THE 'WYLDING' OF TE UREWERA NATIONAL PARK:
ANALYSIS OF (RE)CREATION DISCOURSES IN GODZONE
(AOTEAROA/NEW ZEALAND)

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS
IN
GEOGRAPHY
MAY 2005

By
Christine N. Castagna

Thesis Committee:
Brian J. Murton, Chairperson
Jon Goss
Krisna Suryanata
DEDICATION

For my Mom.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the generous support and help of many kind people. I am extremely grateful to Brian Murton, my committee chair and advisor, who helped me every step of the way for these past four years. It was through him that I became involved in studying the national park concerns of the Tuhoe people. Jon Goss and Krisna Suryanata, who were my committee members, each gave a great deal of time to helping me revise and edit my work. Through the various comments of my committee members I eventually began to understand what I was doing. Rapata Wiri of Te Urewera, my Maori language instructor, was enthusiastic and supportive.

I also want to thank Brad Coombes and Stephanie Hill, who each were generous with documents and advice. Brad’s colloquium at the UHM Department of Geography in spring of 2005 greatly aided me in clarifying my own thoughts on this topic.

Thanks to Chris Jardine, Leslie McLees, and Kapa Oliveira who read and commented on various parts of the thesis. Thanks to the members of the First Nations Working Group from the IRSA XI World Congress, who encouraged me and gave me feedback on my work. Thanks also to the many graduate students from my department who gave me cheer and the ability to persist.

Also, I could never have made it this far without the immense support, both emotionally and financially, from my family and friends. Not only did they put things into perspective, but they all pushed me to keep going.
ABSTRACT

Throughout the world, there are many struggles over resource definition and use; Te Urewera National Park within the North Island of New Zealand is a site of such contestation. Currently the Maori of this region are struggling to regain ownership of the park lands through the Waitangi Tribunal. In the meantime, current legislation requires park management to take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. This thesis is an analysis of selected texts about the aforementioned park. In it I examine the underlying ideologies of recent management plans and compare them with colonial era literature about the region as well as dominant discursive trends that have emerged from Europe. This study demonstrates different means by which the management plans reflect colonial ways of thinking about nature as separate from culture. I argue that until these persistent colonial attitudes are carefully examined, colonial injustices will never be resolved.
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CHAPTER 1. DISCOURSES ON NATURE

1.1 Introduction

This thesis seeks to examine the underlying ideologies of the Management Plans of Te Urewera National Park and to present an interpretation of how these came to be (seen as) normal. I assert that the contemporary management system of the park does not fully take into account the needs and desires of the Maori who reside on freehold land within the park. My central argument is that the management of Te Urewera National Park is largely influenced by European cultural concepts of nature and by the writings of colonial era visitors to the region. These concepts have influenced the ideas of science, rationality, and conservation which are evident in the management plans. Through analysis it is possible to show that national parks in their present form are: 1) not 'normal,' but rather are the products of very specific European cultural notions; and 2) not inevitable as they are the products of specific cultural developments. By excluding the desires of resident peoples, they are perpetuating colonial relations with the Maori.

1.2 The Study Area: Te Urewera National Park

Te Urewera National Park lies within the Te Urewera region which has been the long-occupied homeland of various Maori peoples. Te Urewera is more than just a homeland, the peoples of this region have been and continue to be defined by their relationship to their ancestral lands; together they form a seamless whole. This area is located on the east part of the North Island of New Zealand between Hawke’s Bay and the Bay of Plenty (refer to Figure 1. Te Urewera: Location Map). The park itself includes
Figure 1. Te Urewera: Location Map. Reprinted from Evelyn Stokes, J. Wharehuia Milroy, Hirini Melbourne, Te Urewera Nga Iwi Te Whenua Te Ngahere: People, Land and Forests of Te Urewera (Hamilton, 1986), 1.
several Maori settlements, which are located on lands still in Maori possession, but surrounded by park lands. The majority of the native residents of this region are of the Tuhoe tribe, who can trace their continuous occupation of the area 13 to 23 generations before 1900 (Miles 1999: 12-13). However, several other hapu (sub-tribes) have similarly long-term residence within the area. Over the many centuries of their habitation, these tribes have engaged with each other in intertribal political alliances, territorial shifts, conflicts, and marriages which have and continue to divide and bind them (Miles 1999: 12-20). The political organization of these hapu and iwi is based on a chiefly system, which is historically and spatially tied to different territorial locations. This allows separate groups to retain relative autonomy. This explains why there is no one person who holds authority to speak for the disparate peoples of the region (Binney 2001: 11).

The land is primarily rugged and mountainous, which has led to the development of specialized economies. The majority of it is covered in beech forests. There are two major lakes, Waikaremoana, the larger, and Waikereiti, in addition to numerous smaller ones. Several rivers and their tributaries drain the area. The Whakatane River system flows north to the Bay of Plenty; the Rangitaiki River system drains the Ikawhenua Range to the east and the Kaingaroa Plains to the west; the Wairoa system drains to the south-east into Hawke’s Bay; and in the west, the Te Hoe River drains south to the Mohaka River (Doig 2002: 7-8).

Harsh climatic conditions and a paucity of flat arable land have severely limited agriculture, except for a few places in the north of the region. Prior to the arrival of Europeans, the people of Te Urewera relied on a series of strategies including hunting and gathering a wide variety of forest products, fishing, and trading with their coastal
neighbors (Miles 1999: 8). The European introduction of the potato (roughly by the
1830s), which, unlike traditional Polynesian crops, was able to withstand the climatic
conditions, allowed for limited garden agriculture as a complement to the previously
listed subsistence systems (Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne 1986: 26-27). So, while Maori
did occupy some sites on a more permanent basis, they were more akin to a “nomad
people” exercising their “rights in seeking the wild produce of the forest” over extensive
areas of land (Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne 1986: 14)

Precipitous terrain and relative inaccessibility kept this region fairly isolated from
Pakeha until the end of the nineteenth century. However, a variety of changes in Maori-
Pakeha relations altered that situation. In the mid-1860s war broke out between Maori
and Pakeha. The conflict gradually shifted into the Urewera region. The Crown passed a
series of acts that were designed to extend its authority over the relatively autonomous
Urewera region. Over the next several decades, the Crown initiated legislation that
disrupted traditional property regimes, undermined cultural systems, and alienated Maori
from their lands. The Maori Land Court was established in 1865 to investigate title on
each block of land. It placed the burden of proof of ownership upon the Maori (Binney
2001: 6). The outcome of this was that through confiscation, consolidation schemes,
leases, and purchases by the 1920s the Maori were alienated from about 75 percent of the
lands that had been reserved for them (Campbell 1999: 4-5).

Over the turn of the twentieth century, the concept of land preservation for scenic
value gained currency among New Zealand’s politicians. However, it was not until the
late 1940s that the greater population began to accept such values. Various groups,
including timber, mining, watershed protection, and settlement interests, competed with
scenic preservation and began to press for utilization of the Urewera region, but a lack of clear knowledge about the characteristics of the land prevented any resolution in the decisions of the government. To remedy this, a survey of the area was undertaken. The outcome of the 1936 survey recommendations was that the land was not fit for settlement or mining and should be preserved in perpetuity for scenic value. Furthermore, the two surveyors believed that the government should purchase lands still under Maori ownership and that the majority of the region should be gazetted as a National Park. In compensation for such exchanges, the Maori in residential settlements should receive improvements in public infrastructure. However, a lack of funding and World War II kept the government from executing any of the recommendations other than as regarded those lands already under Crown ownership (Campbell 1999: 159-160).

Over the next several decades the government used various legislative measures to coerce the Maori landowners in the Urewera to part with their lands in order to convert the region into a National Park to maintain the scenic value of the lands. Despite the fact that the Crown could not convince the Maori to sell, offer decent land in exchange, or pay for any purchases, it prevented them as landowners from making any changes to their lands that were not in keeping with the Crown’s plans for the lands (Campbell 1999: 160-168). Therefore, owners were restricted from realizing any profit in terms of timber milling or clearing for farming uses. However, owners were in no way compensated for the economic losses of such restrictions. To make matters worse for the Maori, the rate or tax exemption status of their lands was revoked in 1964 even though their lands were incapable of generating income based on the restrictions that the Crown had imposed. As a result, many land owners began to accrue debt; “by 1985 this rate debt has risen over
Furthermore, in Maori lands that were within the park boundaries, Maori have experienced a variety of infringements upon their lives. Owners were required to apply for permits to hunt on their own lands and traditional gathering rights were severely restricted based on park rangers’ discretion. Trespassers onto Maori land have hunted game, damaged stock, desecrated burial sites, vandalized Maori property and buildings, and harassed owners (Campbell 1999: 151). Despite the isolation and lack of suitable roads, park policy has restricted the use of horses on park lands, which has severely encroached on Maori access to various parts of their disparate enclaves (Campbell 1999: 147).

The interactions between government agencies and the Maori of the Urewera have varied from the beginning of Crown interest in Urewera. Initially, the Maori were treated forcefully, and found themselves subject to confiscations, followed by sales of about 75 percent of the land that was initially reserved for them. In the 1930s and 1940s, Crown representatives felt it would be most useful to maintain good relations with Urewera land owners. However, they continued to apply various means of pressure to achieve their goals of land acquisition for scenic preservation.

The experience of the Maori owners throughout the Urewera since the establishment of the national park has been one of “little participation or control of these processes and conflicts which may affect their economy and life styles profoundly” (Campbell 1999: 169).

The end result of Crown pressure on Maori is that over 89 percent of original Maori lands are now under the direct administration of the government (Campbell 1999: 156). Now there are only a few isolated pockets of Maori owned land left, which are bounded within
Urewera National Park, and despite the fact that they are private lands, they are subject to restrictions based on National Park policy.

Regardless of this alienation, Maori continue to be defined by their ongoing relationship to Te Urewera. A report about this region, entitled *Te Urewera: People, Land, and Forests of Te Urewera* (1986), is significant in that it represents some of the many Maori voices. It is authored by J. Wharehuia Milroy and Hirini Melbourne, who are Tuhoe, and Dame Evelyn Stokes, who is recognized for her many contributions to Maori scholarship. According to them (1986: xiv)

> 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.

Another report entitled *Nga Taonga o Te Urewera* (2004) supports this view. This work was co-authored by Ngahuia 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 (Te Awekotuku and Nikora 2004: 1).

They go on to argue that “Te Urewera and Tuhoe – the place, the people – are synonymous” as each co-constitutes and reinforces the other and that this relationship persists for all Tuhoe no matter where they live (Te Awekotuku and Nikora 2004: 1-3).

But while many of those who remain in Te Urewera maintain a “lifestyle based on the indigenous forest” it must be noted that their culture is dynamic not static (Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne 1986: 8). While these few examples cannot encompass the great
diversity of experience and opinion of the various Maori of Te Urewera, it serves to highlight a particular kind of connected relationship to the land.

In contrast to the integrated people and place, the government represents the place as distinct and separate from the peoples. Specifically, in recent management plans the national park is depicted as a place of nature and as the jurisdiction of the Department of Conservation. What is significant about the national park discourse is that it obscures and denies the lived materiality of Te Urewera as a Tuhoe place and thus continues the displacement of Maori from their lands. Furthermore, the national park has had an impact on the lives of resident Maoris and has restricted their activities and lifestyle both within the park and on their own private lands (Campbell 1999: 135). Tuhoe have contested the government’s actions in many ways, most recently through the submission of several claims with the Waitangi Tribunal for the return of their lands (see Coombes and Hill 2005). In order to develop an understanding of how the government’s discourse works on Te Urewera, I will turn to Bruce Braun and his concept of ‘buried epistemologies’ (2002; 1997).

1.3 European Ways of Seeing Landscape and Nature

1.3.1 Introduction

One of the most critical issues of today is the use of resources, or more broadly, the human relationship to nature. It is often assumed that when people speak of the environment or resources that despite different desires or intentions they are talking about the same thing. In his book *The Intemperate Rainforest: Nature, Culture, and Power on Canada’s West Coast* and in his article “Buried Epistemologies: The Politics of Nature in
(Post)colonial British Columbia” Bruce Braun discusses how environmental entities such as the forest, or for my purposes national parks, are often accepted/assumed to be self-evident things. However, he argues that these are constituted by political, economic, cultural, and historical practices and relations of power to become invested with multiple layers of meaning (Braun 2002: 3).

