such.  

Here again is a situation of hybridity. For John Kopua, the exotic trees represent the economic triumphs of his tribe’s efforts, for which he takes pride. This is not necessarily pride in the capitalism-based achievements of the company, but in the fact that the tribe has been successful in its endeavors. He also notes the economic value of trees. Yet, he goes on to say:

But, from a plantation forester’s point of view, you know having grown a plantation forest in radiata pine…That gives you a buzz too, knowing you’ve produced something like that. And they are big trees. Can’t compete with nature though.

He is clearly proud of what he and NPWFL have achieved.

John Ruru of Te Aitanga-a-Mahaki, the retired NZFS forester who currently works as a forestry consultant, has spent a great deal more time in the native forests, largely driven by his employment in the forest sector. He reflects on what that meant in terms of a working lifestyle.

I was never brought up in the native forests…My relationship with native forests as a youth was when we used to go pig-hunting. Wasn’t until 1957 that I started working for the New Zealand Forest Service that I became very much involved with native forests only from a commercial point of view and that was assessing the value of native forests for logging. We did that on State owned forests cause most sawmill and wood coming out onto the New Zealand market was coming out of native forests, out of State forests. We camped out in them, and we stayed there until the job was finished. Sometimes the jobs would take us two weeks sometimes it’d take us three months, depending on how big an area we had to cover. I enjoyed living in native bush. Enjoyed it very much. Quite liked the way it was, we had to hunt our own meat, what we all, what I knew had to look after ourselves, had to provide for myself. When you were stuck up there in the bush, you can’t get out, you got to survive. I found that very interesting in
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21 John Kopua. 2007. Interview by author. Tokomaru Bay, N.Z. January 15,
22 Kopua.
the types of things that you heard about, read about, that you could certain
types of vegetation and native bush to supplement and you could live off
what came out of the creeks in the way of eels and introduced species like
trout. You could get those. And of course there was pigs, wild cattle
roaming those forests that we used to shoot. Another interesting thing
about working in that native environment in my young days I used to
come out, back into Rotorua and I was playing a lot of sport, particularly
rugby, come back into town and by the time we went back out into the
bush on a Monday I’d be feeling snifty, coughing, flu-ey. And just a
matter of a few days back in the bush again everything was clear. Clear.
You are walking, you are sweating all day, you’re cleaning yourself out,
you’re drinking the water out of the creeks, or boiling the billy [kettle]
with water out of the creeks. You had bread, cheese, and that’s what you
lived on, or what you shot, what your main meal was made of at night. Of
course, you had no electricity or anything like that. You’d be lying around
on your bunk there trying to read under a candle or a tea lamp. Some of us
would be out there in the tent where we all ate, and prepared our food,
trying to do the fieldwork, bookwork, that we did during that day. And we
came out back into town we were feeling fit and bright again. I’ve always
remembered that, thinking that if you can get back into that environment,
it helps to release a lot of things in you, the bad things. So, I’ve got a lot of
respect for our native forests now. So, the day I walked away from the
native bush and the way we used to, I think it’s the right thing. But, I still
think the opportunities are still there to do some sustainable harvest of our
native forests.  

In this way, John Ruru also draws a clear distinction between native and exotic forests.
Here he reflects on the dynamism of his own perspectives. When he was younger, he
objected to the conservation efforts to place a moratorium on logging in Native forests.
Though he initially participated in commercial harvesting of native forests, his views
towards them have changed and he is concerned about protecting them. From this
perspective, John actually makes an interesting argument about the value of exotic trees.
In an earlier conversation, he noted that when he was first was logging the native forests
he viewed them as limitless. But, after a while he noticed that it was more difficult to go
hunting and that people in general had to go further from their homes to get to the native
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23 John Ruru. 2007. Interview by author. Gisborne, N.Z. November 27,
forests. He notes that other people have had these changing perceptions. He suggests that
the production of exotic forests meant that less pressure was applied to the natives, and
thus the exotics served to, in a sense, save the native forests. Others may or may not agree
with this, but it is an interesting point and it also shows how his views are shaped by
changing circumstances that reflect a mixture of economic concern, cultural concern for
the land, and pragmatism. It also shows that his attitudes towards a productive industry
are not merely shaped by a capitalist value system. While jobs are important, having the
ability to go into the woods is also important. If the exotic trees can reduce the need to
log natives, then they are serving an important cultural and ecological role. His more
recent perspective is similar to that of Tamati Cairns, who says:

> I haven’t done too much of the native cutting and that, but yeah I would
say because you know it’s a bit more sacred cutting down native sort of
stuff you know. Pine trees, yeah, you see pine trees every day you know.
And that’s all man-made stuff and then…you’re cutting down a hundred
year old tree. And you know there’s a bit of, there’s a bit of feeling behind
it and that… I’d rather save it for [subsequent] generations, so my young
fella, my grandkids can see it, you know…That’s what a lot of Māoris are
about, you know, they want to try and thing it [have it] for their next
generation, generations instead of trying to make money off it, yeah they’d
rather save it.  

His comment conveys how different economic and cultural considerations are weighed
when interacting with the land.

The fact that there is, perhaps, a bit less direct involvement between the peoples
of this region with native forests may have something to do with the environmental
context. As the members of the trust note, extensive deforestation took place throughout
the region by the early twentieth century. As a result, native forests have not been a part
of the Te Tairāwhiti landscape for the past few generations.

---

24 Cairns. Interview by author.
The above comments speak to the symbolic power of trees. As Scott and Jones and Cloke note, people ascribe different, overlapping, and contradictory characteristics to trees. These meanings can be applied to individual trees or to forests and can range from positive to deeply negative. These quotes highlight the varied responses that people have to the pine trees including such qualities as ‘alien,’ ‘monotonous,’ ‘deathly,’ ‘source of cash,’ ‘source of pride,’ and ‘sustainable alternative to native.’ It is possible that so much of the ambivalence towards exotics is because they are the physical reminder that someone else is in control over their land. In this sense, the structure of the physical landscape is tied up with issues of self-determination and mana, or power associated with control over lands. Whether or not people wanted to have pines on their lands, it seems that they have become a highly symbolic entity.

Another issue is that when the planting was initially done, it was often executed with no regard for cultural features on the landscape. Sites of significance were planted over with impunity. Asked if the introduction of exotics brought a change, Maurice responded:

Yeah. Oh there’s huge change with the exotic forests, you know just a mess…inhabitants of forestry, people, they just say plant all this land you know, no consideration for anybody else.26

This is evidence of the lack of respect that Māori were afforded and a reminder of the history of land loss. Later he was specific about what some of those changes entailed:27

Chris: You said there are 70 pah [palisade protected forts], wahi tapu [sacred] sites in your core area.”
Maurice: Yeah.
Chris: And a lot of them are damaged, some of them are…
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25 Jones and Cloke, 23-36; Scott, 13.
26 Toetoe.
27 Note: The author is Chris
Maurice: All of them, all of them. I reckon that forest, there’s not many areas of more than an acre that hasn’t been planted. Our Northern boundaries where we had just around 15, 20, was guarding that Northern boundary area. Western, Southern. You know the boundaries we had.

Chris: Fortifications.

Maurice: Yeah, we were protecting our own you know?

Chris: Can you recognize the pah sites?

Maurice: Nah. You might be able to recognize the hill, not the actual sites. All those sites have been dozed.

Chris: Dozed, you mean bulldozed?

Maurice: Yeah…When you, when you look at things that happened. All planted, all planted over our sacred places. Ruined. Tractors running over them.28

Again, this is a situation in which the Crown demonstrated no respect for Māori relationships with land.

In many cases, Māori were heavily involved in planting. But, when they worked near these areas they would raise objections with their managers who, up until the last few decades, were almost exclusively Pakeha. These efforts to call attention to sites of significance were typically dismissed out of hand. Faced with the task of planting trees in these places, many Māori would fail to show up to work until the planting in that section was done. Lacking a cultural awareness of the significance of such absences, managers would often characterize Māori as unreliable or lazy. Maurice describes his father’s experience when he had done silviculture:

My Dad and he’s always told me that when they sort of come round to sacred places, they wouldn’t do any work. They were classed as being lazy. You know there’s, I’ve seen things written about those Murupara guys, those Minginui guys are lazy fellows. They don’t turn up for three weeks. The reason for that was that they were, waited til the area was planted. They didn’t want to have anything to do with it.29

He later continues:

28 Toetoe.
29 Toetoe.
Maurice: Well, that’s why I was telling you about my Dad and them.
Chris: They just wouldn’t go there…
Maurice: They just wouldn’t go in there…Because you know they were embarrassed to talk about it. They [managers] were just ‘oh don’t hand us that mumbo jumbo, do you believe in ghosts?’ We still get that now.\(^{30}\)

This involves a clash between different value systems. Māori maintain multiple connections to land, which have expanded to include market-based economic interests, but the government was focused on economic and social (through employment) benefits of forestry. Their participation in the industry highlights how Māori have embraced hybridized uses of the land, yet not solely in a capitalistic sense. They still have important cultural and social relationships with land. At that point in time, the workers could not prevent the damage to cultural sites of significance, but they refused to participate. This draws attention to some of the contested ways in which capitalism plays out in specific locales.

One of the big issues is that until the last decade Pakeha generally displayed complete insensitivity to cultural values regarding the land. This is evident in the ways that Maurice’s father and coworkers were treated when they raised objections to planting on sites of significance. Also, there was frequently a gap in time between the court recognized transfer of title and the actual implementation of land use change. When the planting began, many Māori were shocked at the change in ownership rights. Also, in the case of Ngati Manawa, their argument is that they never sold the land. These plantings were taking place on territory where there was conflict over ownership.

This brings up the struggles over place. Trees are a creative part of place, but they are also contested. As Jones and Cloke note, trees are imbricated in “powerful cultural

\(^{30}\) Toetoe.
constructions.” The above quotes demonstrated that the physicality of the place matters. The trees are the expression of the state’s effort to create a wood supply. In so doing, the state was able to exert power to impose change on appropriated lands regardless of native claims to the lands and despite impacts on cultural sites of significance. Thus, there is a great deal of ambivalence in the above comments.

Again, this involves a lack of respect for cultural relationships, including the Māori importance of turangawaewae (standing place for the feet). Further, this is an imposition of a specific framework and valuation of land. As Banner notes, according to the Pakeha view, land is primarily a commodity that can be divided up in terms of geographic space. This is in contrast to the various Māori understandings of land, not least of which is that land is something to which tangata whenua belong. While Māori are completely comfortable with earning an economic benefit from the land (note that they may disagree over the manner in which it is accomplished), they situate that income in a host of cultural, social, and ecological considerations, rather than a strictly capitalist one. This reflects their dynamism in response to changing circumstances and yet also the enduring nature of their cultural considerations in the face of the introductions of global forces.

Attitudes towards the treatment of such historical cultural features have largely changed. When discussing logging Eliza says:

Because that’s part that’s part of that area where they want to keep, preserve. And we’ve been into places where they could have pipi pit, pits over Herepuru, where pipi pits are pipi pits are historical rubbish areas where, yup from the pah sites. So we don’t go near those, but what we do is that we take them off, where all the pipi pits are meant to be and if
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31 Jones and Cloke, 20.
there’s trees around it, we have to be careful which way, okay if the tree is falling, if the tree is standing there and you’ve got a pipi pit right here you can’t fall it this way, so it’s gotta go the opposite side.  

Maurice’s experience has been different. He notes the time frame of the changes:

Maurice: Right up until a year ago, when wahi tapu sites were actually sited, put on maps and they would still go through and damage them.
Chris: They didn’t recognize them until a year ago?
Maurice: Well, they knew where they were but I mean they still let tractors and that go over them.
Chris: They knew where they were, they didn’t care.
Maurice: I put, I took some photos of those areas and took them to the hearings, Rangitaima. Did you hear of that? That they was stated in place, this year. We went and told them where it was, you know there’s just total ignorance.
Chris: They didn’t care?
Maurice: No, they didn’t care and these are significant places, significant sites. Where our ancestor had his pah site there.  

Overall, Maurice is fairly upset about the physical changes and the damage to cultural sites. His experience of place has been altered. What stands out most is his frustration at the lack of cultural sensitivity, which is also an extension of frustration at lack of control over the management of his tribal lands, or self-determination. Even though Maurice makes a living through forestry, he does not view the industry as without its problems. He judges it from a variety of perspectives that include Native concerns about place, cultural sites of significance, control over land, and responsibility to communities. His position is contingent and a product of a specific encounter between capitalism and an Indigenous place.

Maurice compares the creation of the vast timber plantations with a recent cultural conflict over the destruction of a single tree in Auckland:
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33 Cairns et al. Interview by author.
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Look what happened with that One Tree Hill, someone cut that tree down in One Tree Hill. Big hoo-ha [conflict] and it wasn’t even a native tree.”

Chris: “Is that up in Auckland?”

Maurice: “Yeah. It was a, some sort of pine, cut it down and there was a big hoo-ha about it. What about our?...People who devastated our, get away scot free.”

The incident that he mentions occurred on Maungakiekie, a dormant volcanic cindercone located in suburban Auckland. This site was one of the most important Māori pāhs in the area, prior to colonial contact. A lone native tree stood atop the peak until the mid-1800s when a Pakeha settler removed it. The tree was later replaced with a non-native pine, which was, ironically, *Pinus radiata*. Attempts at planting native trees failed. This *radiata* tree became a symbolic target of Māori activists who were seeking to draw attention to the injustices tangata whenua have suffered. After an unsuccessful attack on the tree in the 1990s, it was damaged beyond recovery in the year 2000. A great deal of controversy surrounded the incident. This again highlights the symbolic and contested quality of trees and also the subjective ways in which they are deployed and valued.

Brett Newton and his father Willy comment on the new attitudes of the Forest Service to cultural sites of significance:

Willy: Earlier days I think they didn’t worry too much about it.

Brett: Right now, if you come across anything. You can ask, they call it all off, and have a good look and archaeologists. Get the people in and check it out, and they’re the ones who know.

Willy: My opinion, personally now I think they missed the boat with that. Cause years ago they only went…You know what I mean, well we’re cutting down trees today that’s covered over those areas, what does that tell you? They missed the boat. There shouldn’t be any trees in there. To me that’s what, all the years I’ve been in there, they missed the boat. Now they coming on strong, but trees are already in those areas you see, growing.

---
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Their comments point to the fact that the creation of the planted forests involved an imposition of an European spatializing strategy on the land. Native features were damaged or planted over in the State’s effort to create a legible, productive space.

Forestry as a project has served to erase the features of the cultural landscape. Willy is arguing even though the State and forestry companies now have culturally sensitive policies current practices cannot fully undo the damage that was already done.

The landscape has been reconstituted as a center of forest resource production. The trees normalize certain relationships with land and are elements of the new “power-geometry” of place. This has other implications. The wider area changed in response to the reorganization of the region to meet industrial needs and many people, such as Ngati Manawa, were forced to relocate as well as to acclimate to the new presence of outsiders and industry.38

7.2.2 EROSION CONTROL

The issue of erosion control looms large in the Te Tairāwhiti region. All informants are keenly away of the erosion issues, though their individual attitudes toward the problem and solutions do vary. The specificity of the environment plays a strong role in shaping possible land uses. John Ruru comments on the geological conditions of certain parts of the land:

That was the sort of country that was prone to erosion because of the type of geology it has, soil mixtures [are] highly erodible…The soil’s poor, the ground when it’s wet, it soaks up all the moisture and then it just collapses. Cause you’ve got no sound rock structure underneath it.39

39 Ruru.
The people of the region are also aware and critical of the land use conversion that occurred throughout the region. John Kopua says:

I guess that, I mean the drive in the past of and the culture, I don’t mean like in my culture, I mean the culture from the point of view of the government of New Zealand was to develop land and I would say in hindsight that they probably did not know at the time, you know the full extent of that culture. Go out there, get rid of all the vegetation, put it into grass, you know farm stock. Cattle and sheep. That probably sustained itself for a while, but over longer period of time, maybe it wasn’t the best use, best land use for that country. Some of it could have sustained itself, at the pastoral level, but there is certainly a lot of it out there that should have been, should have maintained an afforestation cover. And I guess that’s where a commercial plantation forests can have it’s benefit, if you mix it up between flat country farms, cash crops, like pumpkins or sweet corn or maize, some of your other more stable country can run sheep, cattle, and the steeper more erosion prone land goes into plantation forest and that’s to me seems to be a very good utilization of of the country.40

His point is that the promotion of pastoral economy for Te Tairāwhiti was too extensive and some lands that should have remained forested were converted into grasslands. Here again is a conflict that arose from abrogation of Treaty rights, loss of autonomy, the implications of title changes, and the introduction of new economic systems of production. The trust members discuss the historic decisions that were made to clear land of forests to make way for pasturage.

Tui: We’re like 90-110 years later after the deforestation. And that’s actually just in this area. It’s not necessary to tell you, it’s probably south right down to past Gisborne, a similar …but from Te Araroa forward it’s still ngahere Māori eh? It’s still in the bush, and it’s different from then again is they don’t have the same issues we have.

Meagan: Right around to Te Kana whanau Apanui.

Haro: The reason why Whanau Apanui and those blocks specifically returns to bush is they are known as the Papatuku blocks and the leadership when these ideas of clearfelling were coming about, it was a clear split in the Māori in the tangata whenua leadership. My tipuna [ancestor] decided to come in and cut down all the trees…I mean you can
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trace it back to specific decisions in hui, on our maraes in about the 1870s eh Uncle, right after the so-called East Coast land wars when the new economy was proposed to come in. And it’s still recorded, that material is still recorded.

Tui: And the other variation that we had with tribes, other tribes around New Zealand is the geology here, just the actual natural environment here like the climate, the rainfall patterns. So this is just not, this is an area that should have stayed largely in forest because unlike areas such as the Waikato, the devastation wasn’t as bad, it’s different geology. Different stone type, different soil types, we’re quite a high rainfall area here, so when it rains it pours. And just what little issues like that that have really exacerbated the situation so that the land and the natural forces together are just like really devastating.41

This quote acknowledges that tribal elders embraced new economic opportunities and looked for ways that capitalism could benefit their communities. Unfortunately, those particular land uses were not appropriate to certain areas. The result has been a dramatic change to the physical landscape and, thus, the overall experience of people in place. While this has made it possible for Māori to participate in some ways in the new market systems, the physical conditions of the region have deteriorated as a result of deforestation.

The community trust express their deep concern about the impact of land use change upon the watershed. One of the trust members notes that

The Southern Hemisphere has the worst sediment, worst erosion on the planet. New Zealand has the worst erosion in the Southern Hemisphere and the Waipau and Waipaoa catchments have the worst erosion in New Zealand, in terms of the land moving. And the Waipau River is the worst sediment polluted river in terms of volume of sediment per whatever liter or sediment per volume of water.42
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For them, it is not just a matter of the experience of the place, but whether or not the erosion will destroy their fisheries and other natural assets. Their concern is about the long-term survival of their region.

John Ruru notes that the erosion problems drew government attention after a devastating flood in 1948.

Subsequent to 1948 there was a big flood here in Gisborne, and I was still going to school then… So, the government set up this typical committee to investigate the effects of erosion on the East Coast and Gisborne north of here, north and west of here. So, that’s that area there. The outcome of this was the East Coast Project, based in Te Tairāwhiti, which was designed to retire erosion prone land from farming to be put back into forestry. John Ruru comments:

The East Coast project was started in the headwaters here of Mangatu Forest and see all that country there, those forests? [indicates photos on wall] That’s all within the one of the forests that was established by government in 1959. Started in 1959, to arrest that type of erosion… at that stage the thinking was that you use a variety of species rather than radiata pine and in addition to that was P. migra, Douglas Fir, some Ponderosa, but again that was to, not to create a monoculture, but at the same time it was still very much in its early stages of trying to develop a forest using species that would be best suited for that environment and for that purpose.

When it first started he was not yet involved; “when that forest started in 1959 I was working in Rotorua.” He discusses the situation in Mangatu with the conflict between Māori landowners and the government over the retirement of land. Being from Te Aitanga-a-Mahaki, his people were directly affected by the sale of land. Again, this is an

---
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issue of *tino rangatiratanga* and Māori having the right to manage their own lands. John Ruru, however, approves of the erosion work that has been done by the Forest Service.

[The] government set up by the commission of the Crown lands, which was Lands and Survey, to negotiate with the Māori land owners that they were retiring that land from farming and putting it into pine trees. So, you don’t have eight thousand acres that were taken bought from the Māori owners. The Māori owners were not willing to sell. The Māori owners talked about leasing and being part of the project of planting trees. The government was only interested in acquiring the land and doing it themselves. The argument was that they could do it better than anybody else.

Chris: The government’s argument or the Māori argument?

John: No, the government’s argument. The government argued that they could do it better than anybody else. I must agree with that because in 1975 I went to the forest as the, what we used to term the Officer in Charge, that’s a New Zealand government inherited the same system as the British Commission use and they designating the people that were approved by them as officers.46

In looking back upon the impacts of the erosion control program, John considers afforestation to have been a success:

Just going back then as a result of that 1948 flood the formation of this committee here by government and to then the eventual acquiring of that land and retirement from farming were primarily to protect not only the immediate environment but the downstream values as well. So, having actually witnessed the disastrous flood in 1948 as a ten year old and seeing the results of it today and more particularly with Bola 1988…And when that 1988 Bola hit us, that infrastructure that was established was sufficient, I believe personally, to avoid any devastation coming down here to Gisborne and further down onto these flats…So, the infrastructure that was put into place was very successful…So, up to 1984 the government was successful in its policy to arrest the erosion in the headwaters of the Waipaoa River catchment. Only to a degree sufficient enough so that in 1988 the question that I posed was well on 105 percent of that Waipaoa catchment has been retired from farming and put into trees, what would happen if that five percent or that area put into trees what if it wouldn’t have been there, I would say that the stopbanks wouldn’t have held that extra water, they would have come down. See, one has got to acknowledge the fact that the retiring of that land into forest from farming has been successful. The problem is today that the
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arguments are still very much as they were back then in ‘59, 1960, and ‘65 that you can’t really deprive anybody of their desire to do what they want to do with the land they’ve got. You know we’ve still got that problem today.\footnote{Ruru. 3-5.}

John’s positive attitude towards the protection forests reflects a situation of hybridity. His views are contingent; in many ways they are shaped by his employment with the State. Through his work in the NZFS, he has been able to see the successes of the planted forests at stabilizing the soil. His views are also shaped by his desire to halt the deterioration of his lands, which has been accelerated through deforestation.

The above comments by John also illustrate that basic conflict over who should manage the land. Unfortunately, the erosion control program has met with a lot of difficulties. For one, the neoliberal government of the 1980s objected to such subsidies. John notes:

The Labour government of 1984, the Labour government wanted to do away with all the farm subsidies, all grants, including the East Coast forest project. It wanted to do away with it. But, the saving grace, put it that way, was Bola in 1988, which reinforced the need to continue planting trees. So the government did a big U-turn and they revised the East Coast project and now makes it as a grant. In other words, the landowner retires the land from farming and the government will meet a high proportion, I forget the percentages, of the costs of establishing that land in trees. That means providing the seedlings, getting them planted, then the initial releasing [?] until the trees have gotten to the stage where the canopy had closed, at which point the owner can make their own decision whether they want to prune or not.\footnote{Ruru. 5-6.}

And in general the wider farming community has opposed the retirement of their lands.

John says:

So, there was the grant scheme. So, now the uptake of that has been pretty…disappointing.

Chris: Not many people are wanting to do it?
John: No, you’ve got a new generation of people there now who they want to do what their forefathers did, keep farming. Or people who come in and don’t understand the background to this whole thing. Buy a block of land and think this is my lot…So, we have to go through this whole cycle again of debating and trying to talk people into realizing that we have got a situation that is far beyond them to try and do anything about. There’s a scheme there that the government has put out today, what the government is now saying is that the grant is available, if you don’t do anything or take that opportunity, a rule will be put in the district plan where the landowners are gonna have to retire the land and if they don’t they’ll be made to do it. And about time, from my point of view, that is the best decision the government can make because it’s making that grant available. If people aren’t prepared to take it, take advantage of it, because they can see that it’s going to be interfering with some of the productivity of the land through sheep and cattle. What they’re saying is that they would like to have a choice of species of trees and they won’t be bothered to see that one species of tree does a better job than another. But, what they want is to find the best of both worlds, grow a species that will do erosion, but at the same time they can graze under the trees. So, they’re talking about poplar trees and they were planting some in 2000. Well, poplar trees, you know they’re a deciduous species, in the winter there is no cover there at all. Radiata pine growing in the way we’ve done, it acts to soak a lot of the moisture up as it’s falling down into the ground and that’s taken up by the roots. Not to the same degree as it would in the summer through transpiration, but it protects the land far more efficiently than what poplars do. So, landowners are saying, well we’d rather grow poplars. So, they want the best of both worlds. We’re currently going through that debate…But, the problem here with erosion is only unique here to this part of New Zealand…We always have these problems. And the way to address it is to retire all that land from farming.⁴⁹

Chris Cocklin and Melanie Wall, geographers at the University of Auckland, discuss some of the various arguments advanced by farmers.⁵⁰ One was the fear that much of the expansion of forestry would be financed by corporate interests, whose purchases of land for forest plantations would then drive up land prices. There was also the concern that the advance of forestry would come at the expense of agricultural interests in terms of leading to a decline in the availability of jobs. Finally, farmers
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express concern over the impact of forestry on social life of the region. This is based on a perception of what Te Tairāwhiti should look like in terms of its “idealised landscape the social and economic relations of pastoral agriculture.” The authors note that a deep-seated antipathy to forestry is widespread in rural New Zealand. This is in contrast to the close affiliation between tangata whenua and forests. This has an odd resonance with Jones and Cloke’s discussion of European fears of forests generally in comparison with ‘civilized places.’ This also fits with European connotations with conifers. The authors note that the pastoral perception of place is one that is loosely defined yet has powerful meaning to the people of the region.

Different scholars have discussed the long-standing opposition between farming and forestry interests over land use. Settlement and conversion of land to pastoral use was once the cornerstone of New Zealand land policy. Forestry only emerged as valuable when the evidence along with national and imperial discourses regarding timber famine gained enough ground. Even so, forestry was secondary to farming, which is evident in the choice to go for exotic over native, since the latter required better quality land and time. In other words, forestry needed to quickly achieve its commercial goals rather than achieve ecological restoration. But, with the restructuring of the government in general during the 1980s, farming subsidies were also cut leading Cocklin and Wall to suggest that only now is the struggle between the two more “evenly matched.”

The conflict between farming and forestry in Te Tairāwhiti, however, is somewhat unique. The nature of forestry in the region has largely been driven by the need
to protect economic interests, which have primarily been farming, through the stabilization of upland slopes in order to protect downstream farms from flooding and damage. In addition, according to the Taylor Report, part of the problem with farming in general is the overall context of the political economy of the region, which is one of depressed land values and low employment possibilities. While there has been a decrease in agricultural jobs, the correlation between increased forestry and depressed farming has not been established as causal. The issue of decision-making still permeates. As Rau and the MAF report indicate, people are interested in managing their own lands. This, again, raises the issue of autonomy and self-determination, though that concern is not limited to the Māori populace alone. 54

Another problem was the privatization of the New Zealand Forest Service, which was initiated by the Labour Government. John Ruru describes the difference between the original mandate of the Forest Service and the changes implemented during the 1980s:

When you were working for the Crown in those days you were there: A) to establish a forest and if it wasn’t for erosion it was there for community reasons, in other words to provide employment; and B) to generate the established industry. For example, the paper mill that was established at Kawerau, that was established on the basis that they would get a continuous supply of cheap wood. The government agreed to that. They didn’t take in account of how much it was going to cost to produce it, so long as industry got it at a cheap rate where they were able to make return on their business. At our expense of growing those trees. Things changed dramatically when the Labour government came in 1984 and we had to show a profit and to show a profit we had to show that we could make the wood pay out of the cost of producing it and selling it on the market. 8 I was part of the business to set that up to make it look proper, to be profitable, so we could make a good sale of it, the forest, when we were, when the government made the decision to sell the forest in 1986...My job was to make it profitable.

Chris: The forests?
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John: The forests. For the Forest Service.\textsuperscript{55}

Chris: The government required the New Zealand Forest Service to…
John: That’s right, to show a profit. And that’s what we set out to do…So, we started logging at Mangatu, we set that up and we were able to make a profit out of that.
Chris: I thought that Mangatu was supposed to be an erosion control.
John: That’s right. You see the government came and it changed a whole lot of things. So, these forests were to stand on their own feet. So, the forests were set up for sale, 1980…the government made the decision it was going to sell these forests, think it was in 1986. 1986 these forests were put into a State Owned Enterprise in other words, as a commercial entity…Course people were aware through their diligence that these forests weren’t grown for commercial reasons, they were grown for erosion control and social reasons. In other words, to control erosion and to provide employment. So things changed rather dramatically when the Labour government came into power. So, when we set up the sale of these forests the Board of the State Owned Enterprises made up of all the commercial people those who had totally no idea about forestry on the East Coast.
Chris: They were business people…?
John: All they were interested in…I guess with people the Board set up, as I said by business people and they weren’t in the reasons behind the establishing of these forests, all they were interested in was doing what they were told to do, and that was to sell the forests…The government’s got to understand and that Board’s got to understand that these are why these forests were established is that there were here for erosion control. So, where we are today is that all these forests can be logged, going through the Resource Management Act, you get consents and conditions approved. So, Mangatu, practically all of Mangatu Forest has been logged.\textsuperscript{56}

John is critical of the government’s disposal of the social elements of forestry, in terms of providing jobs, and also of the move away from protective measures towards productive forestry. John, however, ensured that some erosion control would be continued, but it was limited to the Te Tairāwhiti region on Crown lands.

But, I made a stipulation that this land has to always contain forests so that the first felling of forest, it has to be replanted. And that applies to the East Coast forests, outside of here it’s up to the people who have clear title to
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the land, they can do what they like, if they want to put it back to sheep they can...Having this land cleared of trees so they can put dairy farms on it. Stupid. And then now, what you’ve got on top of us now is this global warming. Stupid. Which industry of New Zealand creates the most pollution? Dairy Farming. Farming. Stupid.57

What John is addressing is the overall shift from a dual-purpose protection and production forest to ones that have been heavily production-oriented.

The problem with afforestation in Te Tairāwhiti is that the ratio of production to protection has changed and the focus has been to make a profit. Initially, Māori agreed to sale of lands because were told that would be for the common good.

Soil conservation was completed in the name of the national and public good; production forestry is a private good. While production featured as a component of the afforestation program from the beginning, a changing political culture in New Zealand has transformed the protection/production continuum to the point where the conservation benefits are threatened.58

Most importantly, production forestry would hinge on the stability of the land, as erosion control was the primary goal.59 The initial plan for Mangatu was half to be for production and half to remain as protection, but the restructuring of the NZFS changed the government’s approach to forestry in the region. This change is particularly upsetting for John because his tribe was coerced into the sale of Mangatu, and thus deprived of its patrimony, on the basis of the argument that protective forests were necessary and that they had to be operated by the government. Thus, maintaining their mana whenua, control over land, and rangatiratanga, self-determination, were devalued in comparison with the government’s need to protect downstream homes and farms. Though his tribe attempted to argue that they were entirely capable of implementing protective forestry,
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the government did not trust in their ability to manage. Coombes argues that the subsequent profit-oriented sale and logging of Mangatu Forest represents a repudiation of the original argument about the necessity of the afforestation and land sale.\footnote{Coombes, 132.}

Coombes is critical of exotic afforestation.\footnote{Coombes, 137-141.} This relates to Jones and Cloke’s discussion of the ways in which trees demonstrate non-human agency.\footnote{Jones and Cloke, 68.} The use of the tree is influenced by the tree’s innate characteristics. The rapidity of *Pinus radiata*’s growth in New Zealand makes it more useful than native trees for quickly stabilizing soil and substrate. Its short life-span of roughly thirty-three years, however, means that it will soon need to be replaced. Coombes, however, notes that the emphasis on conifers instead of broadleaved trees is evidence that production is more important than soil protection. Pines grow quickly and serve a utilitarian economic need through the production of wood.