This argument is based in the concept of social nature, which means that our understandings of the world around us are mediated by culture. Following the ideas of Martin Heidegger and Michel Foucault, Braun argues that nature is presented to us as a self-evident thing, but our understandings of it are never objective; we have always already been told what to expect and how we should understand nature (Braun 2002: 16). What “we see as “natural” internalizes not only ecological relations but social relations too...[thus] it becomes possible, if not imperative, to identify the specific historical forms that nature’s production takes, and to locate the specific generative processes that shape how this occurs” (emphasis in original, Braun 2002: 11). If nature is socially constructed then this raises the questions of how it came to be, to whose benefit, and with what results (Braun 2002: 13). Power is invested in how nature is understood. Therefore it is important to analyze how contemporary understandings were enabled, what had to be hidden in order for it to be constituted as it now is, and what is still being hidden. To accept nature as self-evident means that certain understandings will be emphasized at the expense of others and thus risks maintaining power relations that are a part of that concept of nature (Braun 2002: 17).

In order to investigate how nature came to be understood in its present forms, Braun turns to Michel Foucault and his theory of genealogy. Here different things are
treated “as the effects of shifting configurations of discourse and practice, rather than innate properties found in the world… [genealogy] points to the historical, cultural, and political conditions through which objects attain legibility…[and] allows us to recognize understanding of the forest – and our interests in the forest – as historical rather than timeless and partial rather than objective” (Braun 2002: 3).

One of Braun’s major arguments is that “if the forest…is a deeply cultural and political space, then it is so in ways that bear the continued imprint of colonialism” (Braun 2002: 8). In other words, the ways in which the forest, as well as nature and wilderness, are understood continue to be mediated by colonial ways of seeing the world. The contemporary world is often described as postcolonial, but this raises a number of problems. The post implies that colonialism is past, but not only does the colonial past still inform the present, but some of the mechanisms from that period are still in place (Braun 2002: 21). Furthermore, the word postcolonial should not be confused as describing a universal experience, for as colonialism was different through space and time, so is the postcolonial experience (Braun 2002: 21). “Postcoloniality refers to the aftermath and not the transcendence of colonialism” (emphasis in original, Braun 2002: 22-23).

Braun (emphasis in original, 2002: 12) criticizes the concepts of wilderness, “pristine”, and “primeval” which “posit nature as something that lies outside history, and thereby denies other histories of nature’s occupation and use, specifically those of indigenous peoples.” This can happen in two ways:

through erasing signs of existing human modification, thereby producing nature as pristine, or by collapsing indigenous cultures into nature to form
a premodern harmony that must be protected *in its totality* from a threatening modernity (emphasis in original, Braun 2002: 12-13).

He argues that the first method relies on the separation of nature and culture and the second is a form of temporal fixing, wherein indigenous culture is only authorized in an ancient form and not in a contemporary manner. Essentially, this latter idea means that those indigenous peoples living today can have nothing to do with nature as they are not considered truly authentic and indigenous peoples (Braun 2002: 12-13).

Braun (1997: 4-5) refers to lasting influences of the colonization process as “buried epistemologies” and writes that these “have been naturalized as “common sense” in everyday relations and in social, economic, and political institutions.” Braun demonstrates the development and continuity of particular modes of thinking with regard to the land. One of these ways is in attitudes towards the environment and culture, which are separated within the European perspectives. He writes about the effects that such thinking have upon attitudes over resources, in particular how ‘buried epistemologies’ affect the concept of nature and its uses. In order to uncover these ‘buried epistemologies,’ Braun analyzes various accounts that were written by the geologist and amateur ethnographer George Mercer Dawson during the colonization process of British Columbia. In these texts, the BC forests are reconfigured from indigenous places into natural and national spaces.

Braun then compares the Dawson texts with more recent ones to show how colonial displacements continue to authorize present day displacements. In one of these later texts, technical expertise has been substituted for moral reason. Instead of dealing with the issue of whether or not native rights have been abrogated, The MacMillan
Bloedel (MB) timber corporation focuses on its scientific skill at managing the forests. MB’s authority and the greater authority of the BC government are treated as foregone conclusions. Braun points out how this relies on and perpetuates the colonial asserted separation of nature and culture (Braun 2002: 34-43).

Using another text, Braun shows how ‘defenders’ of the forests maintain the nature/culture separation as well as temporally fix indigenous peoples. In On the Wild Side, environmentalists construct the forests and ‘true’ nature as being primeval and a place of wilderness. Maintaining colonial rhetoric, and discursive practices, natives are only authorized as long as they are primitive and part of the past. But, since they are part of the past, they are not able to speak to the modern world about the so-called ‘plight’ of the forests. Any contemporary natives are treated as inauthentic and thus incapable of representing nature. Colonial ideas enable modern disinterested environmentalists to speak for nature (Braun 2002: 66-108).

Following Braun’s method, I intend to show how colonialism made over Te Urewera from an indigenous cultural place into a natural and national space, which was then available to be appropriated by the government. Braun writes that “by calling attention to these displacements as constitutive of present-day claims of forest ‘custodianship’ by state and corporate capital alike, I suggest a colonial logic that continues to lie at the heart of BC’s forest economy” (Braun 2002: 27). I will show how key figures in New Zealand’s colonial past created interpretations of Te Urewera that not only influenced their contemporaries, but set the groundwork for modern understandings of Te Urewera as a space of national interest and authority and that this continues to be the basis for popular perceptions of the region. Government control and authority over
the area is taken as a given even today when legislation and court proceedings show this to be problematic. In order to create Te Urewera as a space of national interest and authority, the cultural ties must be broken and the indigenous peoples narrowly circumscribed in their relationships to the park. Accordingly, I will discuss the discursive practices that enable such displacement and containment.

1.3.1.1 Words

Some words about the choice of terms in the title. I choose the archaic word ‘wylding’ to draw attention to the British influence in the colonization of Aotearoa/New Zealand. The Oxford English Dictionary lists ‘wyld’ as a spelling variation of the world ‘wild.’ Among the definitions for ‘wild’ are:

Of a place or region: Uncultivated or uninhabited; hence, waste, desert, desolate. (Often with special reference to the character or aspect of such places.)...Belonging to or characteristic of a wild region; of or in a wilderness...Of persons (or their attributes): Uncivilized, savage; uncultured, rude; also, not accepting, or resisting, the constituted government; rebellious...Not submitting to moral control; taking one's own way in defiance of moral obligation or authority; unruly, insubordinate; wayward, self-willed...implying blame or reproach...Fierce, savage, ferocious; furious, violent, destructive, cruel...Of strange aspect; fantastic in appearance...Of a plant (or flower): Growing in a state of nature; not cultivated (Dictionary 1989).

All of these definitions will take on greater meaning through the colonial reshaping of the Te Urewera region.

Te Urewera is now largely dominated by the national park bearing the same name, which presupposes that it is a space of ‘wilderness’ and ‘primeval’ nature and thus one that is marked by an absence of culture. But, I wish to emphasize the point that this was not always the case. Prior to the creation of Te Urewera National Park and to this day
the region has been and is a deeply cultural space. Therefore I chose the word ‘wylding’ in its active tense to call attention to not only the reframing of Te Urewera as ‘wild’ but the ongoing reassertion of this rhetoric. For the ‘wyldness’ of Te Urewera is not a foregone conclusion. Instead this region is a place of cultural politics, which Mitchell defines as the “contestations over meanings, over border and boundaries, over the ways we make sense of our worlds, and the ways we lead our lives”. Te Urewera is a place of domination, subversion, consent compromise, and resistance. Therefore I think that it is appropriate to use a word of the colonizer to call attention to what the colonialism had done and continues to do.

The words ‘(re)creation discourses’ are meant to show a few things. First, that the discourses were actively creating or re-creating a place from that which already existed for the various Polynesian tangata whenua, who have since become commonly referred to as the Maori. These discourses were formative for the Te Urewera region as well as for Aotearoa/New Zealand as a whole. This brings me to the term ‘Godzone’, for what was known to tangata whenua as Aotearoa, or the Land of the Long White Cloud, was renamed, and thus re-imag(in)ed, by Europeans as ‘Godzone’ or New Zealand. The former term is a conversion of the words “God’s own” which conveys the idea that the land was for those associated with God, in other words Christians, and not heathen primitives. The Edenic Aotearoa, or place of God’s creation, appeared to be theirs for the taking.

What I am trying to show is how important ‘wyld/wild’ ideas and images of nature were to the original settlers and how central they were to European understandings of this space and place. As Aotearoa was recast/reconstituted as ‘Godzone’ for the
colonists, so was Te Urewera refashioned from a cultural place into a space that fitted various nature and recreation tropes. Te Urewera was made to serve the needs of the 20th century public of the New Zealand nation by nostalgically reclaiming some of the imagined ‘wildernesses’ of the colonial period.

1.3.1.2 Space versus Place

When I write about place and space, I draw a significant distinction between the two. Place is the embodiment of culture (Casey 1996: 34). Casey argues that “human beings...are ineluctably place-bound” and that while “the inherent emplacement of culture has been missed,” place is indispensable to the structure and form of culture (Casey 1996: 19, 33). 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.

On the other hand, space, according to Western science, exists prior to place. “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” (Casey 1996: 16). Thus, space is constructed as having priority as well as eminence over place. “Once it is assumed (after Newton and Kant) that space is absolute and infinite as well as empty and a priori in status, places become the mere apportionings of space, its compartmentalizations” (Casey 1996: 14). Edward Casey argues that space is a construct of Western science and does not exist prior to place. He bases his argument in phenomenology, which “began as a critique of what Husserl called the “natural attitude,”
that is, what is taken for granted in a culture that has been influenced predominantly by modern science” (Casey 1996: 13).

Following the ideas of Archytas, Aristotle, Bachelard, and Heidegger, Casey argues that it is place and experience of it which are general, universal and a priori, while space is particular (Casey 1996: 16-20, 28-32, 36-46). Specifically, space is particular to Western science. Several scholars have also argued that place is central to culture (Basso 1996; Deloria 2001; Te Awekotuku and Nikora 2004). Specifically in the case of Te Urewera, Te Awekotuku and Nikora, who are from that land, argue that there is no distinction between Tuhoe and Te Urewera; they “are synonymous” (2004: 1).

Particularly for indigenous peoples, it is place that is a priori. Casey argues that the preponderance of Western culture and science that have convinced us otherwise. 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 of erasing cultural ties or going back to a pre-placial, or pre-human, state. However, reconstituting the landscape as space is an imposition of Western logic and thus an act of colonization that only masks the lived place. In the case of Te Urewera, the land is converted from a Tuhoe place to a space within the national territory. Then, it is converted into a place as a national park, but I believe that this new conception of Te Urewera does not match that of Tuhoe.

1.3.2 ‘Enframing’

This European way of seeing the world has been discussed and developed by Derek Gregory and Timothy Mitchell, who draw from the works of Michel Foucault and Martin Heidegger. According to the ideas embodied in ‘enframing,’ it is believed that
there is an underlying order or systematic rationality to the world and that everything stands for or represents something else. In other words, there is a distinction between the tangible world which we can immediately apprehend, the signifiers, and the realm of meaning, the signified (Gregory 1994: 21; Mitchell 1988: 12-13, 69). The representations claim two things: that they are not real, but mere representations; and that what they are demonstrating or representing really does exist (Gregory 2001: 92; Mitchell 2000: 18). For example, statistics, law codes, and historic monuments, all taken together, can be cited as evidence that the thing called society exists, and that these are just manifestations of society’s order. But, as Mitchell argues, it is through the arrangement of such signifiers that the order of society is created; society does not pre-exist its construction (Mitchell 1988: 126). With this explanation of representations in mind, Gregory and Mitchell explain that Europe came to understand the world in visual terms.

Two of the ways in which Gregory and Mitchell describe ‘enframing’ are through the concepts of the ‘world-as-exhibition’ where the world is organized to convey an underlying meaning and the ‘world as picture’ wherein the “world [is] conceived and grasped as a picture” (Gregory 1994: 34; Gregory 2001: 92-95; Mitchell 1988; Mitchell 2000). World fairs or exhibitions, zoos, museums, and the theatre were all designed as spectacles or pictures that were microcosms of the world; these were intended to be experienced, studied, and learned from (Mitchell 1988: 6). These displays were set up and accepted by audiences as being accurate and complete renderings of their subject matter (Mitchell 1988: 7). But, the organizing of the world as a picture or exhibition did not stop with such specific learning centers, it came to be the way that all of Europe was organized and understood. This habit of setting up the world in such a way became so
pervasive that Europeans expected the entire world to be structured to convey its meaning (Mitchell 1988: 9-13). But, in order to learn from the exhibit or picture, and thus all the world, it was necessary for there to be a distinction between the viewer and what was being viewed; this draws from the concept of perspective.

Perspective is the idea that when a view is beheld from a distance, it grants the viewers an objective and complete access to that view. Perspective has its roots in the technological developments that were used for artistic rendering of landscapes. First demonstrated by Filippo Brunelleschi and then explained by Leon Battista Alberti, linear perspective was a technical means which enabled the artist to create an accurate rendering of a scene onto a flat surface in a realistic manner (Cosgrove 1984: 22). The use of perspective established a visual relationship between the observer and the observed which allowed the latter to be organized by the former (Cosgrove 1984: 20-21). In painting and mapmaking, individual features could be drawn or placed in an idealized way to convey a particular meaning; this was a precursor to the idea that nature and society could be controlled and ordered (Cosgrove 1984: 20-21). In landscape paintings the view is designed for one vantage point and is presented to the viewer as their own privileged view. This is usually reinforced by the fact that any humans within the picture are diminished in comparison with the rest of the scene. The realism of the depiction gives it the appearance that it offers a objective view of the landscape, which elevates the experience and understanding of the observer above that of those inside the frame (Cosgrove 1984: 26-27). The significance of perspective was that the objectivity created by it would grant a deeper understanding of the world and implies the authority of the observer (Cosgrove 1984: 20-21; Fabian 1983: 30-47; Said 1979: 55).
Mary Louise Pratt coined the term 'monarch-of-all-I-survey' to describe the trope of authority (Pratt 1992). This trope is often typified by the author's ascension to high ground, such as on a promontory or bluff (Murton 2001; Pratt 1992). It is as though a view from a height provides a more privileged perspective that can take in every aspect of the land; however, even without the elevated position, the fact that the author presents his or her opinions as though they are the truthful apprehensions of the world establishes some sense of authority (Pratt 1992).

A further means to facilitate analysis is to treat different components of the view one at a time. This derives from Michel Foucault's idea of 'micropower' wherein "the body is approached as an object to be analyzed and separated into its constituent parts" (Dreyfus, Rabinow, and Foucault 1983: 153). This practice was a means by which to achieve discipline and control over a population, one subject at a time. Another critical component of such disciplinary technologies is the control of space. This is accomplished by creating a framework with discrete "regular units" within which individuals are carefully distributed, and thus more efficiently surveilled and controlled (Dreyfus, Rabinow, and Foucault 1983: 154-155). Timothy Mitchell explains that such division of space produces containers within which are placed any objects of study that can then be "isolated, enumerated, and kept" (Mitchell 1988: 45; Smith 1999: 68). Notably, the framework is neutral, it stands apart from what it contains and there is a distinction between what is inside and what is outside the grids. It appears then as though the framework is order itself, or order revealed, when in fact it is imposed (Gregory 1994: 174; Mitchell 1988: 14).
These different characteristics of ‘enframing’ came to be incorporated in the way that Europeans saw and interacted with the world. When describing the world an observer has to accomplish three things: “nature’ has to be held at a distance, set up as an object, and structured as a more or less systematic totality” (Gregory 2001: 92). This would then make the view intelligible to other Europeans. Gregory (2001: 92) refers to this as the ‘artful organization of the view” whereby the audience is convinced that what is shown is a representation, and that that representation signifies something separate that really exists. This is encapsulated by the trope of the ‘picturesque’ which means ‘like a picture.’

“The concept of the picturesque and of picturesque travel had emerged in eighteenth-century Europe” (Neumann 2001). Neumann (2001: 23) writes:

Thinking of one’s surroundings as a picture usually implies a hierarchical relationship between the one who sees and the seen. The picture is there to be consumed by the viewer. While the picture is already there, ready to be found, it is only there as long as it is seen from a particular vantage point and by somebody who knows how to appreciate scenery. The viewer is both there to apprehend scenery (and thereby make it become picturesque) and to convey an image to others…such a relationship can have important ramifications: “if those who see are convinced that the scenery worth preserving is only what is encompassed by the picture they see, then what they cannot see has no ‘scenic’ value (and may be clearfelled, burnt and planted in radiata pine).

He goes on to say that picturesque travel was considered an art form. The eye had to be taught to seek out picturesque beauty…these pictures, travellers pretended, were not something they composed, but were already there, ready to be found (Neumann 2001: 22).

However, in reality, the viewer takes an active role in determining composition, having chosen that site in the first place. The view is framed wherein a particular landscape is selected. Then, “the scene is…ordered with reference to his vantage point, and is static”
The land is described in terms of a formal artistic sketch, where the description is rendered in terms of foreground, middle ground, and background that are composed of a series of planes, elevations, textures, and colors. The effect is an estheticized landscape that has been created for the author (Pratt 1992: 204). This picture is available for the author or viewer to manipulate by discussing certain features, but ignoring others all while describing the world according to the author’s opinions of it. Furthermore, it places the scene in a position to be judged by both author and audience (Pratt 1992: 205-208). It is also important to note that this kind of distanced view of the world is necessarily that of an outsider’s, which relies on “private, personal consumption through sight” (Cosgrove 1984: 269-271).

1.3.2.1 ‘Enframing the world’

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. Pratt cites two significant events which led to this new European global view. The first was the 1735 launching of the La Condamine voyage. Previous explorations primarily focused on determining the shape of coastlines, collecting navigational information, and establishing trade routes (Pratt 1992: 15, 23, 29). That aforementioned journey marked a shift “towards interior exploration and the construction of global-scale meaning through the descriptive apparatuses of natural history” (Pratt 1992: 15). The international nature of the effort, and the existence of a transnational scientific community is testimony to the European belief
that science was extremely important, even more so than political rivalries (Pratt 1992: 16, 18).

The second major hallmark of change was the 1735 publication of Linnaeus’ classification system for all plant life. It made the production of scientific information relatively easy for the general populace and launched the natural history project (Pratt 1992: 27). There was a wide mobilization of resources within European societies that supported and expanded this new pursuit of knowledge (Pratt 1992: 29). It became common for some level of botanizing to be a part of every expedition and such studies were a popular theme in all manner of travel writing; through these developments, the presence of a naturalist became normal (Pratt 1992: 27-28). The popularization of science was particularly crucial because while specialized scientific texts were important to the knowledge building project such incorporation of ‘herborizing’ into “journalism and narrative travel accounts” served to “[legitimize] scientific authority and science’s global project alongside Europe’s other ways of knowing the world and being in it” (Pratt 1992: 29). The widespread European belief in the importance and pursuit of science had a huge impact on the way Europeans understood their place in the world (Pratt 1992: 23-24, 26).

According to Michel Foucault, the main goal of the natural history project was to create descriptions of objects that were as close as possible to observed reality for only that which was based on careful observation would qualify as knowledge (Gregory 1994: 21; Pratt 1992: 28). Cosgrove notes that artistic control through perspective was later combined with naturalists’ observations of the world to become the basis of science (Cosgrove 1984: 25). In other words, a concept of control over nature and the world is invested in science. This was made possible because of the aforementioned belief in an
underlying order to the world. Perspective allows one to see that order, careful
observation allows one to discover truths, and these can be faithfully recorded and placed
within appropriate entries in the grid of knowledge. Furthermore, perspective allows the
author to freeze time; what is selected is an atemporal ‘universal reality’ (Cosgrove 1984:
26). Since it captures a moment in time, it gives the impression that the viewer has
control over time itself and access to the greater underlying atemporal order. It is this
concept of perspective, of standing outside or apart from the object of study that is
incorporated into the scientific privileging of distance and objectivity of having a real
deeper understanding of the world.

Prior to the natural history project, native non-European knowledge of plants and
animals was also important, but as the natural history project grew, the primary
information that was recorded was that which the naturalist acquired through observation
(Pratt 1992: 31). Botanists would isolate an individual plant (and later animal or mineral)
from the ‘chaos’ of its natural ecosystems, carefully observe it for the purpose of
determining defining visual characteristics, give it a new name, and then enter this new
entity into Linnaeus’s carefully organized classification system based on its visual
similarity to other plants (Gregory 1994: 21-22). This was thus the means by which
Europe could make sense of the world by containing and fixing in place of all entities in
lists, taxonomic grids so that data or the items in each container could be easily referred
to and/or counted up; the world was made legible. Biological interdependence or
proximity did not matter, meaning and value were based solely on a thing’s relation to the
grid of knowledge (Gregory 1994: 21-26).
But, the division was not solely limited to entering individual specimens into appropriate grids; at a larger scale, Europeans believed that nature and culture were separate and exclusive of one another. This trope of the 'separation of nature and culture' is encoded into how Europeans described everything. The world was divided up into bounded spaces on maps and in written descriptions where all other manner of life were assigned to different regions or lists based upon whether they were human, animal, mineral, or vegetable (Braun 2002: 44-57; Smith 1999: 47). These were not just documented separately but also treated as distinct and unrelated entities (Braun 2002: 48). It was as though a Native presence only existed in villages and agricultural fields and was entirely disconnected from surrounding lands (Smith 1999: 51). This was the enframing of individual specimens and different types of resources into taxonomic grids, lists, and discrete bounded spaces or containers and the ultimate realization and execution of order (Braun 2002: 45-57).

Europeans did not believe that this was an imposition of order, but rather that it was order revealed. The implications were many. The scientific dissection of the world and ordering of information was construed as being an innocent endeavor, one in which naturalists were discovering an underlying order, or nature's plan. In direct contrast to the acknowledged violence of previous colonial dispossessions during the Age of Exploration, the scientific project was seen as non-disruptive, but this was hardly justified. In reality, scientists created an order and then imposed it on the world (Pratt 1992: 28-31; Smith 1999: 5). Mary Louise Pratt (1992: 7) refers to this as the 'anti-conquest' wherein the natural history project "promised intellectual possession of the world without physical dispossession of the people who inhabited it" (Gregory 1994: 29).
But, while the pursuit of knowledge was vaunted as a noble endeavor, free from the pettiness, guilt, or complicity of commercial exploitation, it was the basis for continued colonial theft as it produced commercially exploitable knowledge (Pratt 1992: 34). Foucault notes that a major development that marked the modern age was "the incorporation of non-European "man" into the table, the taxonomy and the grid [which] effectively prised non-European peoples away from the land which they inhabited, and once they had been textually removed from the landscape, it was presumably easier to do so physically as well (Gregory 1994: 30; Pratt 1992: 32). When culture and nature were separated, the land and nature were emptied of a human presence. This meant that cultural connections and claims to the land were erased which later allowed for easy justification of colonial appropriation of the land (Pratt 1992: 51-52, 59).

When the observing gaze was cast upon humans, it re-configured humans as "both an object of knowledge and a subject that knows" which had radical consequences for how Europeans understood themselves in relation to the world at large (Gregory 1994: 26). As a result of increased interaction between Europeans and non-Europeans in 'contact zones' there arose a crisis of identity amongst the former (Pratt 1992: 6-7). There was concern that there was not much difference between 'us' and 'them.' In his book, entitled Orientalism, Edward Said (1979: 3) argues that one of the goals of the European knowledge producing project was to assert the identity of the non-European, or the Other, in opposition to the European, the Self, in order to construct and secure the identity of the latter. Pennycook (1998: 47) quotes Metcalf who writes:

as Europeans constructed a sense of self for themselves apart from the old order of Christendom, they had of necessity to create a notion of an 'other' beyond the seas. To describe oneself as 'enlightened' meant that someone
else had to be shown as ‘savage’ or ‘vicious’. To describe oneself as ‘modern’, or ‘progressive’, meant that those who were not included in that definition had to be described as ‘primitive’ or ‘backward’. Such alterity, what one might call the creation of doubleness, was an integral part of the Enlightenment project.

In so doing this, scholars developed beliefs and practices that structured their inquiries. Taken together, these ideas formed the discourse of colonialism, which operates to make the Self and the Other known and understood. A series of dichotomous tropes were developed that defined these two in opposition to one another. This worked to construct essentialized identities, which further served to justify the dispossession and subjugation of colonized by the colonizers (Mitchell 2000: 13-14; Pennycook 1998: 33-40; Said 1979: 7). European man was a rational, objective figure who was capable of knowing. Conversely, Non-Europeans were described as irrational and inferior, and therefore subject to the rule of the colonists as well as objects to be studied. European culture was designated as being the contemporary apex of civilization in a linear teleological evolution (Smith 1999: 25). Non-Europeans were placed at varying intervals on the scale of evolutionary development with indigenous peoples placed at the most primitive levels. It was believed that it was the duty of Europeans to bring the light of Western civilization to the rest of the world. Indeed, Said (quoted in Pennycook 1998: 37) explains that

neither imperialism nor colonialism is a simple act of accumulation and acquisition. Both are supported and perhaps even impelled by impressive ideological formations that include notions that certain territories and people require and beseech domination, as well as forms of knowledge affiliated with domination.
1.3.3 Temporal Fixing/Authenticity

The inclusion of humans within the taxonomic grid became the basis for the hierarchical ordering of all cultures, with Europe placed as the most developed (Smith 1999: 25). In the project of making the Self and the Other known, Europeans performed a further discursive practice on indigenous peoples known as ‘temporal fixing.’ This incorporated many of the enframing practices. But, the exclusion of natives from nature was not just about containing and fixing them in place, but also in Time (Fabian 1983: 30). Fabian refers to this as a ‘denial of coevalness’ where the author presents the subject “in a Time other than the present” (1983: 30-47). While nature was constructed as a repository of resources which were integral to the development of the modern state, the Natives were temporally fixed; they were permanently cast back in time to a primitive zone (Braun 2002: 59-60). Braun (2002: 61) writes:

Dispossession did not hinge on ignoring Natives; it hinged on how they were described and incorporated within orders of knowledge....Indigenous people were identified and described in great detail. This presence, however, was contained in a discourse of primitivism and what Anne McClintock (1995) describes as “anachronistic space”: a realm that remains anterior, and thus has not place in the unfolding history of the modern nation.