The problems of Cyclone Bola revived an interest in protection forestry and the government decided to provide subsidies for people to plant trees on their own lands. The subsidy was to cover ninety-five percent of cost; however, it would only cover afforestation with *radiata*. The point is that the renewed emphasis on forestry was specifically that of commercial forestry, not strict protection afforestation. It also emphasized the economic value of such a measure. A major problem with the new efforts was that they enabled the clearance of secondary native bush. Over 3,360 acres of scrub were cleared to make room for planted forests. This became a means to get government to subsidize the development of unproductive lands. Though the government subsidies
now protect against the removal of scrub, under certain circumstances private  
afforestation projects may destroy it.\footnote{Coombes, 136; Chris Phillips and Michael Marden, "Reforestation Schemes to Manage Regional Landslide Risk," in Landslide Hazard and Risk, ed. Thomas Glade, Malcolm Anderson, and Michael J. Crozier (Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley and Sons, Ltd., 2005), 538.}

What ended up happening was that much afforestation occurred on areas that did not need it when other areas that needed it did not get planted. Very little of the worst eroding lands were planted. Much more land was meant to be converted to forests. Overall the erosion mitigation was not high enough. Yet of that forest, much of it was sold during the NZFS restructuring for production purposes. “The original objectives of the afforestation schemes, especially erosion control, have been irrevocably altered by the intrusion of commercial enterprise…Put simply, production and profit objectives conflict with the goals of erosion control.”\footnote{Coombes, 138-39.} The cutting rights of the forests have been sold and there are few protections built into the contracts to ensure that protection against erosion continues to be implemented.

The problem is not easily resolved for even if lands are returned to the tangata whenua, they may still be subject to pressure from landowners on the flats regarding land management. “This leaves open the possibility of a repetition of history. Indiscriminate logging of indigenous forests in the headwaters of the Waipaoa at the turn of the 20th century led to an acceleration of erosion and downstream flooding.”\footnote{Coombes, 140.} Coombes suggests that lands should just be returned. Compensation should be worked out in addition to the land returns.\footnote{Coombes, 137-141.}
Exotic afforestation is also one of the major concerns of the He Oranga Me Nga Uri Tuku Iho (HOMNUTI) trust. Their comments are similar to those of Coombes. The members of the trust are critical of the choice of pines for mitigating erosion. They argue that even though the lifespan and the growing cycle of the pine serves to stabilize steep areas, the trees will eventually fall. One commented:

> When the pine trees go in they do to some respect help to curb the erosion. But, now they’re getting harvested which is what happened including…the sustainable areas or all the areas where they agreed to reserve and leave the pine trees there so that, to prevent the erosion. They still cut them down anyway like, they just assume people would forget that those were the areas set aside.\(^67\)

But, they are argue that even if you leave the trees intact tree plantations are insufficient:

> You need a cover, ground cover. Trees alone won’t control erosion. The land will still erode in between the trees.\(^68\)

This again speaks to the conflict over land management, which is an extension of self-determination, as well as to the issue of the physicality of the land. The trust members would prefer more emphasis on the restoration of native species. They compare the exotic trees to native manuka (*Leptospermum scoparium*) (Figure 17), commonly known as ‘Tea tree plant,’ which is frequently classified as a scrub or brush. Megan says:

> Manuka is so good because it will grow on a slope, it will restore nutrient to the soil and eventually it will allow for the natural regeneration of the trees, the bigger native trees…But, the value of the manuka and having it on the land, that you can see on our land are exactly what you get in a nursery on a huge scale. You can see regeneration come through certain height of manuka or stock growing and [*kahaka*] trees come through. Unbelievable. You see the different stages of regeneration on all our lands that the manuka has been left alone.\(^69\)

---
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Figure 17. Photo of manuka plant (*Leptospermum scoparium*)

Uncle Dick discusses how manuka holds water:

Manuka can hold a lot more water than people think. That drop will make that leaf, that little leaf, there’s millions of them on the tree, it’ll make that little leaf go bigger for catching another drop until it falls off. There’s the secret, the retention of the water in the tree rather than taken into the land and wash down our rivers. It’s retaining the water in huge volumes, huge volumes. So, when you first get wet and it does get dry and you’ve got a long spell that manuka has still got a lot of water to supply to the land. Whereas the pine doesn’t.\(^70\)

Maintaining and promoting native plant and tree species is important within Māori cultural framework as they are the hair of the land in a spiritual sense.\(^71\) They are, therefore, protesting the fact that the planting of trees for protection purposes alters the
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experiential qualities of the land. They are especially concerned that manuka, which they argue is superior for mitigating erosion, is being removed to make space for exotic plantations. Tui comments:

Tui: And burnt all of the manuka. And the bush that was under it.
Chris: So they could pasture?
Tui: Well the intention was to put pine forests in... I mean helicopters are flying over, spraying. You know, the manuka. They’re spraying manuka to put pines in, not just for pasture, they’re killing, spraying all the manuka so that they can put pines in. Even though there are laws that say you can’t take any native species out, they’re still getting Gisborne District Council consent. the mentality of all the farmers around here is it’s scrub it’s not manuka, it’s scrub therefore to be got rid of. So they put a damn helicopter over the top of it.  

Manuka composes a majority of the 3,360 acres of secondary brush that was cleared. This situation is particularly vexing for the trust who are concerned about other values for the land. While they do attend to economic considerations, for them the bottom line must also incorporate cultural and ecological matters. This point is fleshed out below in Section 7.3.2.3 Conflicting Ideas About Cultural Advancement.

7.2.3 HEALTH

The pines have also had impacts on health. Renee talked about the pollen from the trees:

You will notice that the pollen from the trees has really escalated, and it affects a lot of people now. Before when they used to plant, they used to cut one section and replant but they did it all different areas at a time and the pollen back then wasn’t so noticeable. But, now because they cut it when they did, and I mean they literally cut block after block after block. And the trees that are there now generating, they produce a lot of pollen, which of course is a health risk to a lot of people now who suffer from asthma, from hayfever. I know that (Waipake?) I can’t remember who else but they were doing a report for the CFRT and they were trying to get the statistics of how many people now especially suffer from asthma, hayfever and things like that, because as a result of Fletcher’s at that time cutting
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the trees and replanting. At least back in the old days when they did that it wasn’t so noticeable, as what it is now.

Chris: You mean the new growing areas would have spaced out.
Renee: Yes, they wouldn’t have been as concentrated.
Chris: And now it’s just all over.
Renee: Yeah, in that area, of course they’re all the same age. And they’re now producing all at the same time. Not like how it used to be. And people we never suffered from pollen anything like that, we never suffered from it.73

Maurice has a similar view. He states:

Asthma, asthma…they’ve done studies, we’re trying to find studies done on pollen on human. They’ve done it on fish, how pollen affects fish. But, not humans…I maintain that the planting of exotic trees in this area has contributed to the health, not contributed, it’s affected. But that I mean that amount of pollen that the trees…Well, I’d say round about now and I believe it’s the cause of asthma and other illnesses to our people. And I understand that someone is doing a study here in Rotorua on the effects of pollen on other things, from exotic forests on the quality of the water.

Eliza talks about the method for preparing cutover land to be planted for a new crop. For many years, they would burn off the cutover stumps, but that practice has been ended.

They used to, they used to prepare the land to, to plant again and they don't do it now. They don't they don't burn the forest down at the ground anymore. Because it's too risky with the heat. The *Pinus radiata* just burns just like that. So they don't go there anymore. It's actually more of a fire hazard than anything else in the forest owners don't want to do that anymore so they usually just rake the land bring the machines rake the land and replant. Once, once all the trees have been harvested. Sprayed it, break it and plant again.

Chris: What are they spraying it with?
Eliza: Oh, they usually spray it with some pesticide stuff, so it gets into the soil and prepares the land and kills off the other little bugs, so that’s, it’s sort of like clean clean soil, today now. Because I know they’ve done it like in blocks where we’re finished harvesting and then they just get the sprayer to come in, airplane to come in and they spray the land and and it’s all dried out. It’s usually over three or four months since we’ve harvest that side, and then they get the airplane to come in and spray it and then they rake, they get a machine to come in, take out all the rubbish rubbish wood and then they get the planters to come in back in and replant.74

---
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This use of pesticides has raised concern about pollution of water supplies, soil, and the dangers of exposure during spraying. This issue was also raised in a comment above by the members of the trust who were criticizing the fact that manuka has been sprayed to make room for pine. Referring to pikopiko and puha [prickly sow thistle (Sonchus asper)], which are edible plants, Eliza says.

Well, because they turn around and spray so many pesticides all over the blinking grounds, can’t go in and pick it anymore.75

Even where cultural resources are available, they may be dangerous to consume.

This draws attention to the overriding goal of government to create legible, productive spaces. The emphasis of scientific forestry is on the production of commercially valuable crops, not on building habitat. As such, non-timber plants are consuming the valuable minerals that could otherwise be used by the pines.76 Forests and land are no longer available as sources of a variety of different necessities.77 As Durie argues, this issue of spraying and of the reduction of biodiversity is of major concern to many Māori as a key goal of Māori self-determination is caring for the environment and ensuring that it is not polluted.78

75 Cairns et al. Interview by author.
76 Scott, 15-22; Lowood, 340-341; McManus, 191-192.
77 Coates, 46; Best, 1-6; Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne, 27-28; Scott, 12; see also Perlin, 168.
7.3 LAND MANAGEMENT

7.3.1 INCOME VS. ACCESS

Another theme is the conflict between income and access. The pines have been a source of income for many Māori, which has been a benefit. Rapata describes the lease in this way:

They are a Māori asset that generates income for the iwi. It’s a good thing though it’s not much money. I think there’s about 1000 shares in Te Whaiti-Nui-a-Toi block. I only own about 0.5 percent of one share, which is only a very small share, I got it from my grandfather. We do have a charitable trust so we can fund people to go to school. I’m quite proud of that.  

The Cairns family also view the pines as a source of income via their logging contract (Figure 18). With regard to logging, Eliza says:

[We] keep everyone together because as we know you know it’s getting harder to work. And everybody takes off to Australia which we don’t want. We want them to stay here and create something for them here for work… But yeah like I say, we don’t want them to go abroad, because it’s more a worry in mind about them over there, where if we have them, we got them here at least you know we can, well not keep an eye on them, but at least we can see our families flourish over the years you know, and do better or do whatever you know, but at least we got there where, we can help them here.

Her son Tamati echoes her with this comment:

So it’s pretty you know, it’s good. It’s kept all of us, you know, it keeps us working, it keeps us all tight as a family. Cause all my family, we all work together.

These quotes resonate with a hybrid perspective of forestry as being something that meets the income needs of the family, though it is again more than simple capitalism as keeping
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80 Cairns et al. Interview by author.
81 Cairns. Interview by author.
the family together is part of the Cairns calculus. Economic development is a key issue for Māori. Durie discusses the need for Māori to find ways to improve their economic standing, which he argues is crucial to Māori self-determination. But, for some, this income has come at the price of access. Nearly everyone had much to say about getting onto the land, though their perspectives on it varied. A man whose iwi owns the land and the cutting rights says:

I used to go up to the forests. Now I don’t. The relationship to the land is actually changing. Now if that has changed within my generation, that is quite a rapid change. My children have never been on the block. My oldest child is fourteen. So, while there is some potential for economic benefits coming back the association to the land is actually diminished and that to me is the cost of the sustainable development. I haven’t been on that block in like ten years. Some might argue and they have, ‘you don’t even live there anyway.’ And my response is ‘yeah but when I do come back it would be nice to go and walk through it.’

Figure 18. Photo of Logging Site
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82 Durie, 4-6.
83 Tikitu Nathan. 2006. Interview by author. Wellington. November 23,
Anaru is a landowner, but does not own the pines and when I interviewed him he was in the middle of renegotiating the ninety-year lease. He says:

The thing that concerns me is that I will never get to enjoy my own land at the present time or for another sixty years. I won’t be around. It’d be lucky if my children would get the use of it. And with any luck my grandchildren may see it.  

This demonstrates Anaru’s concern over his tribe’s right to autonomy in managing their lands. The lease provides an income, but the situation is far from ideal.

There are additional reasons for going into exotic forests. When asked whether or not he had reasons, aside from work, for going into native forests, Tamati responded:

Tamati: All depends on where you want to go, cause there’s a lot of sights and stuff out there as well like waterfalls and rivers, lakes…Cause like yeah there’s native, like native reserves in patches of the pine and stuff like that.
Chris: Within the patches of the, within the pine?
Tamati: Mm, like yeah like you’ll have all pine trees and right in the middle could be slapped a native reserve that.

These patches or reserves of native forests may have been protected for cultural or aesthetic values.

Yet another reason for gaining access to pine plantations is to go fishing and hunting. Maurice says:

Fishing you know, certain times of year we go and catch eels. Certain places we can catch eels during the daytime.

The Newtons go into both native and pine forests to hunt and fish.

Chris: So you folks go into the natives to go hunting and fishing?
Willy: Yeah, yeah. And the pine. Yeah, yeah. We go to the native. We go hunting there. Into the pine…We go on the weekends [laughs] That’s why
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84 Te Amo.
85 Cairns. Interview by author.
we don’t have to go and travel anywhere else. You know. We think we got it all here and which we have. It was Christmas Dinner and our New Year’s dinner we just, if you’d seen what we ate and what we had got that from.\textsuperscript{87}

But, they point out that there is a difference in the gaming between the native and exotic forests. Willy says:

Our native forests got the best…animals. You get tastier…native pigs.\textsuperscript{88}

Separately, the Cairns elaborate upon this difference:

George: There’s [a] different taste to the pork in the pine than the natives…Big difference, eh James?
James: Yup.
Eliza: It’s what they feed off the lands off the grounds in the native. But you go into a pine tree area and they’ve gotta keep running around in there, there ain’t much to eat. Pine needles.
James: All our animals like pigs and deer in pine there a lot leaner in the native... totally different, harder to catch them in pine, there a lot leaner and faster. Because a lot of people hunt in pine, it's the only place they're allowed to hunt.
Eliza: I think it's with the pigs and the deer and the, in the native it's more nourishing you get the pigs in the pine, it's not, they're quite lean.
James: No, see in the natives they got berries, tawa berries, meru berries. A lot of them are more relaxed in the natives, no one hunts them…so they get fatter.\textsuperscript{89}

Renee suggests another economic reason to gain access:

Prior to me leaving the runanga [the governing council or administrative body for a sub-tribe or tribe] that’s exactly what we were doing, we were in negotiations with them to try and get access or, yeah, to get access through the forest to the river, Te Rangataiki River to go through (Orouruaki?) for tourism interests. At the beginning it looked quite good that we were able to do that, but I think the negotiations fell down along after I left.\textsuperscript{90}

\textsuperscript{87} Family.
\textsuperscript{88} Family.
\textsuperscript{89} Cairns et al. Interview by author.
\textsuperscript{90} Rewi.
Renee is talking about looking at alternative uses of the land as well as being able to get onto the land. This reference to tourism is an example of some of the hybrid ways in which Māori have sought to participate in the market economy. We also talked about other reasons for visiting the land.

Chris: Are there any reasons to visit the planted forests, the land that’s in planted forests now aside for access to the rivers?
Renee: Um, what we call wahi tapu sites, which are sacred sites to Māori, and, um, from time to time people have wanted to go to these sites. That’s when you normally had to get permission or permits to access it. I know when we were doing the boundaries for Ngati Manawa and Ngati Whare we had to get permission from the forest company at the time and to actually go to these places because what we had to show the Crown was where these places were on the maps. And the names of these places, we actually had to take them out for site visits, and because what they’d showed was that our people actually occupied that area, all those sites. And what our connection is to the land. And to Māori land, land is not something that we own…We’re only caretakers of the land. It gives us life, it gives us mauri, it gives us a lot of things. So, we’re just really caretakers of it.91

Her comment speaks directly to the issue of whether or not Māori have control or autonomy in the use of their land. In this case, a lack of control means people must acquire permission to gain access to important burial sites and other places of cultural significance.

The Cairns explained that access had much to do with the forest companies concern to protect their assets either from the risk of fire or accidents:

Chris: Do you have trouble getting onto the land at all?
James: No, not at all.
Chris: Is the access limited because it’s pine trees?
James: Access is only weekends, you gotta get a permit from forestries. And no hunting summer, fire danger. But no usually it’s alright.
Eliza: There’s certain places you’re only allowed to hunt when it’s in season.

91 Rewi.
Chris: And do you, can anyone go on the land or is it was only people from?
James: No anyone, especially the pine forests because its Crown land isn't it. But, a lot of the native you can't.²

Tamati says:

Tamati: Cause they have fire dangers and stuff like that might start a fire and it would flick a smoke butt the wrong area. Yeah so it’s not that easy to get into.
Chris: But, for the people of the land, do you have to check in with anyone or do you just go straight in?
Tamati: Nah, we’ve got to check in, like we make a few phone calls, get permits, access and all that, cause some areas you ain’t allowed to hunt, some areas you ain’t allowed to go into.³

The Newtons have a slightly different perspective on this issue:

Willy: That’ll be one place that that’s putting the pressure on us, we hunt a lot now. Access to all these blocks that we’re not really getting it. There you are, that’s a big issue now.
Chris: Because of the pines.
Willy: Well, now you got all these companies that are in different areas and they’re putting in the different regulations.
Chris: Fire control you mean?
Willy: No, they say that.
Brett: I heard it was that...we own the land, they own the lease and so really they own the trees. And yeah they are starting to [get] harder and harder on letting the owners go in and hunt and do whatever.⁴

This is despite the fact that the Newtons have a provision for hunting access in the lease.

Maurice points out that when he wants to go hunting on his own private land, he needs to cross through exotic plantations as well as Department of Conservation land, both of which require permits. He describes one of his encounters with rangers:

Get up there and you gotta get a permit to go on your own land! You know?...How long you been up here John [the ranger]? ‘Oh, 7 years.’ I been here all my bloody life! My father was here all his life, my grandfather. And you come here and tell us what to do? Because you got a
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⁴ Family.
piece of paper to say that. Nah, it gets on my nerves, eh? But they sort of know where I come from. ‘Oh, happy hunting,’ [the ranger says] I think he just says it to blooming wind me up.

He also complains about the fact that those portions of his land that are leased are technically accessible to anyone who gets permission from the forest company. This again is an issue of autonomy in managing one’s land. His comment brings up another issue: while the best game meat can be found in native areas, much of those remaining native forests are a part of the national parks system, yet hunting in parks is extremely restricted, which is another source of frustration. There is another dimension to the issue of hunting, access, and land management. When possums become a problem, one of the solutions that is raised is the use of 1080 poison, which is applied via pellets. James and Eliza discuss the ramifications of this:

James: They want to drop 1080 in there and get rid of possums, but then it kills everything else too. Birds, deer, pigs.
Eliza: They hunt the pigs, they hunt the deer in that area because that’s their means of feeding their families.⁹⁶

These quotes raise a number of issues. First, as Durie points out, Māori are not monolithic; they have many different attitudes about how best to use the land.⁹⁷ Further,
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these ideas may change under different circumstances. For some, an income is important and people have pride in their work. This also speaks to the new meanings that are layered onto land and new ways in which it may be used, which is an example of hybridity. These are examples of Pratt’s concept of transculturation where native peoples selectively engage with aspects of different cultures.98

The subject of access raises the issue of conflict between different cultural or economic uses of land. Not having control or access to one’s own land is problematic for Māori in terms of a lack of autonomy or self-determination on their own lands.99 The complaint about being denied access also speaks to the need to be enmeshed in place and physically be on the land. As numerous academics argue, a subjective immersion in place is essential for Māori.100

7.3.2 IWI INITIATIVE

There are a variety of ways in which the informants have sought tino rangatiratanga and control over the management of their own lands. Some of these

---
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efforts have been at the *iwi* (tribe) level while others have been at the *whanau* (family) level.

### 7.3.2.1 PRODUCTION FORESTs

Stokes et al. discuss the interconnecting changes at the nexus of farming, forestry, and community.\(^{101}\) As farming has been deemed less viable in steeper regions, especially in Te Tairāwhiti, exotic forestry has seemed an increasingly attractive alternative. This interest in forests as crops, however, places exotic trees in conflict with native ones. There is a great deal of public opposition to clearing indigenous forest cover to plant in exotics, even if the native forests are second growth. This is an important issue when considering that indigenous trees take several hundred years to grow and are a part of a complex ecological succession system that relies on scrub plants such as manuka to act as nursery plants for larger native tree.

Nevertheless, exotic forestry became a big industry for Te Tairāwhiti Māori. Unlike the State Forests in which John Ruru worked, both Christopher and John Kopua, who are Ngati Porou, managed different aspects of a private forest, which had been planted primarily for production. In response to the ECFP grant scheme to fund afforestation by landowners, Ngati Porou became closely involved in the afforestation program. This was to be expected as they continue to have major landholdings in the Te Tairāwhiti region (around 345,950 acres or 140,000 hectares) and because the grant scheme enabled control and rights to the land to remain with the owners. A government

---

\(^{101}\) Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne, 272-284.
report indicated that Ngati Porou preferred forestry development to farming in terms of economic opportunities.\(^2\)

The *iwi* targeted 148,260 acres (60,000 hectares) for afforestation and created a structure for managing forestry on their many land interests. This organization, called Ngati Porou Whanui Forests Ltd. (NPWFL), was a means to aggregate forest rights to multiple land blocks in order to create a large-scale investment possibility. This limited liability corporation is the main architect of forest plantations in the area. John describes the legal structure of NPWFL:

You have all the landowning groups like this, and we’ll just call this landowners. They all they all sign forest rights, this, with a landowners trust LIT, so you’ve got all these land blocks coming into there. This landowner’s trust elect director, those directors then become the, or those trustees actually, then become the directors of NPWFL. So all landowners have a say in this company here, in fact they own this company. Okay. The forest rights in here are for [24,710 acres] 10,000 hectares, and that is the agreement with Hansol Forests Ltd. Hansol Forests Ltd. have a JV with NPWF.

Chris: A joint venture?
John: Yeah a joint venture, sorry. I don’t like abbreviations myself. The agreement is that these people here supply ten thousand hectares, these people here supply dollars and they come together and produce the forest. That’s basically how it works. When it comes to sharing the profit, there’s a three way split, landowners, NPWFL, and Hansol.\(^3\)

And it’s quite an unusual situation that we were able to structure here because it is quite a, under 50-50 control, whereas the investing partner was actually putting in more value if you look at the whole scheme. And maybe putting in let’s say 70 percent or 75 percent of the value and the other partner is only contributing in the order of 25-30 percent if you want to talk money percentages then that’s roughly where it sits. So, to actually have that control is, I like to think of that as the strength of our negotiation that allowed us to end up with that. And some of those things we weren’t prepared to give way on. Because then all of those other things became at risk in particular the land…[If] things go wrong, the land shouldn’t be at risk. You know, so whatever you do with it, whether it’s a farming

\(^{102}\) Cocklin and Wall.
\(^{103}\) Kopua. 16-17.
whether it’s cash cropping, shouldn’t be at risk. Pine trees. So the structures that were set up when Ngati Porou Whanui Forests went into forestry with Hansol as partner that was one of the top priorities of whatever deal that went down with respect to the land. If things crashed within that organization, the land remained with the landowners, it wasn’t part of the security if you like.\textsuperscript{104}

Since John Kopua and his colleagues recognized that the government’s grants would not cover all costs they looked into various options. As before, however, there were limited financial means open to \textit{tangata whenua} and the initial costs of afforestation can be high. Leasing was an option, but \textit{iwi} had already felt the costs of being cut out of land management. Instead, they sought a joint venture partner. Initially, they had an agreement with Tasman Forestry Ltd., which is one of the biggest corporate forestry entities in New Zealand.\textsuperscript{105}

Objections emerging from the private sector, however, soon influenced government policy regarding the grant scheme and undermined Ngati Porou’s forestry plans. Environmental groups and forestry business had met and devised new forestry protocols in 1991. The resulting agreement, called the New Zealand Forest Accord, focused on the promotion of production forestry, but also the protection of native forests. It established rules on what could and could not be cleared to make room for plantation forests. Prior to the Accord, native trees and vegetation could and were removed to make space for production forests. The Accord also has a commercial advantage for forestry in that this kind of agreement allows New Zealand companies to claim that their products are more environmentally sustainable, thus securing particular advantages in a more eco-conscious international market. Though the Accord was a contract between organizations

\textsuperscript{104} Kopua. 3.
\textsuperscript{105} Cocklin and Wall, 155-156.
in the private sector, environmental groups argued that the government should not issue grants to people who intended to clear native vegetation, including scrub, because it was in breach of the Accord.¹⁰⁶

The government eventually agreed to modify the rules regarding clearing native vegetation for afforestation projects. As of the year 2000, the government has redesigned subsidies so that regenerating scrub is protected rather than cleared. This was a major problem for Ngati Porou because much of their lands had already reverted to scrub and regenerating native forest. This was particularly vexing because this meant that the people who were least financially capable of keeping their lands free from scrub, Ngati Porou, were now ineligible for government assistance in pursuing a new form of economic development on their lands. The end result was that Tasman, which had been a signatory to the Forest Accord, backed out of the plan to partner with NPWF. More importantly, the Accord basically eliminated the participation of any other New Zealand company. After a few years of hard work NPWFL was successful in finding a new partner, Hansol Forem, which is a Korean-based company. The actual afforestation was largely financed by Hansol. Under the arrangement, the bulk of the income will come after the forests are harvested. This particular business partnership is what is known as a joint venture.¹⁰⁷

Cocklin and Wall discuss some of the aspects of the impacts of the Forest Accord. First, they raise the issue of the relationships between the various actors involved in the conflict. They ask “what role the state should have adopted vis-à-vis the private agreement when the implication of upholding the Accord spilled over to other parties,

¹⁰⁶ Cocklin and Wall.154-157.
¹⁰⁷ Cocklin and Wall., 158
namely Ngati Porou?” Second, they draw attention to the spatial dynamics of the conflict. While local Te Tairāwhiti farmers had raised objections to afforestation itself, the key environmental parties who promoted the changes to the subsidy system were not local to the Te Tairāwhiti region. These environmentalists were successful in lobbying the national government to change its policies. This then affected the conditions at a local level for Ngati Porou for whom “the environmentalists were seen as intruders who did not themselves have to face the realities of economic survival on the East Coast [Te Tairāwhiti].”

Coombes is critical of the joint venture scheme because it prioritized production and, thus, placed more focus on lands that did not need afforestation. The process of afforestation was so expensive for farmers that many sought financial help through joint ventures. The inputs were so high and there was so much pressure to make a profit, however, that the emphasis became more about production than soil and water conservation. As a result, more attention was placed on afforesting less eroded lands, which were not as in need of afforestation in the first place.

This joint venture raises a number of interesting issues. First, it is an example of ways in which tangata whenua, in this case some Ngati Porou, have expressed agency. They actively sought a means to achieve economic development and self-determination.
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These efforts reflect a hybrid combination of tribal-led development with modern forestry production. Its tribal basis also means that this form of economic investment is grounded in cultural priorities, and is therefore a particular kind of capitalism. This is also a conflict between the local and the regional. In this case, outside environmentalists influenced the ways in which Ngati Porou were developing their lands.

When I conducted my interviews, those lands had not yet been harvested, so there had not been much money for the *iwi*. John also notes that there are limitations with the Hansol agreement.

What was created with the Koreans, South Koreans and Hansol in terms of a commercial company viability was too small, it’s not big enough to sustain itself. It needs to be [49,420 acres] 20,000 hectares of more and all that we had with the Koreans was an agreement for about [24,710 acres] 10,000 hectares. Now that’s reached, but it’s not enough for that company to sustain itself, so they needed to go out there and look for more. And although there was an option with the Koreans I think that they haven’t decided to take an extension up with Ngati Porou, for whatever reasons.¹¹¹

As a result, the people at Ngati Porou Whanui Forests Ltd. have been working on projects to expand their operations. One of those projects is carbon sink forests.

### 7.3.2.2 CARBON SINK FORESTS

Christopher was closely involved in the carbon sink project. Until a few years ago, Christopher was in charge of NPWFL. Taking note of the global climate crisis, he and his organization assessed the possibilities of carbon sequestration. When I spoke with him, he was in the process of setting up a joint venture between Ngati Porou Whanui Forests Ltd. and a London based investment group to finance a permanent carbon sink. This was the predominant focus of conversations that I had with him. He says,
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So this project is a [74,130 acre] 30,000 hectare project within Ngati Porou and it’s attracting international attention around what we’ve just done...[It has a] conservative value of around $200 million...And it’s to plant forests to grow carbon and trade carbon. Plant trees, leave ‘em there. This ties into these international treaties that are now developing around Kyoto. This is a first in the world. And you’re effectively growing forest parks. Cause you don’t harvest them. So the very, it just fundamentally changes the whole thinking about the role that forests play on land.\textsuperscript{112}

He describes how it works,

So, under what we’ve negotiated with the investor, the land owners get annual rental, they get up to thirty percent of the carbon trade and they own the forests, 100 percent ownership of it and if they elect they want to do some harvesting, they can. In the New Zealand government regulations there is an option that if you want to, you can take out no more than twenty percent of the volume once the trees are mature as long as you replant. So that’s the cash benefit they get, they also get the comfort that they not only own the forests, they are managing their forests, or their representatives are managing the forest...[They also have] the option to graze the forest.\textsuperscript{113}

This project reflects hybridity in that it enables a more flexible approach to forestry that incorporates farming needs through grazing. It also pulls in elements of environmental stewardship through the sequestration of carbon. This also reflects a better deal for the owners than a traditional lease model and thus reflects a better bargaining position.

This initiative places Ngati Porou Whanui Forests Ltd. on the cutting edge of global climate change developments through the creation and trading of carbon credits. As such, this is an interaction between the global and the local. It demonstrates ways in which tangata whenua, at the local level, have reached out to shape global practices.