To begin with, Natives were thought of and described as being unaware of the value of the land that they occupied which therefore negated any claim they might have to “the tremendous riches that lay upon or beneath the “face of the country”” (Willems-Braun 1997: 18). It was believed that Natives did not play a role in actively shaping and interacting with the landscape around them (Willems-Braun 1997: 17-18). So, to Europeans it seemed normal to delimit indigenous influence to their villages and more obvious sites of agriculture (Willems-Braun 1997: 17-18). Not only was this made into
reality on maps, but through the practice of separating information into different categories. As mentioned before, culture was separated from plants, animals, minerals, etc, and then it was further broken down into what were assumed to be separate parts of culture: “physical appearance, social organization, religion and medicine, the potlatch and distribution of property, folklore, villages, and population” (Braun 2002: 48). In addition, a dichotomy was laid down, that of traditional versus modern (Willems-Braun 1997: 21-24).

Europeans believed that what marked indigenous cultures was their static nature. These cultures were placed on the opposite end of the evolutionary spectrum from modern European culture, which was defined as dynamic and progressive. It was believed that “identities are more ‘pure’ the further they can be separated. Nature is the absence of culture. The traditional is the absence of the modern” (Willems-Braun 1997: 21). Because of this, Europeans felt that interaction with such traditional cultures would only lead to their decline. The moment of contact is viewed as the point of rupture or decline of the pure indigenous culture. This was supported by the fact that contact was often attended by massive epidemics amongst indigenous populations and huge death rates. It was believed that native culture and life was dying out and therefore, many cultural accounts are characterized as ‘salvage ethnography’.

According to the European concept of perspective, it was possible for someone to freeze time and to select out an atemporal ‘universal reality’ (Cosgrove 1984: 26). Combining this with the belief in static culture, it was assumed that any ethnographic information that was recorded would reflect the ‘true,’ ‘pure’ and unchanging cultures of indigenous peoples. This is reinforced by the methods of ethnographic study.
The juxtaposition in literature of observer versus subject presents an unbalanced situation, where the subject is passive to the views of the observer (Pratt 1992: 204-205). Johannes Fabian (1983: 35) points out that in order for ethnographers to observe subjects, they must occupy the same Time, but once the researcher has shifted to analysis of the field experience, the subjects are cast back in Time and treated as relicts of a past Time who are only in the present by accident. This is characterized by descriptions of natives as being ‘savage’, ‘primitive’, or ‘heathen’, which places them in direct contrast to the modern world. Indeed, the sheer absence of indigenous peoples in certain texts as supplemented by stories that are temporally marked, such as ‘legends’ or ‘myths,’ makes it appear as though the natives and their ways of life are dying out, disappearing, or are already gone (Fabian 1983: 30; Neumann 2001: 23-26; Pratt 1992). By refusing to critically engage the cause of cultural decline or by directly writing that such death is inevitable, the author legitimates this expectation.

Colonists frequently believed that their writings about the people being colonized reflected the universal reality of the native. By constructing narrowly circumscribed essentialized identities, colonists often created their definition of what true and authentic culture was and that became the basis for determining what was not authentic. The problem was that no culture is spatially isolated or static, culture continually undergoes dynamic change. So, by restricting natives to an outsider perspective that was fixed to a colonial moment in time, Europeans established a standard by which to judge all indigenous peoples from that point forward. Of course, in this thesis for the sake of my argument I am also essentializing both Maori and colonists.
What this can do is disempower Natives through the trope of ‘authenticity’ (Braun 2002: 24, 94-97; Smith 1999: 72-74). If they demonstrate any sign of deviation from the rigid colonial identity, then they are considered ‘inauthentic’ and therefore no longer have a place of privilege, as indigenous peoples, to speak on behalf of themselves or their lands (Braun 2002: 96; Smith 1999: 72-74). If natives become modern then they will be subsumed within the larger non-indigenous body politic. On the other hand, to accept a reified identity is also to be forced into silence. By being ‘traditional’ they are a part of the past and thus cannot “be modern, scientific, and enlightened spokespersons for nature” (Willems-Braun 1997: 23). Furthermore, this requires indigenous peoples “to remain forever outside the economic circuits of the global economy, situated where European cultures have always placed indigenous populations: back in nature, always outside modern forms of rationality, as undeveloped, primitive precursors to modern culture” (Willems-Braun 1997: 24). Since they are identified as ‘primitives’ it is believed that they are unable to speak for themselves, which thus authorizes the voice of modern ‘disinterested’ ecologists and scientists (Willems-Braun 1997: 22-23). Thus, no matter what natives are kept from speaking for themselves and their lands.

As discussed in the preceding section, when Native ties to the land were cut, this cleared the way for Europeans to appropriate the lands for themselves. One of the ways in which this is manifested in travel writing is the trope of ‘anticipatory vision’ or ‘destiny’ (Murton 2001: 10-11; Pratt 1992: 205-213). Murton (2001: 10-11) writes that colonial writers would describe personal imaginations of how the land could be changed in ways that were “meaningful only in terms of a capitalistic future.” This implies that European uses of the land are superior to Native uses.
1.3.4 The Politicized Landscape and the Emergence of National Parks

1.3.4.1 English Landscape Ideas

Before indigenous peoples were cut away from the fabric of their place, European ideas about nature and culture underwent many changes. Initially the two were closely tied together. In his book *Landscape Nature and the Body Politic: From Britain’s Renaissance to America’s New World* (2002) Kenneth Olwig traces the development of the concept of landscape as scenery back to the political struggles of early 17th century England. The changing concept of landscape reflected changing social relations to land and nature. Eventually nature and culture were separated from one another. The ascendancy of James I to the throne of England ushered in the beginnings of representation conflicts between the centralizing force of the king and the Parliament, whose legitimacy was predicated on local, place-bound customary law. The parliaments were an abstract form of polities which had traditionally exercised their local rule in individual communities that were built upon custom and occupation of the land. Throughout the 16th and 17th centuries, the rulers of England had relied upon parliaments for financial support of their increasingly expensive wars. In exchange, the parliaments had gradually acquired greater political influence. Through virtue of heredity, James I of England also held the throne of Scotland. But, beyond these two countries, he envisioned the unification of the British Isles under his rule. He imagined this new realm as his modern (18th century) incarnation of the empire of Rome with all of its attendant glory. By creating the idea that Britain was the heir to the legacy of Rome, the former acquired an ancient legitimacy. The term Britain was even borrowed from Roman literature. However, since English customary law only granted the English Parliament the right to
represent the English people, the extension of the king’s power beyond England meant an increase in his power of representation while the English Parliament would not have this same legitimacy with regard to the amalgamated body politic of Britain since there was no precedent by which the English parliament could claim a customary right to represent a country such as Scotland (Olwig 2002: 44).

Therefore, Parliament was resistant to efforts to create Britain. In order to achieve his goal, James I undertook to promote the idea of nation as embodied within the land or body geographical rather than its individual polities. This drew attention away from the conflict over different ideas of representation and the ethnic and cultural variations within the populace and instead placed emphasis on the entirety of the national land as differentiated from other nations. A century later, Montesquieu took this idea further and suggested that the improvement of the land, such as through landscaping, would improve the body politic and the state (Olwig 2002: 158).

At the same time, social change led to new attitudes about and utilization of the land. The success of foreign colonies led to the financial rise of a new gentry. However, money did not equal political power. Instead, these men envisioned “country as the natural source of political legitimacy” (Olwig 2002: 102). This idea was eventually transferred out of the court and into the countryside where landscaped estates became the physical expression of privilege and status of the country elite. By re-designing their lands, which were acquired by the enclosure of commons, these gentry were able to create country seats for their global colonial empires. It was believed that social values no longer emanated from the customary law of the community; they came rather from the natural laws embodied in the scenery of the physical landscape and in its improvement (Olwig 2002: 117).
But, these values were still only in landscaped places rather than in all of nature.

1.3.4.2 Aesthetics and Landscape

For a long period of time in Western thought, wilderness was counterposed to culture. Wilderness was seen as a place of imbalance in fertility, either in excess or in an absence of it. The ideal landscape was one which was cultivated and productive. This took on moral overtones where the garden or cultivated land was representative of Eden, and the wilderness was the wasteland to which humanity had been cast after the fall (Olwig 2002: 131-132). Wilderness only lost its negative connotation when the majority of lands had been cultivated or appeared to be under human control. No longer threatening in its boundlessness, it became a site of aesthetic appreciation.

At the beginning of the 19th century, the concepts of wilderness and the sublime changed. This was partially a Romantic reaction against the development of industrial capitalism. But, these romantic arguments only criticized the consequences of capitalism and not the system itself. Cosgrove (1984: 230-234) argues that the result was a mystification of the relations of capitalism. In other words, these arguments created the impression that even though capitalism was flawed, it was inevitable. Romantics believed that society was not natural, and that the only salvation for humanity was to be found in nature and in wilderness (Braun 2002: 87-89; Cosgrove 1984: 230-234).

“If cultivated land, resources and labour were increasingly unnatural, nature could only exists where human society had not intervened, or at least where the appearance of non-intervention could be sustained, in the wild and unused parts of the environment” (Cosgrove 1984: 232).
Thus, “the wilderness ideal created the basis for a clear-cut dichotomization of culture and nature” (Olwig 2002: 164).

Romantic ideology was also significant in that nature was viewed as a commodity with exchange value based in aesthetics rather than pre-capitalistic use-value. This aesthetic appreciation was rooted in the concept of the sublime, which originally was a term used to describe poetry and architecture that was elevated. In the early eighteenth century the sublime was used to describe the state of mind that an individual could reach when considering the awesome power of God and it resided in works that were created by people. In the mid-18th century the concept of the sublime was slightly altered to describe an emotional state of passion which could be reached through the senses, particularly through sight (Cosgrove 1984: 226-234). Landscapes could now be described as sublime. Here a rugged, wild nature was conceived of and imbued with a sense of masculinity, power, and ‘mind-boggling force’ (Olwig 2002: 160). It was believed that within this wild and raw nature lay the reinvigorative qualities which would help to define and renew the nation.

The sublime was also prized for didactic qualities of the scenery, wherein nature would be a source of inspiration and education of the populace. Of course, this depended on the training of the observer in aesthetic tastes. In early eighteenth century England the subject of picturesque beauty was the smooth, tended, pastoral landscape. Towards the middle of the century the picturesque was also used to describe wild, untrammeled lands, where “the values expressed by these scenes were thought to spring directly from the physical properties of the land as viewed as picture” (Olwig 2002: 165). This led
eventually to the development of travel in search of picturesque scenery for the
cultivation of aesthetic ideals.

1.3.4.3 The American Wilderness Movement

English aesthetic tastes and their political values were transferred across the
Atlantic and adopted in America where they underwent a variety of transformations;
there the meaning of wilderness became even more charged after it was incorporated into
the American aesthetic and intellectual milieu. As noted in the preceding section, it had
lost its appearance of political meaning. But, this was merely hidden beneath an aesthetic
movement. Olwig (2002: 182) notes that “America...has a great heritage of nature
writers who have interpreted its landscape scenery and given it meaning in their texts.”
Key among these ideas were the concepts of sublime and wild nature (which were critical
in the development of the concept of the national park).

By the 19th century, it became accepted notion that natural values emanated from
nature and therefore wilderness was a place for the recreation of society at an individual
level. Henry David Thoreau believed that walking or hiking were the means by which
individuals would be imbued with “the creative forces of nature” (Olwig 2002: 188-189).
Ralph Waldo Emerson also saw value in wilderness; however, his transcendental view of
nature was primarily organized around the gaze. By observing, seeing, beholding nature,
man would develop an understanding of his place in the world. This was an
anthropocentric ordered practice. Emerson noted that by the concept of perspective
allowed man to establish the difference between subject and observer, “between man and
nature...the least change in our point of view gives the whole world a pictorial air...man
is hereby apprized, that, whilst the world is a spectacle, something in himself is
stable...[man] unfixes the land and sea, makes them revolve around the axis of his
primary thought, and disposes them anew” (as quoted in Olwig 2002: 190). Olwig (2002:
190) goes on to write that “man looks into this infinite nature in order to find a reflection
of his own infinite possibilities.”

Another key protagonist in the wilderness movement was John Muir. His attitudes
towards wilderness were markedly different from the Americans previously mentioned.
He read Emerson’s view on nature and wilderness much more literally and felt that nature
was indeed God’s temple. “Wild nature, Muir believed, was not amenable to recreation
nor was it a source of national developmental strength” (Olwig 2002: 203). He also felt
that it should only be enjoyed by the privileged few, those who knew how to appreciate
it. There were strong overtones of environmental determinism in this argument. For Muir
believed that in man’s confrontation/interaction with wild nature, he would become
intellectually and physically stronger (Olwig 2002: 161-164, 185-186). Nature was a
place where individuals could test and develop their traits of manhood. His friend Teddy
Roosevelt held similar beliefs and “saw recreation in the wilderness as a means of re­
creating the rugged individualistic spirit identified with their White Anglo-Saxon
Protestant forebears. Once properly hardened and shaped by confrontation with western
wilderness the young scion of East Coast wealth would then be ready to make his
1.3.4.4 Invoking Sacred Wilderness

Wilderness, or more specifically, its preservation, is a serious topic in the United States. These concepts are thought to be free from cultural bias, but in reality the wilderness aesthetic has many real cultural overtones, as is evident from the preceding sections. Moreover, wilderness is a focus of emotional attachment, which has serious complications for the management of such spaces; particularly national parks.

In her monograph on wilderness, Linda Graber (1976: ix-x) writes that wilderness has become a contemporary form of sacred space...we live in a secular age, so the religious essence of the wilderness ethic tends to be overshadowed by attempts to justify wilderness preservation on secular grounds, be they scientific, aesthetic, nationalistic, or hygienic...[but] the intense emotion and rigid codes of conduct associated with wilderness areas suggest a motivation beyond the practical.

She goes on to argue that while wilderness preservationists comprise one of many interest groups that fall under the heading 'environmentalists,' the sentiments, views, and strategies of the former shape much of the discourse on environmental issues (Graber 1976: x).

Various changes in Western thought led to the disenchantment of the world. The idea of a transcendental God, Renaissance concepts of perspective, and the Enlightenment development of objective, rational individuals are all key to the gradual secularization of the world. Graber (1976: 7) argues that despite this modern people still yearn for connection to the sacred, but the ways in which people attain that experience "varies among cultures and over time."

Different aspects of the wilderness movement betray its religious undertones. The sense of 'mind-boggling awe' and the vastness of space, in other words, the sublime, are
characteristics popularly associated with wild nature. Wilderness literature is often typified by religious references to the out of doors. A major goal is communing with nature for transcendent experience. Graber (1976: 22) also writes that

the striking uniformity of wilderness purists' beliefs, their membership in conservation organizations, their sense of identity, and their degree of emotional commitment suggest the emergence of something like a sacred community.

The success of the wilderness ethic for the mainstream public is in its similarity to other important American principles. Graber (1976: 16) notes that "veneration of the frontier and the urge to balance the urban experience with periodic personal movements 'back to nature'" provide the common sentiments that make Americans receptive to wilderness values.

The constituency of the wilderness movement deserves comment. Graber and Denis Cosgrove note that there are curious sociological traits to the purists. Primarily they are well-educated, affluent, and from urban places. They are an elite group and they tend to scorn those people who do not appreciate the wild places in the same ways that they do (Graber 1976: 17-22).

**1.3.4.5 American Politics of Wilderness**

In attempting to develop and unify the young nation, the wilderness movement was critical in that it helped to identify and delineate symbols of an American national identity. Following independence, America, like Britain prior to the unification of Scotland and England, "faced the problem of incorporating conquered national territories within its prospective bounds" (Olwig 2002: 179). The American founders had to unite
individual states as well as newly conquered Native American lands. The masking of political differences by creating the idea of a national identity as exemplified by the geographical land appealed to the American nation builders. Here the distinction and uniqueness of America’s landscapes were tightly bound with an American sense of identity. Unlike English gardens, American scenery was envisioned not as a product of landscape designers, but of the ultimate designer, God (Olwig 2002: 182). In particular, the ideas of wild, rugged, vast nature were seen as hallmarks of American scenery. For America, as well as other settler countries, national identity was defined by the mythic confrontation between immigrant and wild frontier with its naturalized savage natives.

The configuring of America as a wilderness became a means to achieve political legitimacy. For Henry David Thoreau, the American “Wild WEST” is the same mythic “west” [read wilderness] of national and imperial destiny with which the British and Germans had once associated themselves” and from which civilization springs (Olwig 2002: 184). This was a means by which America could establish a political legitimacy for the state, by establishing itself as the heir of the ancient tradition of Greek and Roman civilization, which most recently had been vested in Britain. Not only was civilization moving westward, but also it returned, in cyclical fashion, to its wild roots to renew itself. The reason for this, Thoreau argued, was that civilizations “survive as long as the [fertile] soil is not exhausted. Alas for human culture! Little is to be expected of a nation, when the vegetable mould is exhausted” (as quoted in Olwig 2002: 185-186). Therefore, Britain had lost its place in the sun. The problem with such belief in the teleological westward progress of civilization was the recognition that, eventually, America would also be left behind as the apex of civilization. “The teleology of Thoreau’s moving world
picture is so ordered that even as the nation is busy being born in the West, it is also
dying in the East" (Olwig 2002: 187-188). As Thoreau saw it, the answer lay in
emparking and preserving that great resource of wilderness.

1.3.4.6 The National Parks Movement

Uninhabited wilderness had to be created before it could be preserved, and
this type of landscape became reified in the first national parks (Spence
1999: 4).

Neumann (1998: 23) writes that

The historical point (roughly, the mid-nineteenth century) when the
landscape ideal was most fully developed in England and North America,
and the concepts of landscape and nature had become increasingly
interchangeable, was precisely the point at which the national park
movement emerged.

While national parks had different significance and values from English parks and
landscapes, they developed out of the same of the same aesthetic concepts. Neumann
(1998: 10) goes on to argue that “we – meaning ‘educated Westerners’ – recognize
certain landscape as natural in part because we have been trained to expect a particular
vision through centuries of painting, poetry, literature, and landscape design.” National
parks are predicated on European assumptions that nature can be approached and judged
as visual art (Neumann 1998: 9). “Thus, in the development of the national park concept,
we witness a convergence of ideas about landscape appreciation, social identity, and
nature protection” (Neumann 1998: 24).

The problem with lands deemed suitable to be national parks was that they were
all occupied by Native Americans. Thus, even though it was supposed to be a place of
pristine nature, the national park was a place of historical cultural occupation. While “the
earliest national parks advocates hoped to protect “wild” landscapes and the people who called these places home” such beliefs eventually were replaced with the preservationist attitude to nature, which posited that ‘wild nature,’ as represented by national parks, and human occupation were mutually exclusive (Spence 1999: 4).

People, such as Thomas Jefferson and Frederick Law Olmsted, believed that the wild beauty of nature should be available to the masses (Olwig 2002: 179, 198-199). Olmsted cited the commons of England and Switzerland as ideals that the national park would embody. The former was available for shared, communal industry, based in resource consumption, while the latter was grounded in tourism. Both benefited the local populace. The common use of land which Olmsted advocated preempted the subsistence economy of the Native Americans which was based on ancestral usufruct rights. Therefore, what was important about Olmsted’s argument was that in deciding against the privileged use of the few, he also felt that Native Americans did not have a right to exclusive use of the land (Olwig 2002: 199). Accordingly the greater good outweighed the customary occupation of the minority. But, this did not mean that national parks would be without profit, for as Neumann (emphasis in original, 1998: 24) notes,

*a national park is the quintessential landscape of consumption for modern society.* At the time of its establishment, Yellowstone was foremost a “pleasing ground” (the term used in the original legislation), receiving strong backing in Congress from the railroad industry, which saw in it the potential to increase ridership through mass tourism.

Tragically, Native Americans were not meant to share in the new nation, or its new symbols of identity. For the new nation conceived of itself as being founded in an Edenic wilderness.
Ideas of Eden and a mythic conquest of wilderness as embodied in national parks were critical to constructing a national identity. The national identity being fought over is that of an immigrant population whose history has been left behind in the Old World and who must forge a new identity “an identity forged through a mythologized encounter with nature” (Neumann 1998: 32-33). But, the problem was that the Edenic wilderness which Europeans were “conquering” did not exist, the lands were already inhabited and had been so for millennia.

Hence, an important role of national parks in the construction of class and racial identity is to eliminate the record of indigenous history and culture, replacing it with a vacant landscape into which the Europeans streamed....The history of the conquest of humans...was transformed in a conquest of nature. Parks help to conceal the violence of conquest and in so doing not only deny the Other their history, but also create a new history in which the Other literally has no place (Neumann 1998: 33, 30-31).

This then required the removal of Native Americans from their lands. “As in the case of Ireland, the right of the conqueror over the conquered was bolstered if the conquered were portrayed as inferior beings” (Olwig 2002: 201). This was supported by the idea that the land was going to waste while under the care of the natives. However, this time it was not in the sense of productive use, but of aesthetic value. To add to his argument against Natives Americans, Olmsted believed that they were incapable of appreciating the wild, rugged scenery in that they were not civilized (Olwig 2002: 201).

The fact that Indians continued to hunt and light purposeful fires in such places seemed only to demonstrate a marked inability to appreciate natural beauty. To guard against these “violations,” the establishment of the first national parks necessarily entailed the exclusion or removal of native peoples (Spence 1999: 4).
In the case of Yosemite this meant the enforced physical removal of various tribes at the hands of James D. Savage’s troops. As a placatory note, an enlistee by the name of Lafayette Bunnell informed Chief Tenaya that a lake and river would be named for him. Bunnell records the exchange as follows:

At first he seemed unable to comprehend our purpose, and point to the group of glistening peaks, near the head of the lake, said “It already has a name; we call it Py-we-ack.” Upon my telling him that we had named it Ten-ie-ya, because it was upon the shores of the lake that we had found his people, who would never return to it to live, his countenance fell and he at once left our group and joined his family circle. His countenance indicated that he thought the naming of the lake no equivalent for the loss of his territory (as quoted in Solnit 1994: 219-220).

Solnit (1994: 220) goes on to comment that:

Bunnell claims to Tenaya that the new name will give the man a kind of immortality, but what he is really doing is obliterating Tenaya’s culture from the place and beginning its history over again.

Then, government agents set about destroying their interpretations of evidence of cultural occupation, including white settlers’ buildings (Olwig 2002: 206). Furthermore, the depiction of national parks as being the works of nature and God served “to obliterate the memory of earlier cultures and their marks on the land” (Olwig 2002: 206).

The mistaken belief that Yosemite and other natural landscapes were formed by natural processes affected park management policy. The central idea was to place a fence around the park, and then leave it. This was predicated on the equilibrium model that nature is not dynamic and will remain unchanged as long as there is no interference. “Such a view overlooked the fact that, even using primitive tools, such as fire, humans had had an all-pervasive impact upon the land. Once humans were removed from a park, the original landscape scene would change more or less dramatically” (Olwig 2002: 206-
207). For in reality, nature is dynamic, and such landscapes were maintained in a stable state by human effort. As a result, the “open, park-like scenery of Yosemite...became more and more overgrown and it became more difficult to see the park’s natural wonders. Furthermore, the park became a fire hazard” (Olwig 2002: 207-208). This American model was the basis for national park development around the world and it carried with it all the flaws and political and cultural biases of its original design. Olwig (2002: 224) notes that creating these parks has

meant expelling the native inhabitants from their ancestral lands...under such conditions these parks appear to replicate the social injustices of the imperial mindset linked to British landscape garden parks.

Yosemite was the first site for the development of Olmsted’s national park concept. However, Yellowstone was first to be gazetted as a national park by the federal government. The key aspects of the national park were the tension between the need to preserve the wilderness and the desire to provide the park as a place of public recreation.

1.3.4.7 The U.S. National Park Model and Its Influence

I conceptualize national parks not simply as threatened by social, political, and economic forces beyond their control, but as active sociopolitical forces in their own right (Neumann 1998: 9).

The U.S. national park model began to appeal to other countries. Not only was it useful for creating a national identity, but it also attractive because of a growing concern for conservation. “Interest in conservation has been generated by sharpened perceptions of the prospects for a global ecological ‘crisis’” (Anderson and Grove 1987: 6). Conservation proponents believe that their cause is apolitical with universal values. But, such narratives of ‘crisis’ are inextricably linked to Western perceptions and attitudes to
the nature and these descriptions can be extremely influential in shaping policy and practice (Anderson and Grove 1987: 7).