\textsuperscript{112} Christopher Insley. 2007. Interview by author. Gisborne, N.Z. January 15, 5, 3-5. 
\textsuperscript{113} Insley. 6.
7.3.2.3 CONFLICTING IDEAS ABOUT CULTURAL ADVANCEMENT

But, while John Kopua and Christopher agree on some aspects of commercial forestry, they emphasize different goals. John concurs on the importance of the limited liability structure that protects Ngati Porou land from financial complications, but he emphasizes the importance of land for his people:

If we didn’t have our whenua, I don’t think we would be Māori people. If we ever lost all of our land, a significant if not all of our culture would dissipate with that over time.114

In contrast to John, Christopher emphasized a commercial drive:

It’s important for people...not to go away and write up this warm fuzzy statement that says you know all Māori people are interested in is looking after their wahi tapu [sites of significance] and growing flax and all that kind of stuff. We are, we absolutely are and we hold dear to those traditions, but at the same time we are absolutely driven by making money. We absolutely are, and you can trace back through the history, I would argue, of all bloody indigenous peoples around the world, it’s, in some way shape or form, they are driven by some kind of economic driver.115

He argues that participating in the global economy and being Ngati Porou are not mutually exclusive, which speaks to hybridity, and that Māori bring a more responsible approach to business:

You hear people talking about triple bottom line. For me that’s a, for us that’s a no brainer. We do that all the time, and yet you see corporate America trying very hard to paint themselves as responsible corporate citizens...And so those principles are just absolutely ingrained in us, the sort of principles of sustainability.116

Again, John Kopua’s explanation of Ngati Porou’s responsibility in commercial development is slightly different:
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We can’t decide “Oh we’ve stuffed this up, we’ll go somewhere else and be Ngati Porou” cause it doesn’t happen, eh. It’s very important that we make sure that this here is here for us. For all of those people out there, for all the ones at home…Trying to marry up a commercial philosophy with a cultural [philosophy]…So that is a hard decision, you better get it right…governments can make that decision, companies can make that decision, oh stuff it we’re you know, it doesn’t work here, we’ll walk away and we’ll go somewhere else. We can’t walk out of here, if we make it wrong here, then its wrong. You can’t walk away.

This shows the serious connection that Māori have to specific places; land is not interchangeable from this perspective. Thus, it speaks to the issue of the subjective quality of Māori relationships with land. Also, land is something for which people must care, which again highlights a cultural responsibility.

John Kopua raises another issue about the competing uses of land.

It’s important that we sustain ourselves as a people. Because I don’t think you can you can exist in today’s world without that financial ability to be able to participate. It’s a matter of finding something that allows to participate. At a level that allows us to sustain our culture. Because if all you, if you live on the poverty line, the largest focus in the mind will probably be living from day to day. Which doesn’t necessarily allow you to maintain your culture or enhance your culture…But you feel financially comfortable. You don’t have to be filthy rich to be comfortable, then you can sustain yourself. and I think on the average, the people out there, well I know that’s people up here, who’s annual income is at the lower end of the scale than other places and we still manage to sustain that on a cultural base.

John Kopua’s comments speak to the issue of economic integrity of the community. He is concerned about being able to maintain control and ownership of tribal lands and views forestry as an important source of money to protect that self-determination. These ideas are echoed by Christopher who notes that pines are important primarily as a means to an end.
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I would argue that it didn’t have to be just pines to achieve that outcome, it could have been something else. And the reason it was pine was because pine was attractive to an investor...it didn’t have to be pine, it could have been any other species. But, when you start talking about other species, they grow longer rotation and therefore they start to become less attractive [from a timber harvesting standpoint] yes yes. That’s right. So, you know I think John’s right, they have that soil erosion benefit, but to me that’s, for me, not to, for me that’s a subordinate benefit compared to the broader things that we’ve talked about in terms of economic benefit, in terms of being able to manage social things like employing people and employing people throughout the entire value chain.\textsuperscript{119}

In fact, Christopher notes that NPWFL is not limited solely to developing lands through afforestation, whether it be for production, carbon sequestration, or both.

And we can defend and argue that they [pine] are a good thing, in their place, now we are not advocating pine trees or trees everywhere, we’re saying on parts of our land they make absolute sense...The next project is 30,000 hectares so we’re conceivably talking about 1 to 200 land blocks. And we want to plant some trees, so we want to find out what is the best use of certain land blocks. And what I am getting at is technology. So we have all this land and it’s made up of all these different parcels. Representing 50,000 people, the population of Ngati Porou. So one of the things that we developed, a project with a 100,000 dollars of research funding from government and we developed, a land management tool...Their measurement tool is GIS...we want to find what’s the best use of them, because some of our land is used better for growing avocados, some is better used for growing sheep, some is better used for growing whatever, flax, whatever. We’ve got this tool and it helps us identify where to target these different kinds of land use.\textsuperscript{120}

Christopher is willing to engage in a variety of projects. He defends this goal of making money, not just from a need to keep the community economically viable, but also from the perspective that it is not antithetical to being Māori.

While John Kopua supports the project of commercial forestry, he is more circumspect with regard to the long-term outcomes of the carbon sink plan. This has to do with recent laws placing a virtual moratorium on harvesting native trees. He says,

\textsuperscript{119} Insley.
\textsuperscript{120} Insley.
One of the things that will happen in the, if you go down the carbon sink track is that they’re trying to lock up fiber, or lock up carbon in the form of wood basically to offset…carbon emissions somewhere else in the world and that’s good. But what happens when you get out to the end there thirty years out. If part of your carbon sink has to do with regeneration [of native trees], scrub and stuff, not necessarily plantation and that sort of thing. In thirty years time I would very much doubt that you would get resource consent to clear the land…My worries about it is, if you lock stuff up now without knowing that, well what would the next generation say or the generation after that, when only twenty percent of land that could, that eighty percent could be producing for you, but its locked up forever…Natural change will turn it into. But if its thirty years or forty years, whatever that is, that will become something quite different. And if it evolves back into closed canopy manuka kanuka [a native scrub plant], with a native understory, you won’t get resource consent to actually clear that. whereas if you make that decision now to try and catch or use all the land within that block that can be used sustainably.\textsuperscript{121}

This again speaks to the issue of control over the land; however, based on how Christopher describes the carbon sink plan, this does not seem like it will necessarily be a problem. First, the permanent forest parks look to be comprised mostly of non-native timber. He says:

\begin{quote}
Native trees are a part of the thinking as well, but we are looking to plant hardwoods and we’re talking about some varieties of eucalypts, Douglas fir, redwoods.\textsuperscript{122}
\end{quote}

This is actually source of contention for many people who are very interested in restoring native habitat. Second, he notes that just like the \textit{radiata} plantations that comprise the majority of industrial forests in New Zealand, the Ngati Porou carbon sinks will be planted in rows and columns in eight-foot intervals.\textsuperscript{123}

In contrast to both John Kopua and Christopher, the members of the trust argue that money is not the key to cultural maintenance, but rather it is cultural knowledge,

\textsuperscript{121} Kopua. 6-7.
\textsuperscript{122} Insley.
\textsuperscript{123} Insley.
which is tied to native trees and forests. They are critical of the fact that the production of pines has meant a loss of access to native ecosystems. Haro said:

It has some other insidious effects, I mean we’ve talked here about the loss of the ecology and the biosphere with the planting. But, you also have the loss of access to land, that’s been talked about before, for generations. For the length of the time that that timber is there you have loss of cultural and social memory…Even further than wahi tapu [sites of significance], wahi tapu is one of the elements. But, the practices, the tikanga [cultural protocol] of actually going to a ngahere [native forest] and being able to identify the life-giving properties of those specific species is lost when that tree and that forest is lost. So, that relationship that you have with the land, the people have with, the tangata whenua [people of the land] have with the land, is immediately lost forever. It’s not allowed to regenerate even when the ngahere is allowed to regenerate. Because you’ve lost that connection and this is what’s happened here. That process we call wananga [learning]. You wananga with the teina [younger sibling] and the tuakana [older sibling]. The teina we are the younger sibling and the tuakana is birds and the bees and the trees out here. That’s our relationship. That relationship between tuakana and teina is broken if there is an imposition, either the people are taken away or the ngahere, the personification of those ngahere and those relationships that are built up over a thousand years are suddenly removed. You can then go and grow your ngahere but the relationship, the traditional relationship that was there, that sustained the people, in ecologically and biodiverse ways, and maintained thousands of people here is lost because that knowledge, that matauranga, that knowledge base that gave rise to these practices is lost by it’s simple practice, by it’s continual practice. That’s what we’re trying to recreate is actually record those traditional practices here in the trust so that when the day comes that the ngaheres are back that we are able to draw on some of the traditional resource practices and knowledge bases to inform those generations. This is how it was done, this is why it was done. These are the healing properties from this species. You understand rongoa?

Chris: Rongoa rakau [traditional medicine].
Haro: Yeah, this is the rongoa of this species, this is the rongoa of this species. This is why it was sacred. Without attaching any commercial value. Because attaching commercial value is the process of dehumanizing the environment. And in fact it actually goes against our worldview because in a Māori worldview you personify and you had a relationship with everything you saw heard and smelled and tasted.124

---
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Figure 19. Photo of Exotic Forests on Mt. Hikurangi
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Figure 20. Photo of Secondary Growth on Hillsides
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From their perspectives, the joint venture production forests and the carbon sink are still problematic because they effectively deny access and because they emphasize an economic relationship at the expense of other cultural connections. They focus on the experiential quality of the land and how the exotic trees displace native ones, which touches on a phenomenological connection to place. Haro’s comments draw attention to the importance of land and community relationships to land, highlighting various cultural and social implications of loss of access, especially cultural loss of memory. During a recent health day event in the area, Ngati Porou students commented on what was important for their iwi. The trust members commented:

And their view to health for our people was to plant trees, and that was the simple statement. To plant trees, to grow, actually it wasn’t plant, to grow more trees. Grow more trees, and these are the young people. And that doctor took that one statement out and stuck it in, there were other statements, but that statement from the young people in the forum was to grow more trees and I think they would be referring to rakau Māori [indigenous trees].

Further, they view industrial forestry as a commodification of the land. For them, the exotic tree planted on their lands is a metaphor of a colonizer, they view the pines as a foreign occupying presence.

Exotic plantations are colonizers, another way of extracting the value from our land, that’s all, that’s all. You know you can say it’s got a social and economic and all, you know all these Western facets of measurement, but it still boils down it, its about economic extraction from poor people. What you have in a community like this is you have western influences, you have traditional indigenous influences, and you have those who sit in the middle who believe it’s possible to mesh the two. In fact, the practical reality is you have very little indigenous influences, you have remnants of them. Such is the strength and power of the western political economy, to dominate and extract and mine.
Haro’s comment reframes the pine trees as more than symbols, but instead as actants. Their various physical attributes made them more successful for

This problem is being perpetuated by a number of factors. For example, they express frustration with the local governments decisions regarding land use. Tui says

Yeah, to allow the men like, well you know, we’ve gotta farm our land. It’s our land and we can make these decisions, so. I mean when I spoke to a couple of them about this one consent that they’ve give to spray all this manuka and what I said was, Class Eight, which is the lowest class level of land in terms of its soil content, its ability to grow or to have things thrive on it. There’s Class Seven land. And he says, well it’s Class Seven land so it was okay to allow this land use and I said to him but what happens is that after it’s been sprayed it become Class Eight. And then it becomes totally nothing. And that’s how the system, and he says within that class this land use option is available. I said yeah but once they spray it it becomes Class Eight because there’s nothing to hold the land together. It’s the most highly unstable classification you know. So, you’ve got all those thing happening as well cause they’re not actually looking at the bigger picture.¹²⁷

She is expressing concern that government policies have enabled the destruction of manuka and kanuka (Kunzea ericoides, a.k.a. ‘White tea tree’) to create space for pines. But, she concedes:

They’re really looking at being able to be fair to the farmers and then of course the farmers themselves in this case were actually tangata whenua.¹²⁸

The real issue is that the introduction of market principles associated with capitalism and changes in leasing arrangements through the imposition of a private property regime have affected management of the land. Tui comments:

Tui: So, they lease land off other families and that’s the land that they’re actually you know poisoning and clearing the scrub off and what have you. So, yeah there’s a lot to be said about that lease option because, to me that just takes away any accountability or responsibility on the part of the

¹²⁷ Trust.
¹²⁸ Trust.
land user. You know it’s like ‘oh I’m allowed to do whatever I like within this lease.’ And there’s no real connection to it.

Uncle: Leasing land devastated us as a family. Once she got a lease, the fence, now she would say, ‘I’ve got the lease you’re on that side, I’m on this side.’

Haro explains:

There was a sentence in the Māori term leases for settlements of an ecological sustainable farming practice and long-term leases. The lessees had the incentive to put resources back and hold the land in native plantations and many Pakeha and tangata whenua have done that. Now you have a different situation where under law, under the Te Ture Whenua Act 1993, Māori land is actually compulsorily leased for only five years with another five-year private renewal. What that does, it does not give the new lessee any incentive to turn any returns, any economic returns, to actually the stabilization of the land as a productive capacity. So the economic model, the market model that’s been imposed with transferable property titles is failing. This is a failure of the market, okay?...What the incentive was was purely an economic incentive to individualize a title to then give that individual the incentive to maximize their economic returns off the land. That is being the principal destructive basis that you see here. The end result is this destruction.

Tui continues:

The individualization of title was to make easy the acquiring of land. What happened was you had one block of land you had about a hundred heads of families who would make decisions on that land. So, they individualized the title so that they could just go to one person who had title and buy that tract of land or lease that tract of land with the signing of one hand. And it’s carried on down to now where you have one person who deems themself the be all and end all decision maker of that land and it’s still.

The imposition of the English property system and leasing has not encouraged responsible land management. The end result is that the emphasis is on economic production. But, getting community consensus to overcome this has been fraught with difficulty. Tui notes:

---
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We’re still arguing over little things and fighting over little bits of things like what I’m talking about is with the treaty claims in my view. Why fight for the rest of it when we can’t even look after what we’ve got. What little that we do have. Let’s look after this first and then we should be able to take on new stuff because I have no, I don’t feel that there’s enough collective thinking going on as to what are we going to do with this, with these resources when and if they get them too, whenever that is. 131

Overall, these different positions highlight the difficult road that Māori face as they seek to balance the economic, cultural, social, and environmental concerns. As Durie notes, all of these are important elements of Māori self-determination. 132 The issue is how to achieve development in these areas while retaining and cultivating Māori identity. Again, tangata whenua are not monolithic; they have different ideas about how to achieve cultural advancement and how their economic endeavors should relate to their cultural values.

The debate about how carbon farming should be pursued may soon change. As noted above, John Kopua expresses concern over whether the carbon sinks will involve some native scrub or tree regeneration, which may lead to restrictions on future harvests. Also, the members of the trust are critical of afforestation and carbon sinks as being based on the use of exotic trees at the expense of native scrub. New studies, however, are investigating the possibility that carbon credits can be earned through native forest regeneration. Initially, carbon sinks were based on the planting of exotic trees and could allow for a mixture of production and protection. A recent report suggests, however, that regenerating native forests may be more ideal for long-term storage of carbon than

131 Trust. 132 Durie, 4-6.
exotics. Another report explores whether this may be of particular benefit to Māori landowners.

The importance of carbon farming as an option for Māori is that it may offer socio-economic benefits while also protecting environmental and cultural values, autonomy, and multiple uses of lands. While the amount of carbon sequestered under regenerating scrub is lower than that of radiata, regenerating scrub has much lower initial costs. Also, there are other benefits to manuka and kanuka over radiata in that Māori have a cultural connection to native forests and, further, that Māori considerations of land use take the long term into consideration as well as the short term. Also, these plants offer other development possibilities, such as honey production, pharmaceuticals, and eco-tourism. So, a slow recovery of native forests with a lower payout may still weigh more favorably than the higher immediate returns of an exotic forest.

There are several factors that must affect whether or not regenerating scrub would be feasible for carbon trading. The height and density of the vegetation affects it eligibility. Another issue is land taxation. If land shifts from being “unproductive” to “productive” because it is earning carbon credits, the taxes levied against the land may exceed the return from carbon trading, thus preventing participation of the owners. Local government determines tax exemption status of Māori land and may consider carbon sequestration through regeneration to be an exception to taxable earnings, but this can

135 Carswell et al., ; Hall.
vary by district. It is therefore necessary to include local government in designing the framework for carbon trading.\textsuperscript{136}

Carswell et al. refer to research that indicates the importance of including community in the process of designing and implementing new policy.\textsuperscript{137} In other words, grass roots development is more effective than top down policy when it comes to management of private land. Māori are no exception. Given their troubled history with government, Māori are extremely resistant to the imposition of policy that affects their land use unless they have been included throughout the entire process. Any project that may result in further loss of autonomy is bound to be met with objections. The idea of community buy-in was raised by the Forest Conservator during the planning process for the afforestation of Mangatu Forests. He and the Panel, the group that was convened in 1955 to assess land use and erosion, had suggested several alternatives to the purchase of Mangatu that would enable Te Aitanga-a-Mahaki to retain their lands while also achieving the goals of afforestation; however, the government ruled out these ideas.