These narratives of a global environmental ‘crisis’ have created what Schroeder and Neumann (1995: 321) refer to as “manifest ecological destinies,” which they refer to as “a naturalized ecological mandate that drives environmental organizations and their donors to assert control over remote territories.” But, they go on to argue that while such behavior appears to be motivated by glorious ideals of nature saving it masks a series of problematic things. “Northern-generated notions of ‘one-world’ and a global commons” require the Southern Hemisphere countries to stay permanently underdeveloped for the benefit of middle-class tourists from Northern countries while “capital’s complicity in fomenting ecological crises escapes examination” and “patterns of accumulation and consumption in the North continue unchecked” (Schroeder and Neumann 1995: 322, 321). Thus, “manifest destiny” allows the North to continue to assert power over the South and justifies the continued dispossession and disenfranchisement of rural peoples.

But, to native peoples, conservation could not be anything less than political. Conservation agendas and their goals, such as preservation, directly impinge on native peoples “management and ownership of land, as both the dwelling place and means of production of the majority of the population, [and] therefore lies at the core of the political agenda” (Anderson and Grove 1987: 6). West and Brechin (1991: 16) point out that the meanings and values of the national park model cannot be separated from the culture in which it was designed and that it is often poorly suited to other cultural circumstances. “The United States has always been a country with vast, sparsely settled
lands. It is also a wealthy country where most of the population is now urban-based, and
does not need to subsist directly from the land” (West and Brechin 1991: 16).

1.4 The U.S. National Park Model Applied to New Zealand

1.4.1 The Context of Nature Protection

According to Harmon (as quoted in West and Brechin 1991: 16), “national parks
are the product of an affluent culture, and…they emerged from a ‘context of boundless
wealth, under the expectation that the natural resources left outside them were
inexhaustible.’” But, in the case of New Zealand, Pakeha perceptions of the environment
were much different and developed along their own trajectory.

The concept of sublime was also used to describe that which was strangely
beautiful (Park 1995: 142). This was particularly the case in New Zealand, where the
unique environment provided much in the way of strangeness and wildness for European
travelers. But, this required the adoption of European tastes in New Zealand. This attitude
towards nature and landscape led to the rise of the national parks movement.

The year 1874 marked the introduction of this concept into New Zealand. Citing
Yellowstone National Park as precedent, ex-Premier Fox promoted the reservation of the
Rotorua area for its thermal activity. The subsequent development of the area was geared
more towards settlement. However, the idea of scenery preservation for tourism began to
gain popularity. In 1887, a Maori leader, Te Heuheu Tukino IV, gave a large portion of
land, which included three volcanoes, to the Crown to preserve in perpetuity. Its
successful reservation as New Zealand’s first national park “owed much to the fact that
the land was ‘almost useless as far as grazing was concerned’” (Star and Lochhead 2002:
The growing recognition of the tourist value of such parks facilitated support for their reservation. But, this required land.

In New Zealand, there was a change in some Pakeha's attitudes towards the land at the beginning of the 20th century. Initially wilderness was seen as a threat wherein "the forest is conservative, repressive, making not for culture or advancement" (Park 1995). But, the idea that nature was valuable in and of itself gained currency once the majority of the rest of the land had been cleared; when it was realized that the wilderness was disappearing, it gave what little was left a sentimental value (Park 1995: 154). People interested in conservation began to form scenery preservation societies to promote reservation of more blocks of land. Despite the fact that society participants believed in preservation of wilderness for its indigenous flora and fauna protection and for its sublime, spiritual qualities, they understood that such aesthetic appreciation was not common and instead focused attention on the tourist values of natural parks and, to a lesser degree, habitat protection. Their efforts contributed to the subsequent gazettal of many parks.

This led to the birth of the 'scenic reserve,' which in New Zealand was "a pleasure of imperialism, set aside 'only when...the needs of settlement...have been amply met and provided for'" (Park 1995: 143). But, the beauty of nature was not so much to keep the Maori land intact as it was to create places for tourist to recreate. The land was "'not alone in the interests of...conservation...but in the interests of tourists and other travellers'" (Park 1995: 143).

Most of the lands that preservation societies sought to protect were not economically viable. When they did push for the reservation of a commercially valuable
forest, in the Rai Valley, they discovered that New Zealand was not ready to put scenery before utilitarian benefits.

The majority of colonists in New Zealand appreciated nature and scenery; however, they felt that industry and progress were more important and that it was their job to domesticate nature (Star and Lochhead 2002: 120-121). The first conservation efforts, in the late nineteenth century, were designed at maintaining a resource base for future use or other economic considerations, such as against erosion or droughts, rather than out of any aesthetic or spiritual quality within nature (Star and Lochhead 2002: 121). Interest in preservation grew in response to attention that brought to the decline of native bird species concern over faunal habitat loss and preserving New Zealand's unique species led. A prominent aspect of scenery reservation focused around the tourist value of unique places. Yet, tourism was a distant second behind settlement usage. Lands that were set aside were usually useless in terms of productive value.

As it became more obvious that timber resources were declining, there was greater emphasis on the idea of preserving stands of certain native species as museum pieces for posterity. However, the overall sentiment was that native flora was destined to be supplanted by introduced species. This was bolstered by the belief that native timber trees were slow to mature in comparison with exotic timber. Yet there were challenges to the idea that the displacement of native species was inevitable which led to greater support of preservation. Scientists became involved in the politics of preservation; this highlights the growing sense that scientists are not neutral. Meanwhile, the indigenous people were not heard.
In his book entitled *Nga Uruora: The Groves of Life* (1995), Geoff Park writes that in the 1970s that the conservation movement gained its current popular momentum. At this point, scientists were even more involved in authorizing and legitimating the arguments for conservation. Ecosystems concepts were particularly important for developing arguments for extensive connected habitats of various types as opposed to isolated pockets. Protection of bird habitat was one of the initial reasons for the development of preservation and conservation interests. Willems-Braun points out that even though scientific arguments for the protection of habitat appear to be objective, it is possible to decode them and reveal a variety of interconnected biases. In recent years, the concept of ecosystems theory has been shown to be too limited and it is now evident that natural environments can recover from various shocks. However, such evidence is not always to the advantage of conservation interests. This provides ‘wise use’ advocates the opportunity to present evidence that systems shocks and disruptions are not only normal, but are more characteristic of environments than stasis. Furthermore, natural environments are quite capable of recovering from such changes. Also, the tendency of environmental groups to push for natural reserves that are exclusive of human use furthers a variety of troubling attitudes about nature and culture. The idea of setting aside large tracts of land in an apparent state of wilderness was appealing.

1.4.2 National Parks in New Zealand

Generally reserves were legislated to be on Crown lands. The early legislation did not provide power to acquire private or Maori lands. Through the efforts of scenery preservation societies, the Scenery Preservation Act of 1903 was amended under the
Public Works Act of 1910, which enabled ‘compulsory purchase of private or Maori land if their features were of sufficient note’ (Park 1995: 145-147; Star and Lochhead 2002: 126). Despite this, the majority of the lands that were reserved were government owned and not acquired through the 1910 Act.

By the late nineteenth century, those lands that still had the appearance of being in a state of nature were primarily Maori. Geoff Park (1995: 317-318) notes that “the Western approach to conservation sets nature aside as large tracts of land in a state of imagined innocence – national parks and other ‘reserves.’” He goes on to say that “wherever Percy Smith and his [Scenery Preservation] commission looked, what had escaped 60 years of settlers’ fires and was still wild and beautiful tended to be Maori land” (Park 1995: 145). The lands that scenic preservation groups took an interest in had originally been left to Maori because they had been perceived as being wild, in other words, useless. Such lands had become desirable because ‘wilderness’ had become valuable.

The problem with the preservation movement was that it was another form of imperialism. For, in reserving land, Maori were excluded from using it as well. Park points out that the scenic preservation movement of New Zealand contains a series of very colonial attitudes. Not only was it based on European aesthetics and geared towards lands that were economically marginal, but also it was a further extension of European dispossession of Maori for their lands. Lands were only set aside if they were considered useless in economic terms. Also, despite the efforts of scenery preservation interests, one of the main agendas in reserving lands was the development of the tourism industry. In
order to create places as Urewera, natives had to be removed and/or confined. It was in this context that national parks and the preservation movement operated.

Therefore, the appropriation of land from natives for the purpose of reservation as a national park was not limited solely to the United States for conservation in New Zealand is no more multi-cultural than it is innocent endeavor without a compromising history. It obtained much of its land by stealth and confiscation in the years of government-led devastation of taha Maori. It is prevailed upon by preservation, an ethic rooted in dogma about an ephemerally occupied, but otherwise empty, land whose ‘many types of ancient forms’ needed to be saved in their ‘old primeval grandeur’. Conservation began in the minds of men who viewed Maori as a vanishing race whose attitude to nature reflected a primitive stage in human progress, irrelevant to modern needs (Park 1995: 317-318).

Through this it becomes evident that those national park lands that were envisioned as being wild, romantic and empty were in fact occupied, used, and meaningful to its inhabitants as I detailed in Chapter One.

1.4.3 National Parks as Symbols of National Identity

Despite the push for preservation, there was another clear direction to the appearance and structure of the scenic reserve and national park system. Though introduction of exotic fauna was coming under criticism, national park managers continued to stock non-native animals in order to make the parks more attractive, particularly for hunting. Likewise, certain native species were not considered attractive enough and it was proposed that they be replaced with more impressive species. But, preservation groups and some members of the scientific community all pushed for the exclusion of exotics from the reserves. To garner support for the protection of New Zealand’s flora, one botanist, Leonard Cockayne, developed arguments to ideologically
weld landscape scenery with native plants which together represented the special character of New Zealand’s landscape. His rhetoric of science included the tropes ‘distinctiveness’ and ‘ecology’ (Star and Lochhead 2002: 128-130).

The landscape was eventually very important as a symbol of national identity. Lacking a long cultural history to define nationhood, the uniqueness of New Zealand scenery became an icon of the growing sense of nationhood, and a point around which to construct a sense of being a New Zealander. These became representative of ‘Godzone’ and the Pakeha narratives of their encounter with an Edenic wilderness out of which they wrested their new futures. This, of course, obscures the long established Maori occupation of Aotearoa, but it contributed to support for protection of what native scenery remained.

New Zealand’s national parks contain its unique landscapes and thus are important symbols of national identity. In examining the national parks that dominate the New Zealand system, it is clear that mountains comprise a large portion of the protected regions. Mountains are considered appealing for many reasons, two of which are because they are grand and spectacular. But, the overwhelmingly mountainous character of New Zealand’s national parks cannot be simply attributed to the value of mountains. Prior to the attachment of aesthetic sentiment to mountain places, Europeans viewed them as useless, which is precisely why they survived during settlement. While these national park areas are now supposed to represent the mythic wilderness which the first colonists encountered, the ecosystem types which more accurately represent the lands that were converted by settlers, such as grasslands and wetlands, are barely represented within the national park system. This is largely because they were considered to be too valuable as
'productive' lands to be reserved for aesthetic consumption. It was only in the 20th century, with the acceptance of New Zealand's landscapes as unique national symbols, that wilderness and mountains had aesthetic value. Thus, while these areas may be considered to be simply sites of nature, they encompass a variety of cultural meanings and are the results of specific attitudes and valuations of nature (Pawson 2002: 150).

1.5 Key Concepts and Guiding Questions

Perceptions of nature and culture that originally belonged to colonists are reproduced in the contemporary world. These cultural perceptions build up over time and, in many cases, become naturalized and taken as common sense. Thus, they are not recognized for their discursive power, but just taken as a universal given or truth. In order to uncover or break apart these 'buried epistemologies' Braun pursues a Foucauldian genealogical approach. In analyzing the travel writings and the management plans, I will be looking for how the following key concepts shape images and understandings of and play a role in the deployment of power in Te Urewera. These are roughly be organized by the conceptual sections in which they were introduced, though it should be noted that there is a significant amount of overlap between them.

1.5.1 Space and Place

According to Casey (1996) Western science proposes that space is absolute, infinite, and a priori to place which is just considered to be just a component of space. But, he argues that this is a Western scientific view and indeed place is universal and prior to space (Casey 1996: 16-20, 28-32, 36-46). From the European point of view, this
means that Tuhoe and their claims to Te Urewera are secondary to the national claims to the land. Tuhoe and Te Urewera are reduced respectively to a minor portion of the national body politic and of the national space.

1.5.2 Enframing

There are several key ideas that emerge from the discussion on enframing, among these are the concepts that: there is an underlying order or systematic rationality to the world and everything stands for or represents something else, specifically that there is a distinction between the world of the signifiers and the realm of the signified; the world is a picture or exhibition in that it is organized to convey that meaning; if a view is beheld from a distance, it grants objective, truthful, and complete access to that view; using a framework, space can be divided into neutral, discrete containers into which can be placed any items; nature is an object and is a systematic totality; the ‘artful organization of the view’ makes a scene intelligible.

1.5.3 Enframing and Science

Using the concepts of enframing, science is constructed as the objective study of the world wherein: careful observations and descriptions yield knowledge; frameworks facilitate the scientific method: detailed descriptions should be isolated and kept in separate containers; and the world can be divided into discrete, bounded spaces; science is innocent.
1.5.4 Indigeneity, Authenticity

The ideas about indigeneity include several Eurocentric assumptions: that natives do not understand the value of resources, therefore they have no claim to the land; that land and resources are critical to the development of the modern state; that native culture is static and indigenous peoples belong to the past; that authentic indigenous culture has no trace of modern influence; and that natives can not speak for themselves. As a result, natives and nature must be represented by someone modern.

1.5.5 Wilderness and the Sublime

As the landscape was gradually depoliticized and the national parks concept evolved they came to incorporate a few concepts regarding nature and culture: that nature and culture are separate; that social values can be instilled into the landscape. This second idea was then contradicted and it was proposed instead that social values emanate from the landscape are from natural laws and God.

The national parks concept also included many ideas on wilderness: that wilderness is the opposite of culture and they are mutually exclusive; that wilderness is a place of aesthetic appreciation; that wilderness is sacred and sublime; that the sublime can be a source of inspiration and education for the populace; that wilderness is a symbol of national identity; that wilderness is a source of renewal of the civilization.

The concept of conservation was based on several beliefs: that non-consumptive appreciation of wilderness is more important than the subsistence economy of a minority group; that natives can not appreciate the value of wild scenery; that national parks must be exclusive of human occupation; that subsistence uses are not compatible with
preservation values; that conservation is apolitical and is of global importance; that conservation is based in science and skilled technocrats, and these are integral to the maintenance of a national park; that national parks are run by government agencies.

1.5.6 ‘Buried Epistemologies’ and New Zealand’s National Parks

In New Zealand’s conservation movement and national park system there are several notable attitudes: that aesthetic appreciation and tourism are prominent reasons for national parks; that conservation is necessary for sustainable yield and future resource development; that habitat protection is important; that science is critical to conservation and the management of national parks.

The above are all examples of ‘buried epistemologies;’ they are remnants of earlier European attitudes towards the world and towards nature and culture that have become normalized within contemporary discourse. In addition to introducing the dominant rhetoric, a few critical concepts have been introduced. These are: that while they are purported to be unbiased truth, narratives of ‘crisis’ are influential in shaping policy; that conservation agendas mask continued dislocations of resident peoples; that national parks are an active sociopolitical force; that New Zealand’s national parks supposedly embody its mythic settler origins; however, they overwhelmingly represent what were deemed ‘wastelands.’

1.6 The Way Forward

Chapter Two discusses the influence of travel writers. I have selected two writers who had visited Urewera and whose literature on that region were critical in shaping
popular attitudes towards it. I will give a brief summary of their respective backgrounds as well as their relationships to the greater New Zealand public. Drawing from the conceptual framework, I will explain the different tropes that are found within the selected texts and how these relate to contemporary attitudes regarding resources and the land.

Chapter Three is a discussion of the Management Plans of Urewera National Park. I will examine how these most recent plans exemplify a certain attitude towards the land. I will also deconstruct conservation discourses of science and rationality to show how they authorize certain people to manage national park resources and in specific ways. Recent legislation requires that the needs of Maori be taken into consideration in the management of national parks. Despite this fact, it is evident that there have been many cognitive failures that continue to circumscribe the full consideration of Maori desires. I draw connections between colonial and contemporary tropes that affect Urewera. I conclude that the management systems must analyze common sense assumptions about nature and culture in order to more justly address the different interests of Maori as well as the population at large.
CHAPTER 2. TEXTS AND TROPES: TWO TRAVEL ACCOUNTS

2.1 Introduction

Most nineteenth century travel writing focused on the collection of all sorts of information for the purpose of making a place known to the colonial metropole, which was most desirous for such accounts. There was a scientific aspect to travel writing; it was a part of the overall knowledge producing project of the new European 'planetary consciousness' (Pratt 1992; Wevers 2002: 1-5). Wevers (2002: 3) cites Colonel Julian Jackson's 1841 publication entitled What to Observe; or, the Traveller's Remembrancer in which he instructs the writers that

he can not only do much to enlarge the sphere of his own ideas, but acquire the means of communicating to others a great mass of valuable and interesting Information...the result will be beneficial, as regards a true knowledge of the Earth.

Wevers argues that travel writing creates a textual landscape. She writes that

travellers are usually readers and many refer to their reading in their own writing in order to agree or disagree, compare, extend or digress from their own experience (Wevers 2002: 5).

The ongoing referencing and commentary are very important for creating and sustaining images of the place and, in this case, "locking into place a set of assumptions that help to define New Zealand as a country pleasing to European tastes" (Wevers 2002: 6).

Mary Louise Pratt and Linda Tuhiwai Smith have each argued that travel writing has been crucial to the spread of colonialism (1992: 23-30; 1999: 8-9). It normalized the presence of the European outside of Europe. It legitimated the scientific project and served to define how Europeans understood themselves as well as their relationship to the
greater world. Travel writing operated under the guise of ‘anti-conquest’ wherein it
presumed innocence even as it represented foreign lands in ways that were instrumental
to the spread of colonialism (Pratt 1992: 7, 34). Wevers writes that “the focus on the
heroic, personlised aspects of travel conceals the fact that it is a class activity, enabled by
financial status and cultural knowledge” (2002: 6). Furthermore, the colonial project that
it underwrote created “material benefits [which] accrued mainly to the very few” (Pratt

Some of the first Europeans to see new colonial territory, such as missionaries,
travelers, and surveyors, believed themselves to be innocent or passive observers. But,
the perceptual practices of enframing came through in the recorded notes of their
journeys. In these writings, the cultural landscape of natives would be transformed and
re-created according to European ideas of rationality. What were rich, interconnected
systems of humans, animals, plants, minerals, and fluids that all influenced and sustained
each other were identified and extracted out of that place based on the Linnaean system
of an underlying universal order to the world. Then, they were placed within discrete
categories according to European values of use and meaning. Through this process, these
interlinked systems were broken down and separated into disconnected resources that
appear to have no connection with each other. At this same time, this erases all of the
ongoing relations that people have with their lands (Pratt 1992: 51-52, 59).
2.2 Authors and Texts

2.2.1 Introduction

In the case of New Zealand, its "extreme distance from Europe, literally the furthest away you could go, also conferred on it a special character: New Zealand as a wonderland of the new, a terra incognita of tremendous possibilities" (emphasis in original, Wevers 2002: 3). Within that colony itself Te Urewera was even more remote, but, the region was a focus of interest for Pakeha, many of whom wrote about their impressions and experiences.

The texts that I have chosen are Waikare-moana, the Sea of the Rippling Waters: the lake, the land, the legends, with a tramp through Tuhoe Land (1975) by Elsdon Best and The Urewera Notebook (printed posthumously in 1978) by Katherine Mansfield. I chose these texts because they have particularly influential in molding popular interpretations of Te Urewera. The aesthetic images that these authors create adhere to several tropes, which I draw from the concepts described in the first chapter. The importance in outlining these tropes is that I wish to show how these colonial authors created narrowly circumscribed understandings of Te Urewera and its residents which later facilitated Crown dispossession of the natives (Braun 2002: 61; Coombes 2001: 4).

Specifically, the Best and Mansfield texts depict Te Urewera as a tourist destination. This is different from previous constructions of the region. Binney (2001: Chapter Two, p. 1) notes that up to the 1860s the dominant European constructions of Tuhoe and Te Urewera characterized both in terms of 'extreme isolation.' Descriptions of Tuhoe as harsh, isolated, and primitive were partly based on European attitudes about the harshness of the land; the two were seen as directly related.
Binney (2001: Chapter Two, p. 1) argues that Tuhoe were not isolated from other Maori and were in fact cautiously supportive of government proposals for Maori political representation. But, images of Tuhoe as a source of dissidence and as a threat to ‘civilized society’ and European sovereignty were important to justify the government’s desire to conquer the land. Only after Tuhoe had been ‘subdued’ could the land be re-manufactured into a space for romantic tourism.

Murton points out that while not all colonial travel writers saw and treated Te Urewera in the same way, their writings supported colonial attitudes about the land and its people (Murton 2002: 19). For example, the practice of enframing the land and separating nature from culture is evident in the writings of people who traveled through Te Urewera in 19th century. William Colenso was one such traveler. He describes the land at great length and, to a lesser degree, the Maori. He paid careful attention to the geologic structure of the region as well as to the various botanical specimens as described by the following quotation: “Two common yet striking objects in particular may be mentioned...the one geological, the other botanical” (Colenso 1874: 360). He goes on to detail the rock composition and the vegetation. When he does discuss the Maori, it is usually only to say how they interacted with him on his travels or to add an account of their knowledge or use of a specific plant or animal. For example Colenso (Colenso 1874: 367) writes that

from the natives’ account, it should appear that these birds resort at certain times to the tops of the highest and barrenest hills, where...they are easily taken with nets.

From all of the descriptions of his travels, it would appear as though the Maori only have limited interaction with the land.
For the purposes of this thesis, I will show that the tourism imagery of Best and Mansfield has been critical in legitimizing Te Urewera as a national park.

2.2.2 Katherine Mansfield

Mansfield was a prominent and controversial early 20th century New Zealand writer. Also she was one of the first Pakeha to visit Te Urewera. As such, her writings about the land were influential in shaping the impressions of those who followed. Sara Mills writes that "a key assumption underlying much of the theoretical work on travel writing is that men’s and women’s texts are fundamentally different" (Mills 1994: 35). It is as though womens’ connection to domesticity and lack of overt domination exempts them from the imperial project. However, women travel writers’ typical avoidance of direct confrontation with imperial expansion in itself “produced a form of knowledge that affirmed the colonial presence” (Mills 1994). Further, that colonial system made their travels possible in the first place and was something from which they benefited. However, Katherine Mansfield was not the average woman traveler of her time. She was an adventurer who left the comforts of the domestic space to explore the rugged Te Urewera region. So, in her case gender does not necessarily make a difference in the production of colonial authority and knowledge.

Katherine Mansfield was the penname of Kathleen Beauchamp. Kathleen was born on October 14, 1888 in Wellington, New Zealand. She spent her childhood attending schools in New Zealand, “each a step up the social and educational ladder,” then went away to Queen’s College in London, where she was exposed to the literary and intellectual currents of the colonial metropole (Mansfield 1978: 11). There she became “a
young woman...of considerable determination, equipped with the skills, the experiences, and the tastes that had been rapidly developed in these four formative years in London” (Mansfield 1978: 11). The intellectual movements of the continent greatly influenced her later writing style, which led one of her contemporaries to comment that we ‘murmur sympathetically if vaguely for “Katherine the Great”...but she went far from us...most of her tales were written in a subtle foreign language which is not yet fully understood out here...the language of twentieth century art’ (Robinson 2003). After college, she returned to New Zealand, during which time she made the trip into Te Urewera that formed the subject of the text that I have selected. Following that she stayed in Wellington until she had convinced her family to allow her to return to England and the Continent in order to pursue her writing career and where she remained until her death.

Despite the fact that she preferred to make Europe her home, Mansfield never lost her strong affection for her homeland. In a biography of Mansfield, Ian Gordon (1954: 6), who is also the editor of *The Urewera Notebook* (1978), writes that

she came to recognize that a New Zealander can be as much of an exile in England as an Englishman on an island in the Pacific. From the moment of that discovery the note of elegy entered her work, and she turned for her themes to her origins. All of her best work dates from this point.

In particular, her notes from her trip into Te Urewera were the basis of “the great New Zealand stories of her maturity” which have had an enormous impact upon that country (Mansfield 1978).

Katherine Mansfield’s *The Urewera Notebook* (printed posthumously in 1978) shows some of the ways in which she reveals a European colonial attitude towards that region and its inhabitants. Gordon (Mansfield 1978) comments that “her notebook is not
a diary. It is a writer’s notebook, analogous to an artist’s sketchbook.” It is carefully transcribed and includes all of her crossed out entries and notations indicating where her writing was indecipherable. Also included in the text are ‘head-notes’ before each entry “to supply narrative continuity and offer the necessary background information” (Mansfield 1978: 31). While Gordon does remark that her notebooks did not have any ‘order,’ but ‘are simply her rough working notes’ which were filled with anything: “‘diary’ entries; clothing lists; household accounts” they also contained “isolated paragraphs worked up to the ‘finished’ forms in which they appear in her printed works; personal observations on places and people; pages where she is simply thinking aloud; critical observations on her current reading” (Mansfield 1978: 14). She found “in the landscape parallels in her reading of H.G. Wells, Walt Whitman and Maeterlinck” (Mansfield 1978: 20). She “saw in the travelling and camping adventure an opportunity to expand her experience and to explore a technique of observation and reportage” (Mansfield 1978: 20). Clearly Mansfield was participating in creating a textual landscape of Te Urewera.