There are different issues that need to be worked out. But, importantly, there is evidence that limited selective harvest may improve carbon sequestration yields. One of the potential problems that may occur is that as native forests develop, the land may be reclassified as a “significant ecological area” and thus subject to restrictions under the regulations of the Department of Conservation. This would effectively limit the management control of owners and would be a major problem. John Ruru, for example, has experienced many problems while managing his tribal lands (the residual Mangatu parcels) because of the restrictions on harvesting native trees. He is frustrated that the

\textsuperscript{136} Carswell et al.,
\textsuperscript{137} Carswell et al., ; Jacqueline Haapu, \textit{Te Ripoata o Mangatu: The Mangatu Report (draft)} (Te Aitanga a Mahaki Claims Committee, 1997), 129-152.
Department of Conservation has intervened in his tribe’s affairs and prevented selective logging to raise much needed funds. Thus, while the promotion of native regeneration as carbon sinks may meet certain goals in terms of lower inputs, increased access, economic returns, and improved cultural and social connections through native plant communities, there are many potential problems that must be addressed.\textsuperscript{138}

This is perhaps one of the salient issues with regard to this internal diversity to perspectives on forestry. It is not a matter of modern vs. traditional attitudes towards land use. All of the people with whom I spoke are committed to protecting Māori ownership of land and advancing self-determination. The differences that exist are over the ways in which to meet the various needs of the community. The members of the trust argue that the way forward must include native habitat restoration and emphasize the cultural knowledge that hinges on a direct relationship with the land and ecosystem. Though John Kopua and Christopher, on the one hand, and John Ruru on the other each advocate the use of exotic trees, they still differ to some extent on the basic point of the trees. But they are similar in that each advocates forestry to meet the needs of the community. For the former two, trees meet a productive need that creates an economic benefit for their community. This economic value is essential to maintaining ownership over their lands. For the latter, the productive element is not nearly as important as the protective element in terms of erosion control and its wider impacts on the environment. In this sense, each is advocating the use of forestry as a means to achieve the goals of kaitiakitanga, or guardianship, and tino rangatiratanga, or self-determination. Thus, their goals are similar

\textsuperscript{138} Carswell et al.,
to those of the trust, but it is the means by which the people will attain those goals that is
in dispute. Ultimately, this points to the relationships between people and land.

7.3.2.4 MĀORI AGENCY

Over the years, as forestry has shifted from a government-run industry to a privatized
one, the Cairns have seen the number of contractors in their area decline. At one point,
the Cairns family lost its contract to log. Fortunately, the Cairns knew their rights. Eliza
describes the lease arrangement to grow trees on Ngati Pikiao lands:

The company wants to plant their trees, harvest their trees, and all that. As
long as they're offering…work back to the people first before they can
disperse it out to other contractors to come in and log the lands. But,
giving rights to [Ngati Pikiao] people first to log because they own the
land. So, that's usually in [the] contract and [the] agreement with your
landowners and they should be able to abide by those.\footnote{Cairns et al.  Interview by author.}

The actual forests, however, though excluding the lands they occupy, had changed hands
among several companies. The new forest owner was not aware of the existing rights and
so attempted to eliminate various local logging crews, including the Cairns.

At that time we were working Rotoiti [her family’s land] and we were
logging there and they said to us, they gave us a letter that said that we
were going to be terminated at the end of the month, end of the year…I
says they can't do that, we're logging our own lands. Because apparently I
think they were going to bring in another crew a mechanized crew to get
their logs out faster so I said no they can't do that…we own the lands.
Okay, I know my rights. These trees only belong to them, okay. But, they
say they gave us the opportunity to turn around and work and we've taken
that opportunity and now they're trying to take it away from us. I says they
can't do that. They need to do their homework a bit more so apparently.\footnote{Cairns et al.  Interview by author.}
Fortunately, Eliza’s mom still had the lease documents. The Cairns followed up with a court suit in which they argued that the leases for their lands guarantee that tribal members have priority for logging contracts over non-members. She says:

Because we knew our rights with the lands they couldn't do anything, they couldn't terminate us in our contract. So, they had to get rid of somebody else. So, they reinstated us back into the job.\(^{141}\)

They won the claim and continue to log.

The Newton family has also been involved in shaping the leases. Willy describes his father’s role in designing the leases for Ngati Pikiao.

My Dad actually negotiated the lot…As he done six or seven of them he got better at it.\(^{142}\)

His son Brett follows up with this comment,

The first one was good but then he just got better and better at it all the time…What's happened now is people say now, ‘Oh who negotiated this?’ Hey [go] back thirty years and look at it…back then it was good.\(^{143}\)

In terms of structuring the lease, Willy’s father was careful to include a provision that enabled the landowners to have continued access to the area.

See my Dad went for the hunting trip. That we have that right…He wanted the lease agreements written so they actually can’t keep us out [of] our land blocks. … they cannot stop us from going into over there. We can have a hunting track and we can carry out. Oh, I was the one who said to my Dad when they were putting, I said soon as they get those trees growing in there they will be blocking [us from access]. But, then they wrote it in the agreement, in the lease deal...And they say it’s fire risk, but still.\(^{144}\)

Anaru has also been involved in influencing the leases. When I interviewed him, he was the chairman of Te Whāti-Nui-a-Toi trust and was in the process of negotiating a

---
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new contract with the Crown. He was successful at reducing the lease length from ninety years to sixty years. He describes the outcome:

They’ve only got thirty years to run…thirty years is gone already. So, there’s another thirty years, another rotation…Plus at the end of that term, they have to replant…Now I'll retire. I told the people once I’ve cut this deal, I’m going to retire…from the trust. I've been there twenty years. And I've been part of this [lease change negotiations] for about ten years.\(^{145}\)

All of the above are examples of the agency of *tangata whenua*. The emphasis has been on advancing self-determination by restoring their rights, inserting their rights into contracts, or bargaining for better terms.\(^{146}\) This also emphasizes the fact that *tino rangatiratanga* (self-determination) is an ongoing process that involves continual negotiation and flexibility. It also demonstrates ways in which Māori have created new, dynamic formations of jobs, leases, land rights, and industry.

### 7.3.3 CLAIMS CONFLICTS

Another concern is that the current claims settlement process has placed some *iwi* into conflict with one another over some of the lands that are now covered in pines. When New Zealand was colonized, a treaty was signed guaranteeing Māori the use and enjoyment of their lands and resources. The Treaty, however, was not honored. After massive protests in the 1960s and 1970s over the injustices visited upon Māori, the New Zealand government agreed to establish a judicial system to investigate claims. For Kaingaroa-Te Urewera, the state-owned timber plantations and the land they occupy have become one of the most important assets offered as compensation for Māori claims,

\(^{145}\) Anaru Te Amo. 2007. Interview by author. Rotorua. March 8, 2007,
\(^{146}\) Durie, 4-6.
regardless of who may have actual rights to the area. Maurice describes the problem in this way:

And all the evidence that was given by our chiefs, the Crown actually said ‘yes, that land is Ngati Manawa’. But, because it’s got exotic forests on it everybody’s…when that land was just bare after the Taupo eruption, nobody wanted it, Ngati Manawa lived there. All of a sudden there’s money on it, everybody’s got interests, but the Crown put in a thing called threshold interest. Which means, if your ancestor walked through it they’ve got a threshold interest.\textsuperscript{147}

This idea of ‘threshold interest’ has been controversial. Not all government property is available as part of a compensation package upon the settlement of Waitangi Tribunal claims. For example, national parks will not be returned to traditional owners, which means the people of Te Urewera have minimal chance of regaining territory. Those lands and properties with which the government is willing to part may belong to specific tribes, but the state is willing to give them to whichever tribe can prove ‘threshold interest.’

The non-human agency of trees again influences this issue. Because \textit{Pinus radiata} are fast-growing they are ideal for timber production and the generation of money.\textsuperscript{148} As a result, they are now a significant Crown asset for use in the settlement of Treaty claims. The Crown policy of honoring threshold interests of claimants enables a wider group of people to assert rights to Kaingaroa and other Crown Forest Lands. This directly pits different \textit{iwi} and \textit{hapu} against one another. One woman describes it as:

\begin{quote}
another way of confiscation where they confiscate from the real owners and give it to someone else.\textsuperscript{149}
\end{quote}

Several people complained that the government’s priority was to settle claims regardless of whether they gave one \textit{iwi}’s traditional land to another. Renee says:

\textsuperscript{147} Toetoe. 
\textsuperscript{148} Jones and Cloke, 68. 
\textsuperscript{149} Denise. 2007. Interview by author. Rotorua.
When Ngati Awa claim was being worked on there was a government document indicating which slice of Kaingaroa had been allocated to different iwi. But, Ngati Whare and Ngati Manawa were not even on the document...It wasn’t until later that Ngati Whare and Ngati Manawa were even included by the government on the Kaingaroa [allocation].

Again later she comments:

The Crown have taken the land and thing is that now they are giving it to other iwi, for instance Nga Kaihutu Kaingaroa, who don’t really belong to the land. They may belong through their affiliations through Ngati Manawa and Ngati Whare but Te Arawa itself don’t [belong] directly, it’s only through their connections through those iwi that they are able to.

Her perspective is that the government has not been careful about determining who has historic rights to an area. For Māori, this is a serious matter of justice and restitution involving property rights and self-determination. Anaru comments:

What’s happening is the Crown says they own the land and they’ll do what they like with it to settle claims. Māori are saying that first preference should be given to those who had traditional ownership. So, it’s causing a whole lot of grief at the moment. I objected to a settlement that was done here in the last few months because they have given some of our traditional lands to other iwi.

Anaru’s comment demonstrates the view that the Crown is less concerned about who gets what land and more about completing its business with various claimants. In the above quotes, the participants convey their concern about their historic connections to their territory. Again, these relationships are tied to cultural issues of mana, power and authority, and rangatiratanga, autonomy. The state, however, does not calculate these cultural and political issues into its resolution of Treaty claims.

---
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7.4 LAND AS A SOURCE OF IDENTITY

The pines have brought physical changes to the landscape as well as new economic relationships that have often caused changes in access, and are a part of a contentious claims settlement process. Yet, despite these changes, Māori connections to their lands are still very important. Even if many people are not able to visit their lands as often, being connected is of great significance as a source of their identity. Below are Renee’s thoughts on the value of land:

Chris: You said that’s it’s still important for people to get onto the land regardless of whether or not it’s planted in pine. To get to wahi tapu, is there any other reason to go?
Renee: Not that I can think of, but I mean that’s one of the most important aspects of Māori is the fact that, and I mean when you talk about wahi tapu, you’ve also got native burial sites that our people are actually buried in and those areas are sort of [sacred] for Māori and I suppose even for today, especially when you want to teach your young ones where you actually come from and what actually happened. A lot of it’s all around the history, where they belong because actually Māori belong to mother earth because that’s where they belong, that’s where they were all brought up or that’s where the ancestors moved or lived.153

Renee draws attention to some of the cultural reasons why it is important to visit these places. Forests are the locations of urupa (burial sites) and other sites of cultural significance. The Māori words for various scales of the social system: e.g., whanau, hapu, iwi, all have multiple meanings that also represent different aspects of an individual’s life cycle as well as relationships to a particular place. A person is physically connected to the ground through the burial of afterbirth at the beginning of life to the interment of bones at the end of a person’s life. Because a person’s tribal land has served as the location of birth, life, and burial for so many generations, the land is a connection between past, present, and future and a connection to one’s kinship systems as well as the

153 Rewi.
genealogical system (*whakapapa*) that encompasses the universe. As such, these connections serve as the basis of a person’s identity.\(^{154}\)

Renee is again highlighting the fact that it is important for Māori to physically be present on their lands. Again, this is important in the sense that a subjective immersion in place is essential to being Māori.\(^ {155}\) There is also the idea that is common among indigenous peoples that one maintains place through direct experience of it. For Māori, this is the means of maintaining *ahi ka* (burning fire), which is about maintaining one’s rights to the land.\(^ {156}\) One’s land is one’s *turangawaewae* (standing place for the feet). This is the core essence of who a person is.\(^ {157}\) This comment correlates with Seamon’s discussion of the performative quality of place and Thrift and Gregory’s ideas about how place is experienced through the body.\(^ {158}\) They and Casey, who builds on the work of Merleau-Ponty, argue that one understands the world through one’s emplacement within it rather than one’s presumed distance from it.\(^ {159}\) Furthermore, agency, identity, and self are products of the body’s immersion in specific places.

For Māori, place and knowledge are intertwined. Place is the repository of human history through place names.\(^ {160}\) Those places all still have names. Even if people are unable to physically visit them as frequently, when they remember or utter a name, they
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are connecting to those people who named it and why it was given that particular toponym. For example, Maurice says:

Nga Oinga Motu Moku. See that: Nga Oinga; the names you know tell you something. Meeting place for our people. Yeah. Now it’s a meeting place for our people if you’re allowed to go there. You know with the restrictions [referring to Department of Conservation access limitations]. It’s a beautiful place! That’s where the two rivers meet. Flat farmland and it goes up to the quite steep foothills and then native at the back. Beautiful place.\(^\text{161}\)

One’s history is encoded into place names, but one learns them by being on the land. It is the seat of knowledge, culture, and history. As Durie notes, for Māori identity is closely enmeshed in the “historical, social, and geographic characteristics” of place.\(^\text{162}\) The Māori cultural framework for organizing all knowledge is *whakapapa* (genealogy), which is inseparable from place. Through *whakapapa*, the spirit realm and the earthly realms are connected through space and time.\(^\text{163}\) People and place “mirror” each other; they are different expressions of the same thing.\(^\text{164}\) These descriptions give only a small sense of peoples’ passionate attachments to place. These thoughts are echoed in other comments. Rapata says:

It’s a connection to the *whenua* [land] even though its pine forest. I know that I’ve still got a connection to Te Whaiti-Nui-a-Toi even though it’s a pine forest.\(^\text{165}\)

Anaru says:

The Māori spiritual attachment is to the land, not the pine trees, but if it has native trees on it that enhances it….I have dead buried there, my
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\(^\text{161}\) Toetoe.

\(^\text{162}\) Durie, 53.

\(^\text{163}\) Murton, "Toward an Understanding of a Maori Cultural Landscape" 3.


\(^\text{165}\) Wiri.
father, grandmother, and uncles. I grew up there as a child, I still go there.\footnote{Te Amo. Interview by author.}

John Kopua lives on the lands of his father’s people.

I have no plans to go anywhere else. And that’s to do with, this is my turangawaewae if you like and this is where I feel at home. Yeah, I don’t want to, I know you’ve talked to other, you have talked to people, but you can’t divorce us, when I say us, I mean Māori people, from their whenua. I guess holistically we see ourselves as not being divorced from it. You know. We’re certainly not a race of people without it I think.

Chris: Your identity is wrapped up in it.

John: Yeah. If we didn’t have our whenua, I don’t think we would be Māori people. If we ever lost all of our land, a significant if not all of our culture would dissipate with that over time. You know as the generations. And I know there’s a lot of our people who live in other places. When I say our people, I’m talking about just Ngati Porou people, you know, this East Coast tribe of ours. I know that a lot of them live in other places and they still see this as home. They still have, if they die, a lot of them still want to come home, be buried at home. Maybe in time that may change, I don’t know. It may change because of generations that have grown up in cities you know and over time that strong pull back to your roots I guess that will dissipate over time. And for me that would be a shame and a worry. Although there are signs that our young people are making a serious effort to understand who they are, where they come from and therefore that culture is still strong and important. There’s a lot of revival in our language, there’s a lot of revival in our waiata (songs) and haka (ceremonial dances) and stuff. And that’s great.\footnote{Kopua.}

John’s comments echo the argument that people are produced through their sensual immersion in place. Christopher also emphasizes the value of the land. In discussing the legal arrangements of NPWFL business partnerships, he notes that certain concerns were “non-negotiable.”

What was non-negotiable…they were things about us as Māori…we have a non-negotiable and that’s land, you [the investors] will never do anything to put our land at risk, and they [the investors] said fine great… We will manage the project, you will not introduce somebody from London or some other, if you like, Pakeha kind of forest manager to
manage things on our land, that’s not negotiable. And they said, “Okay we can work with that.”

This is not just about land as an asset, but land as the foundation of his tribe. Even while he embraces different aspects of the global economy, as the CEO of his tribal forestry organization, his goal of economic advancement incorporates the protection of cultural lands.

Ultimately, place is the source of identity. These examples show the ways in which people and place mutually co-constitute one another in the face of the globalizing influences. People retain and cultivate, to varying degrees, these connections to place. This resonates with Massey’s idea of place as process in that it is shaped by multiple connections and interactions with people at the same time that it influences people.

7.5 SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

These different excerpts from conversations illustrate a small glimpse of the variety of perspectives and experiences that characterize Māori interactions with forestry in the Kaingaroa-Te Urewera and Te Tairāwhiti regions. At the center of the statements are questions over what it means to be Ngati Whare, Ngati Manawa, Ngati Pikiao, Tūhoe, Te Aitanga-a-Mahaki, or Ngati Porou and how this identity is articulated in the face of changing relationships with local and national governments as well as global movements.

In general, these people share a strong sense of identity and a deep sense of responsibility to their own people and place. But, this does not mean that these people can be rendered as monolithic. As these examples show, there is a great deal of diversity that characterizes these people; they have different priorities and concerns with regard to
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what to do with their lands, and also different ways of achieving those goals. By extension, these narratives are an illustration of diversity within wider Māori society.

This chapter has shown the dynamism of connections between people, places, plants, technologies, and land. The rise of scientific forestry in New Zealand has led to new configurations of these different entities and altered access to place. Māori, however, have not been passive. Instead, they have pursued a variety of options for themselves. People have adapted to changing conditions by establishing new jobs and economic projects, renegotiating leases, fighting in court to protect contractual rights, pushing for or against forestry, and seeking different forms of community advancement. These interconnections have drawn together different, shifting scales from the local, regional, and national to the global. I have also demonstrated that the introduction of European concepts of land ownership and a market-based economy did not lead to the elimination of Māori relationships with their lands and environments. Instead, they added new dimensions, concerns, and complexity. Māori adapted to new industrial work regimes and thrived. In the face of efforts to eliminate their cultural base, Māori demonstrate resilience and strategically pursue their varied interests as well as maintained connections to place. There are, however, significant differences within an hapu or iwi over community development.

This chapter has also shown the ways in which Māori have engaged with a global industry. Not only do they continue to draw their own meanings from their participation and the tree industry, but in many instances they have shaped the direction in which forestry has gone; they have engaged with it at varying scales that include the global.
The above discussion has also addressed the ways in which the different qualities of *Pinus radiata* gave it an advantage and enabled it to become the dominant species of the exotic forestry industry of Aotearoa/New Zealand. While the tree is a contested symbol, based on current market trends, the carbon credit system, legal restrictions on native tree harvesting, and economic opportunities, *radiata* occupies an important position. This is only a glimpse of some of these different interactions at one moment in time, but it serves to demonstrate some of the spatiality, complexity, and dynamism of all of these different interests as they relate to one particular place.

The next chapter will summarize the preceding chapters and will discuss the implications of this research. It will also include reflections on the fieldwork and dissertation process.
CHAPTER 8. CONCLUSIONS

8.1 FINDINGS

This dissertation has focused on the relationships between Māori, place, political autonomy, economic development, the local, and the global using the example of industrial forestry.

In Chapter One I outline the framework of the dissertation. The chapter begins with a discussion of pre-contact Native relationships with forests and land and their meaning within Māori culture. This is followed by an introduction to the overarching theory of the dissertation, which is the intersections between local and global processes. Then, there is a discussion of key questions, which is followed by an introduction to the area and environment of the case studies. The next section deals with methodologies.

Chapter Two deals with the theoretical framework. It begins with an analysis of the ways in which global projects have become powerful forces, but presents the argument that globalizing systems are not hegemonic. This is followed by a discussion of local, place-based Māori culture. The section analyzes the ways in which Māori relate to place, how it informs their culture, their ways of being-in-the-world, is the base of identity, and the significance of land to Māori authority and tino rangatiratanga, authority and self-determination. This section also introduces the idea that Māori have agency and that they have, from first contact, sought evolving ways to express self-determination. From there the chapter reviews geography’s approaches to place and identifies two major trends, place as socially constructed and place as being-in-the-world.

The social constructionist approach is useful for critically assessing the structural elements that inform relationships to place. This is especially true in terms of drawing
attention to the historicity of land tenure and structural limitations of land management for indigenous peoples in a settler state. This approach, however, is limited because it creates distance between people and their environments.

In my approach to place it is necessary to problematize the distinction between objectivity and subjectivity. Thus, the phenomenological ideas as developed by Archytas, Aristotle, Bachelard, Heidegger, Merleau-Pointy, Casey, and Relph have been powerful. In particular, the ideas of ‘dasein’ or ‘being in the world’ and ‘dwelling’ emphasize the subjective experience of the person through their physical sensations of being in place. Murton describes Casey’s concept of the ‘geographical self,’ which is comprised of the relationships between landscape, self, and the body, this emphasizes the embodied experience of place.¹

My concern has been to address the ways in which Western academia approaches an indigenous understanding of place. The anthropologists Ingold and Basso analyze the ways in which Heidegger’s notion of ‘dwelling’ is applicable.² There are, however, limitations to Heidegger’s concept of dwelling that include its sense of temporal and spatial stasis as well as its failure to address the political. Thus, Jones and Cloke prefer Ingold’s term ‘taskscape’ to emphasize the performative and dynamic qualities of place, while still emphasizing the its enduring qualities.³ Murton notes that the embodied qualities of Casey’s concept of the ‘geographical self’ resonates with Māori ontology in

¹ Brian Murton, "Toward an Understanding of a Maori Cultural Landscape" (paper presented at the Regional International Geographical Union conference, Brisbane, Australia, July 3-7, 2006).
³ Owain Jones and Paul Cloke, Tree Cultures: The Place of Trees and Trees in Their Place, (Oxford: Berg Editorial Offices, 2002), 83.
that all matter, in all realms, possess form and energy. The form is a means by which different entities interact (there are others).

Native academics draw attention to the ways in which place itself is a living, creative agent as well as having spiritual and mythic meaning. Māori scholars also discuss this. Drawing on Roberts et al, Shirres, Marsden, Tau, Henare and others, Murton emphasizes the ‘inseparable relationship’ between past, present, and future as well as between this world and the spiritual realm. For Māori, genealogical knowledge is not just grounded in place, it must be spoken in place. Therefore, an understanding of a Māori sense of place must be grounded in an understanding of a Māori worldview and epistemology. Thus, place is an ‘emotional landscape’ embedded with social meaning and relationships. A more appropriate term for this situation is turangawaewae, which translates as ‘a standing place for the feet.’

Chapter Two then goes on to address theories that engage the interactions between local and global. Harvey and Massey’s social construction approaches offer valuable insights. Harvey’s writings examine the ways in which global and local forces influence and resist one another; he especially draws attention to movements of capital. He overemphasizes, however, the importance of capital, the local as reactionary, and the idea that places are created out of socio-political systems. In contrast, Massey draws attention to the dynamism of place and the ways in which different social categories inform experiences of place.

Yet again, too much emphasis is given to global forces and the local and global are constructed as opposing forces. I explored hybridity as a means to overcome the
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binary, though it has its problems as well. The concept of cultural dynamism is another alternative and highlights the contingent and diverse aspect of cultures.

The chapter then examines the ways in which Dirlik and Escobar have analyzed place. Their emphasis has been on the physicality and lived experience of place and draws from phenomenology. For Māori, the experience of place is predicated on its materiality. This collapses the difference between the built environment and nature and sets the groundwork for a closer investigation of the impacts of changes to property rights, land use, resource consumption, and the creation of industrial tree plantations.

The third chapter begins to address the question of how Aotearoa became integrated into the world economy. It analyzes the impacts of the globalization of European modernity as it relates to property rights and political power. These changes led to significant alienation of Māori from their lands, in which they quickly became minorities. This also laid the foundation for the establishment of New Zealand as a colony. The chapter examines how this affected the people in the case study areas and their responses to these changes.

Chapter Four continues the discussion of the integration of New Zealand into the world economy. In particular, it addresses changes to land use, resources consumption patterns, and the development of a market-based economy and how that established the context in which forest management would be pursued. It addresses how Māori responded to the changing conditions generally as well as in the case study areas and looks at the diminishing economic options available to people in those regions. The chapter makes the argument that Māori have always chosen how to participate and, as much as has been possible, on their own terms.
Chapter Five gives an overview of the ways in which spatializing strategies, in the form of scientific forestry, were developed and how they made their way beyond their places of origin. I make the point that ideas and technologies must be adapted to new places and that those places exert their own forces on the ways in which forestry has been practiced. The chapter also discusses the implications of these practices on land use options.

The next chapter, Six, addresses the history of forest management in New Zealand, post-contact. It builds on the implications of Chapter Four in terms of dominant cultural views towards forests and land. This includes an explanation of the particular characteristics of New Zealand that led to a departure from classic sustained yield forestry and the development of exotic plantations and the qualities of Pinus radiata that made it so successful as an industrial tree. This is followed by a discussion of the ways in which these changes to forest management impacted upon Māori and how they responded. Again, Māori participated in different ways and, despite various constraints, demonstrated agency. The chapter concludes with a discussion of tree agency and begins to address some of the complicated ways in which trees and people influence one another and place.

These chapters have documented historic relationships between Crown and Māori. The Crown goals with regard to Kaingaroa-Te Urewera shifted over time. It was not until the early twentieth century that the interests of the forestry departments intersected with the broader state plans for this region. For the Crown, the initial goal was to establish military control over the region; land acquisition was a means of extending the legibility of the state. Thus, land was first important for military reasons and only
later for settlement purposes. From the perspective of the Crown, this was necessary to maintaining peace and stability. From the viewpoint of Māori, their various cultural, social, and economic needs as well as their Treaty ensured rights to self-determination were subordinated to various state goals.

The Crown placed the needs of Pakeha settlers and of the government above those of tangata whenua. So, when the pumice lands of Kaingaroa-Te Urewera were deemed unsuitable for agriculture, rather than return those lands to its former owners, the Crown retained it. This can partially be attributed to the fact that Pakeha officials did not believe that Māori were capable of taking care of themselves, much less their own lands. Later, when afforestation became a major goal of the Crown, those lands around Kaingaroa were planted as needed. Other lands, such as those of Te Whaiti, were important to the indigenous timber industry. The loss of their most productive lands propelled many Māori into the timber industry, both native and exotic.

The changing relationships between forestry and the state has continued to affect Māori. The Forest Service’s ongoing need for land meant pressure to alienate, then pressure to lease, all of which affected Māori access to land. Later, leases were adjusted to be more inclusive of Māori needs. Throughout this process, Māori have sought to participate in the developing market economy and forestry was one avenue. The changing dictates of the national government, however, again took their toll on Māori through the restructuring of the Forest Service and the attendant impacts on the socio-economic systems of several forest towns.
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In addition to the impacts of downsizing, the government’s decision to sell off its forestry assets led to further problems for _tangata whenua_ in that it meant the possibility of further alienation from their lands once those forests were sold to another entity. After renewing the attention to the contested nature of those afforested lands, Māori demanded a return of their resources. The government took steps to address these concerns through the Waitangi Tribunal system and the creation of the Crown Forestry Rental Trust. But, the ways in which the claims process was established, particularly with the concept of ‘threshold interest,’ created the potential for conflict between the various _iwi_ and _hapu_.

It was, therefore, not until recently that the government has started to act in a manner consistent with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. While there has since been a massive settlement (Treelords), there are still many different issues that need to be worked out, not the least of which are the many claims that are still pending.

Crown goals and motivations in the Te Tairāwhiti region varied to some degree from those described in Kaingaroa-Te Urewera. Though the state cannot be said to be a monolithic entity, and the actions of various officials or of different agencies are often at cross-purposes, the overall direction of government actions’ has been against the interests of _tangata whenua_ in terms of political autonomy, economic development, and maintenance of cultural connections to land via ownership and access.

At the beginning of their interaction with _tangata whenua_ the state was interested in extending control over Māori lands in order to then distribute lands to European settlers (Pakeha). The state also confiscated land as a means to pacify Māori. Later, the means by which land was acquired was modified in order to keep ‘friendly’ Māori from being disaffected. The state imposed a western framework of private property to facilitate
the transition of the country and of Māori to a western market economy based in agricultural production, but Māori were treated prejudicially and not allowed to make their own decisions regarding development. Māori, individually and as tribes, were regarded as barriers to the interests of the nation rather than as Treaty partners or even as citizens of the nation.

Unlike in Kaingaroa-Te Urewera, state-led forestry played a different role in the Te Tairāwhiti region and was initially designed to halt erosion. The government’s actions at the end of nineteenth and through the beginning of the twentieth century had enabled and encouraged extensive deforestation even after the erosion problem was evident. In reaction to the erosion problem, local government employed various, limited methods of mitigation. Māori were excluded from participation in these processes despite the fact that they were directly impacted by the outcome.

Later, when the state was trying to set up Mangatu Forest it had the twin goals of protecting downstream farming interests and promoting commercial forestry for economic development of the region. Again, Māori were viewed as a barrier and were coerced into selling. By 1993, the state was trying protective/productive afforestation, but at that point Māori were seen as a part of its plan for development.

While forestry did in many ways compete with agriculture, it was primarily introduced to protect the interests of agriculture. In that sense, early afforestation underwrote the economic interests of farmers. The difference is that this was for lowland farmers and often at the expense of upland farm production. From the outset, however, forestry was conducted for combined purposes of protection and production. Later, with shifting economic costs and potential of agriculture in the region, agriculture lost its place
of primacy while productive forestry has become more important at the expense of protection. Following national economic imperatives, the New Zealand Forest Service was dismantled, which led to further changes to the local systems of forestry, and further efforts to make forestry productive. The unique geologic problems of the region, however, were such that national government continued to underwrite afforestation, though through subsidies rather than through direct planting. Recently, forestry has moved from being either production or protection to also serving as carbon sinks.

Under the Treaty of Waitangi, the government was supposed to protect Māori interests. Instead, from the 1860s, it was often the main mechanism behind dispossession. Later, it facilitated the deforestation of the region, thus initiating widespread land degradation. Throughout these interactions, the Crown frequently displayed paternalistic attitudes towards tangata whenua.

The introduction of large-scale afforestation affected Māori in varying ways. Land degradation was used to justify further dispossession of Māori on the grounds that they were incompetent land managers and that the government needed to have control over the establishment of the dual-purpose exotic forests. This was despite the fact that Māori were actually running a profitable business in the form of Mangatu Farms. These Crown actions were pursued despite repeated efforts on the part of Māori to retain ownership, if not full control, of their lands. Following the dismantling of the NZFS, the forests on Mangatu lands were sold for a profit. This was despite the fact that the owners of Mangatu had parted with their lands under protest and under the impression that the lands were needed for the national good.
Rarely did the Crown interact with Māori as Treaty partners. Under the East Coast Forestry Project, the government specifically focused on addressing Māori socio-economic concerns. After a review, however, it abandoned this goal to deal primarily with increased afforestation. More recently, government accommodated private interests regarding the Forest Accord, despite the fact that this had a negative impact on NPWFL development and Ngati Porou efforts to pursue economic opportunities with their lands.

In some ways, the actions of the Crown have reflected its shifting relationships with different actors or events at local, national, and the international levels. I would argue that Māori were not given priority in their interactions with the Crown. Coombes also takes this position. In many ways the government has excluded Māori from participation and subordinated their needs to those of other actors. Not only does this potentially constitute a breach of Treaty of Waitangi principles, which emphasize partnership between Crown and tangata whenua, but it demonstrates a lack of concern about Māori values. Further, a lack of inclusion can limit the effectiveness of resource management.

All of the above has been a prelude to examining Māori responses to these encounters, which is the focus on Chapter Seven. That chapter focuses on Māori perspectives on forestry, land, Monterey Pine, place, and cultural advancement. These views are organized into a set of themes that reveal the diversity of attitudes about forestry as well as relationships to it. The chapter also attends to how Māori have exerted agency throughout their involvements with forestry and shaped the ways in which it is practiced. While the respondents agree as to the cultural significance of place, they

---

7 Brad Coombes, *Ecological impacts and planning history* (Auckland: The University of Auckland, 2000), 424
disagree over how best to protect and maintain their cultural rights. I also examine the ways in which radiata influences place and how it competes against native plant species.

8.2 IMPLICATIONS

This dissertation is an examination of ways in which local and global forces intersect. I argue that globalizing projects are not simply imposed on places, but are ongoing, negotiated interactions. Focusing on places shows the ways in which the local shapes the trajectories of those encounters.

The integration of the global and local in New Zealand involved increasing intervention by the Crown into Māori affairs. These polices affected land alienation, promotion of pastoral landscapes, resource consumption, and the management of forests. These are all examples of ways in which global spatializing strategies have been applied to a specific place. While New Zealand practices are clearly connected to wider imperial networks and knowledges, however, it is important to recognize the contingency of these systems. McManus and Tsing’s respective metaphors of ‘translation’ and ‘friction’ are useful to draw attention to the ways in which the connections between people, places, organisms, and technologies in place are negotiated and transformative. It also highlights the ways that particularities of place influence the adaptation of new ideas.8

Using a multi-sited research approach demonstrates how different agents actively produce these encounters. Māori engage in these developments in a variety of ways that shift depending on many circumstances. They use European technologies to further or

protect their own interests, but to the advantage of their family or sub-tribe, rather than at a pan-Māori level. Indeed, foreign introductions are frequently incorporated into inter-tribal rivalries. For example, they have sought strategic alliances with or against the Crown, worked to retain sovereignty, and selectively engaged with market economies.

I also note the variety of ways in which participants interacted with different actors. Some have negotiated more flexible leases with government. In response to changing ownership of forestry companies, the Cairns had to fight to restore their logging rights. Protests, from walking off the job to raising concerns over cultural sites, have led to changes in forestry management practices. While some damage has already been done, the new policies represent ways in which Māori concerns have been advanced. Recognizing the importance of erosion mitigation, the people of Mangatu sought to assist the region with afforestation, even if it meant that they had to finance it on their own. Despite this, they were forced to part with the land. Following the creation of the East Coast Forestry Project, Ngati Porou worked to reorganize land rights in order to consolidate interests and exploit the forestry subsidies. When negotiations with New Zealand based Tasman fell through, Ngati Porou then looked outside of the country for a partner, which they found in Hansol. This practice of operating at an international level has continued with a British-based carbon farming partner. NPWF has launched themselves into the international arena by proceeding with carbon farming and with developing new technologies to assist in these practices. Throughout their interactions with the outside world, from first contact through the end of the twentieth century, Māori have made choices based on their own priorities and have been actively involved in
advancing their desire for autonomy and self-determination, but this has primarily been at specific family and sub-tribe levels.

This is not to say that Māori have solely operated according to personal consideration. Despite the fact that the government has rarely treated them as Treaty partners, Māori have acted, at various times, in the interests of the nation as a whole. This is clearly the case with their participation in the forestry industry in Te Urewera-Kaingaroa, described in Chapter Six as a social contract, and the sale of Mangatu in Te Tairāwhiti, though there are many others.

Trees have also been active agents. Jones and Cloke’s argument that trees and non-human actors also contribute to a sense of place has resonance for the Māori worldview incorporates human and non-human actors in a web of relationships and filial obligations. The Te Urewera-Kaingaroa case study has provided an opportunity to assess the aspects of tree agency as they pertain to the region. As mentioned, the unique characteristics of native tree regeneration placed native forests at a disadvantage relative to the imperatives of state production of resources. This enabled foreign trees, especially *Pinus radiata*, to insert themselves into the state forestry regime. The logic of rational management was extended through plantation style forestry to create a forbidding and uniform, conifer landscape of alien trees.

In Te Tairāwhiti, the *Pinus radiata* also had an advantage over native plant communities when it came to rapid afforestation of the land for the dual-purpose protection and production forests. Despite this, native ‘scrub’ plants, such as manuka and kanuka, have been continuously asserting their own presence. They have now been
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identified as a potential alternative for long-term carbon sequestration. As the dialogue about carbon emissions shifts, these ‘scrub’ plants may be able to insinuate themselves into carbon sink farming and thereby establish the means by which complex native ecosystems can reclaim place. As the advance guard of complex native ecosystems, this is a community expressing agency and pushing back against the foreign radiata. Haro and others have identified radiata as an outsider and as a metaphor for the colonizer. In this sense, the increased recognition of the value of complex communities in addition to radiata for carbon sequestration works to challenge the hegemony of monoculture as well as to demonstrate ways in which native and exotic are meshing with one another.

The particularities of place have also influenced the direction of state forestry. The unique properties of native regeneration, the competition for land, and the economic imperatives of the government led to a forestry system based on exotic plantations instead of sustained yield from natural forests. In Te Urewera-Kaingaroa, the cobalt deficiency contributed to the region being selection as the core location of the exotic industry. Later, scarcity of land and the financial and development constraints that affected Māori land development led to further pressure on Māori land. But, unlike before, this land pressure was not for agriculture, it was for forestry.

In Te Tairāwhiti the issue of erosion looms large. The rampant deforestation that occurred throughout the settler colony was devastating to the physical environment of this region in that the combination of climate, geology, and earthquakes have created a highly erodible soil and rock structure. The end result is extensive denudation of uplands, aggradation of lowlands, and a highly degraded environment. This provides a unique context for afforestation efforts in the region. Though exotic plantations were established
to provide productive for lands, they were initially geared to protective uses. This highlights the complex interconnections between varied upland and lowland economic interests, land management goals, Māori place-based and ecological concerns, as well as local and national level development projects. Later, the voices of environmental groups were added to the mix.

While Māori have participated with capitalism-based systems in a variety of ways, those interactions are situated in a host of additional concerns that include cultural, social (especially family-based), environmental, and political. Furthermore, those relationships are grounded in specific places. This is evident in the way that efforts to regain autonomy and territorial rights pervade Māori actions through history. There are, however, many other ways in which forestry has served the complex needs of tangata whenua because there is great internal diversity within their societies. This work builds upon the scholarship of Native and non-Natives who seek to counter depictions of indigenous peoples as temporally fixed or monolithic. In keeping with the ideas of cultural dynamism, I argue that all cultures have been and continue to change. Such change is not a signal of modernity or of decline, but is an intrinsic characteristic and is a product of interactions between different peoples.

With regard to Māori, access to land and having control over its development are key issues. The individuals with whom I spoke, however, had different ideas about the best course for their īwi and hapu. They also differed on their attitudes towards forestry. Some (such as the Cairns, the Newtons, John Kopua, and Christopher) saw it as a means to secure the economic interests of their people while others (such as the Trust members) saw it as an intrusion into their lives. John Ruru supported productive forestry elsewhere,
and saw it as a means to take pressure off of the harvesting of native trees. In Te Tairāwhiti, however, he views the primary importance of radiata in terms of erosion mitigation. The Trust members are also concerned about erosion; however, they argued that pine contributed to the problem. Instead, they preferred native plants, such as manuka. All these people saw land as central to their identity, but the ways in which they maintained those rights differed. The Cairns, John Kopua, and John Ruru clearly enjoyed earning a living through forestry, though John Kopua and others (Anaru, Renee, Rapata, and Christopher) also focused on the ways in which the money benefited other parts of their tribal development.

In some ways, the perspectives of these individual people are a reflection of the different regional situations. Both regions have issues related to low socio-economic levels of indigenous communities and need to address ways to develop the communities (though the form of such development and the means by which it will happen are up for debate), but Te Tairāwhiti has specific issue of highly erosive environment. For the people of Te Urewera-Kaingaroa, the pines have converted what was undeveloped land into one of the Crown assets that are being used as compensation of Treaty claims. The cost for those involved may be a final loss of land. While in Te Tairāwhiti, what started as erosion mitigation for protection/production purposes has shifted towards a heavily production emphasis. The cost for those of Te Tairāwhiti may be renewed and continued erosion.

Another aspect of this research is that peoples’ relationships to place endure. While participants generally agree that pines are distinct from native ecosystems and some have made the point that indigenous plants enhance the qualities of place, they do
not think that the pines diminish the power or importance of place. As many pointed out, even if the land is covered in pines and if access is limited, it is still important to visit places. There are many reasons for this, such as the location of cultural sites of significance, but the main reason is because they come from that place and it is the seat of their cultural identity. Thus, it must be protected.

The above discussions of the interactions between the global and the local, and the ways in which people, trees, and place are entwined demonstrate that the integration of different places around the world is a contingent and messy process. It also highlights the agency of many different actors and it shows some of the ways in which people and place mutually co-constitute one another. It examines some of the many passionate attachments to place and the different ways that people go about protecting those interests. Thus, not only are there alternative visions of how capitalism works, but places continue to have salience in an increasingly globalized world. They have not been ploughed under, in fact they are even more important as a base for political autonomy, cultural meaning, and identity.

8.3 WHAT IS NEXT

As this research was done in the days and months immediately preceding the Treelords settlement, there is a great deal of change that is now occurring in terms of land tenure and economic development. This will have an enormous impact on the relationships of various Māori to forestry, to the national government, and to one another. Given the importance of recognizing the diversity of indigenous peoples as well as inclusion of their acts and perspectives, it will be interesting to see how they view these
changes as well as their overall position as Treaty partners. This study has focused exclusively on people who have active or overt relationships to forestry. As a result, while I have spoken with some people who reside in urban areas, the emphasis has been on the rural experience. Given the changing dynamics of Māori demographics where most Māori reside in urban areas and many no longer have active affiliation with their iwi and hapu, the settlement of so many largely rural claims may affect the dynamics between urban and rural Māori. This deserves exploring.

Also, the initial research was conducted in three different areas. For the sake of time, I omitted the case study set in Taitokerau (Northland). This needs to be revisited for its own sake as well as to compare to the other two.

In terms of unanswered questions, I do not feel that I adequately explored the issue of turangawaewae. Partially, this can be attributed to the fact that the concept is not one about which the average Māori is necessarily authorized to speak. A more pressing issue is that while conducting fieldwork I ran up against many obstacles, not the least of which was the fact that most of the people who are in a position to speak about such matters were consumed with preparations for Treaty of Waitangi claims. This was further complicated by my decision to conduct multi-sited research on a limited schedule and budget. The physical distances between the three sites as well as the vagaries of individual schedules severely hampered my ability to speak with people to any depth. Another issue was my reluctance to ask too much of people when we were only just beginning to establish a relationship. While the people with whom I spoke were most generous with their time and thoughts, we were only able to scratch the surface in terms
of the discussion of forestry and their relationships to place. Deeper esoteric questions on these subjects must take place at a later time.

I had known that wood was an integral part of New Zealand life, through architecture, infrastructure, and heating purposes, but through this research I got a more immediate sense of what that really meant and of the value of forests to New Zealanders. When people, both Māori and Pakeha, found out that I was interested in forestry, they would regale me with stories about the different ways in which trees and timber structured their lives and homes. One described the intricacies of finger-jointing and other means of improving the structural qualities of pine. Another told me about his salvage efforts on rivers that served as conveyance for timber operations. He would retrieve logs that had sunk onto the river bottoms. Still another told me about how the pine was treated with dangerous chemicals that insidiously poisoned low-quality homes. One group bemoaned the ways in which the pine trees contributed to land loss through accelerated erosion, while one person suggested that production forestry had relieved the pressure to cut native trees. Many spoke of the beauty of the forests. They talked about what tree places held in terms of cultural, spiritual, and personal connections to land. They talked about how it made them feel to spend time in the forests. As a result, I began to develop a richer sense of the importance of trees, both native and exotic, in the lives of New Zealanders.
ahua: the form of a being
Aotearoa: “the land of the long white cloud;” the Native word for the North Island of New Zealand, it is often used in conjunction with the name New Zealand, though it does not include South Island.
atua: the gods

hapu: can be translated as sub-tribe, which is the main political unit of Maori; pregnant; conceived in the womb
hau: the vitality of an entity
hui: meeting

Io: The Supreme Being of Maori cosmology
iwi: tribe; bones; relatives

kaitiaki: to care for or look after
kaitiakitanga: guardianship of land, referring to the responsibility to care for one’s territory
kaumatua: An elder
kaupapa Maori: A research approach grounded in the Maori knowledge system
koru: double-spiral in which past, present, future, space, matter, and spirit are intertwined
kupapa: Maori who, for various political reasons, sided with the Crown during the New Zealand Wars

mana: spiritual authority and power; comes in three forms (see mana atua; mana tangata; mana whenua)
mana atua: spiritual power controlled by gods, but wielded by humans
mana tangata: authority that a person derives from power and knowledge cultivated by people
mana whenua: authority achieved through the maintenance of territorial rights to an area
marae: meeting house of a sub-tribe or tribe
matauranga Maori: An holistic framework for understanding the world
mauri: divine power or life force of an entity

ngahere: native forest

ora: to live

pah: villages fortified with palisades
papakainga
Papatuanuku: Earth Mother, who gave life to the various gods
pepeha: a personal introduction in which a person refers to the various physical features of their kin group’s territory
pito: umbilical cord
rangatiratanga: chief, leader
rangatiratanga): autonomy; self-determination; Maori control over their own concerns
raupatu: confiscation; many tribes suffered confiscation of their lands before and after the New Zealand Wars
Rangi-awatea: Sky Father, who sired the various gods
rohe: territory or boundaries of a tribe or sub-tribe
rongoa: medicine
rongoa rakau: traditional medicine derived from the forest
runanga: the governing council or administrative body for a sub-tribe or tribe.

Tane: the god who created the forests, birds, and humans
tangata whenua: meaning people of the land; a term to refer to the Indigenous peoples of Aotearoa/New Zealand
tapu: sacred, protected
Te Aomarama: meaning “the day,” this refers to one of the initial stages of the creation of the universe in Maori cosmogony
Te Kauwae Raro: meaning “the lower jawbone;” refers to everyday knowledge within Maori cultural framework
Te Kauwae Runga: meaning “the upper jawbone;” represents esoteric knowledge
Te Korekore: the realm of potential being out of which the world was created
Te Po: meaning “the night,” it refers to one of the initial stages of the creation of the universe in Maori cosmogony
Te Whitu Tekau: “The Union of Seventy;” a political organization of Te Urewera tribes that was formed during the late nineteenth century
teina: younger sibling
tinana: the body of an entity
tipu: the nature of an entity
tuakana: older sibling
turangawaewae: “standing place for the feet;” the historic territory of a person’s kin group

wahi tapu: sites of cultural significance, such as the location of burial sites or historic battles
wairua: immaterial self, or spirit of an entity
wananga: learning
whakapapa: genealogy, which is also the framework of knowledge
whakawhanau: the act of giving birth
whanau: can mean family or extended kin group, which form the basic social unit of the Maori system; to be born; offspring
whenua: land; ground; country; state; placenta
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