The notebook describes a camping trip she made in November and December of 1907 where she traveled with several people throughout the North Island of New Zealand and through Te Urewera. They departed from Wellington via train. From Hastings, they journeyed on by horse drawn coach and wagon stopping at several places along the way before reaching Te Urewera. While there, they visited Galatea, Te Whaiti, which her editor refers to as “the gateway to the rugged Urewera country,” Umuroa, and Ruatahuna (Mansfield 1978). They spent four days traveling through the region.
2.2.3 Elsdon Best

Best wrote extensively about the Te Urewera Tuhoe people and their culture (Smith 1999: 83-85; Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne 1986: 30). In his 2001 report on the region, Coombes (2001: 3) writes:

The published legacy of Elsdon Best will almost invariably filter any retrospective account of Maori resources in the Urewera inquiry district. Yet, his amateur ethnography is now considered controversial and even a force of the colonial processes of his time.

Coombes (2001: 3) also notes that “Sissons argued that Best’s histories reflected Crown attempts to force Tuhoe to alienate their land.”

Best’s work reinforced the construction of Te Urewera as a pristine wilderness. According to Coombes (2001: 4) “Best’s narratives institutionalised an understanding of Tuhoe use of the forests which was later to deprive them of that use.” Best depicted the Maori as only having limited impact upon the environment, thus negating any claim to it. This then justified outsider uses of the lands, in particular European ideas of preservation.

Best writes that he had the trust of Tuhoe, thus giving him the appearance of authority. However, “historical inquiry has proved that his relationship with the iwi was troubled…and that he was the source of much inter-hapu unrest” (Coombes 2001: 5). Coombes (2001: 5) writes that “nevertheless, some use can still be made of Best’s many articles because of the strength of Tuhoe voice which, despite the author’s subconscious efforts to tame it, permeates his text.”

Best’s work incorporated European intellectual trends. As far as constructions of the region, others may have “described Waikaremoana as a ‘romantic lake,’ but it was the writing of Elsdon Best especially, which portrayed the Urewera in almost Wordsworthian
sublimity” (Murton 2002: 22-23; Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne 1986: 33-34). This depiction of Te Urewera “owed more to the European Romantic tradition, than it did to any real understanding of Tuhoe life and culture, past or present” (Murton 2002: 23; Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne 1986: 33-34). He sought to infuse his descriptions of the land with a romantic mystique by incorporating the histories that he learned from Tuhoe, especially Tutakangahau Tapuihina of Maungapohatu. This is consistent with Neumann’s (2001: 21) generalization that people that “the Urewera...[was] considered to possess scenic qualities not merely on account of some physical characteristics, but because these physical characteristics acquired meaning in the context of Maori knowledge of them.”

Elsdon Best was born on June 30, 1856 in Tawa Flat, which is now a suburb in Wellington. One of his biographers, Barry Mitcalfe, notes that his first playmates were Maori children from whom he learned some Maori words (1963: 70). With his father’s help, and a few years of school, Elsdon successfully took and passed the Junior Civil Service exam, but did not want a white collar job. After that he went to Gisborne where he worked on his brother-in-law’s farm. That was where he learned to speak Maori. Following that, he worked in milling until the economic depression at which time he joined the Armed Constabulary and served in Taranaki and Kawhia. After another brief stint in Gisborne, he left for America for about four years. In 1886, he returned to New Zealand and moved around a bit more before working as a storekeeper in Galatea and where he also assisted with establishing Tuhoe land title for the Urewera Commission. Eventually he was engaged by Percy Smith, the Chief Surveyor of New Zealand to go into the Urewera to “mediate between Tuhoe and the Crown agents who were surveying and constructing the Murupara-Wairoa road...[and] to capture and record Tuhoe history
before it ‘disappeared’” (Coombes 2001: 3). During this time he gained the trust of some Tuhoe, which is the basis for his claim of ‘authority’ on the people and area.

In 1897 Elsdon Best was hired by the Minister of Lands to write about Te Urewera in order to develop tourist interest in the region. His book *Waikare-moana, the Sea of the Rippling Waters: the lake, the land, the legends, with a tramp through Tuhoe Land* (1975) "set the trend for subsequent descriptions about the attractiveness of the region" (Neumann 2001: 20). Best made Te Urewera known to the population at large. Unlike Mansfield’s notebook, Best’s book is written as a story. This book is considered to be “one of the classics of New Zealand travel literature” (Neumann 2001: 20). The book describes Best’s journey through Te Urewera in the company of a kaumatua, or Maori elder. The text is full of oral history and place names that the kaumatua related to Best along the way. Elsdon observes and describes the Maori and their lands. The Kaumatua, Best, and the Maori who bear their supplies traveled primarily by foot. Best’s work is a key piece in shaping popular images of Te Urewera.

2.3 The Tropes of Travel

2.3.1 Introduction

This thesis is based on a textual analysis of two colonial texts and two contemporary management plans, each of which represents Te Urewera in a particular way. Forbes (2000) outlines some of the methods for reading texts. He writes that one of the ways to uncover hidden, and sometimes unintended, meanings in texts is through semiotics and deconstruction (Forbes 2000: 126-128). According to this approach, there are multiple meanings that can be read in each text. Deconstruction works to destabilize
the representations in texts by showing what is excluded as well as included. In order to determine what these various meanings were, I read several works that included textual analysis. I found that I preferred the arguments made by Braun, Murton, and Pratt (2002; 2001; 1992; 1997). Chapter One includes a review of several tropes that have been identified by these academics. These scholars describe how these tropes are constructed in texts and explain their discursive functions. Through a careful reading of the Best, Mansfield, and management plan texts, I have found several ways in which they adhere to the tropes. In this chapter I will deal with the first two texts. Even if not intended by the authors, Best and Mansfield create a representation of Te Urewera in which Tuhoe claims and presence are absent or serve an aesthetic function.

The dominant metaphor that Braun, Murton, and Pratt discuss is that of enframing, which comes from Heidegger’s concept of the ‘world as exhibition.’ Heidegger argues that this is a peculiarly European way of seeing the world (as discussed in Braun 2002: 15-17). This is primarily a spatial concept organized around the sense of sight. Following the structure of Murton and Pratt (2001; 1992), I focused on three tropes that fall within enframing. These include: the ‘picturesque’; the ‘Monarch of all I survey,’ which was coined by Pratt (1992); and the ‘separation of nature and culture’ (Murton 2001). Pratt places the ‘picturesque’ first because the aestheticization of the land is most obvious (1992: 204-205). She writes that when the scene is understood as a painting that implies that the author has the power to evaluate the view. The aesthetic qualities of the landscape determine its overall value to the author’s audience (Pratt 1992: 205). The realism that is invested in both the ‘picturesque’ and ‘monarch-of-all-I-survey’ implies that what the author describes is all that there is, so when nature and culture are
separately described it is order revealed rather than imposed (Pratt 1992: 204-205). Braun argues that once nature and culture have been spatially separated, Natives peoples can be temporally separated as well. This leads to the trope of temporal fixing (Braun 2002; Fabian 1983; Said 1979). Once Natives have been eliminated from the landscape both spatially and temporally, the observer is free to speculate on future uses of the land, and usually includes the assumption that nature will be for “future national development” as part of the state and modern civilization (Braun 2002, 48). This is the trope of ‘destiny’ or ‘anticipatory vision’ (Murton 2001: 10-11; Pratt 1992: 205-213). Finally, I draw out examples of the trope of ‘wilderness’ (Olwig 2002). In the case of Te Urewera, its construction as a ‘wilderness’ will legitimize the state’s plan to convert it into a national park.

Taken together, I will show that these tropes create representations of Te Urewera as a tourist destination or something to be consumed aesthetically. Best and Mansfield also collapse the Maori into nature and eliminate their voices from the land. Through this, these authors create the impression that Te Urewera is a place within the national territory rather than a cultural homeland to various Maori iwi and hapu.

At some points, these tropes overlap or contradict one another. In the latter case, these are situations in which one trope becomes more significant to the overall narrative than another. These instances will be addressed in the individual sections.

2.3.2 ‘Picturesque’

As described in Chapter One, the trope of the ‘picturesque’ is derived from the technique of perspective and the ‘artful organization of the view’ (Cosgrove 1984: 20-27;
Gregory 1994: 92). Pratt writes that this was important for colonial travel writers as a means of understanding, appropriating, and conveying that which was unfamiliar. Presenting the view as a picture was one way to make it seem familiar to a European audience. The power of the ‘picturesque’ is that it evokes a sense of what it is like to be there.

Mansfield treats the Urewera landscape as though it is a picture. She uses literary styles to create images of what she sees and perceives. The following are excerpts from her text. In this first quotation, Mansfield employs a simile to describe the clouds. She refers to the placement of the natural features in order to create a picture of what she sees which then makes the view available to be judged. According to her, it is “perfect.” She attributes emotional qualities to the description with the phrase “full of gloom.” Furthermore, Pratt (1992: 204) argues that when travel writers use “nominal color expressions” they “add material referents into the landscape [which] tie the landscape explicitly to the explorer's home culture”. Mansfield (emphasis added, 1978: 51) writes:

Before me a perfect panorama of sunset – long sweet steel like clouds – against the faint blue – the hills full of gloom – a little river with a tree beside it is burnished silver – like the sea.

Here is another example. In this excerpt Mansfield again uses a simile, in this case she is describing the noise of the waterfall. She also describes certain features of the scene to convey a particular “experience.”

Just before pulling up for lunch we came to the Waipunga Falls – my first experience of great waterfalls – they are indescribably beautiful – three – one beside the other – and a ravine of bush either side – The noise like thunder and the sun shone full on the water – I am sitting now on the bank of the river – just a few yards away – the water is flowing past – and the manuka flax and fern line the banks (emphasis added, Mansfield 1978: 45).
In this next quotation Mansfield specifically uses the word picture. This time, she describes Mrs. Warbrick’s hands as being ‘like carving’ rather than being human:

Rather sweet Mrs. Warbrick is such a picture in her pink dressing gown – Her wide native hat her black fringe – her hands are like carving

She also waxes lyrically:

And sunflecked avenues – The new bracken is like H.G. Wells dreaming of flowers like strings of beads – the sky in the water like white swans in a blue mirror (1978: 57).

In this last quotation, Mansfield exhibits the writer’s tendency to cross-reference other works of literature.

Here are some excerpts from Best in which he describes Te Urewera as being like a picture. He encourages a visual understanding of the natural features by using the term ‘scenery’:

The scenery along this road is extremely picturesque and typical of the country (emphasis added, 1975: 13).

Here Best writes how this scene should be judged:

On the brow of this spur, where the steep descent to the lake commences, is a little opening in the forest, from which we see the blue waters of the Whanganui Inlet lying beneath us – a charming scene as viewed through the trees, for the bush-covered hills trend abruptly down to the waters below (emphasis added, 1975: 30).

Here is another example, where Best describes what he sees as a ‘scene,’ thus validating that it is supposed to be consumed visually. He refers to the forest as ‘voiceless.’

Basically, he is so far away from what he is describing in order to privilege vision that he cannot hear anything. Then offers himself as the voice to speak for it and the rest of nature. This is an overlap with the ‘authenticity’ trope, where Natives are a part of the
past or completely not present, which authorizes ‘modern’ people to speak for them and nature:

And all over the wonderous scene a great silence reigns; the wind has died away, no sound comes from the voiceless forest, the rugged crags, the shimmering waters – silent, imposing, and grand (emphasis added, 1975: 28).

In this next quotation, Best describes the location of the different features in reference to one another to create an aestheticized image:

For it is truly magnificent, with the little isles looking as groves of trees upon the face of the shining lake, and the sun flashing in the waters of many inlets; with the noble forest of Tane sweeping back by ridge and range to colossal Huia-rau, with its covering of glittering snow, and Manuaha, which pierces the distant sky-line. So the Kaumatua and the Pakeha look upon this most picturesque of mountain-lakes (emphasis added, 1975: 44).

Again, Best indicates the aesthetic qualities of this view by the use of several adjectives:

Marau and Marau-iti, an inlet dividing into two branches, is now before us – a most beautiful and picturesque spot, with great crags…

“Just beyond Te Rata, the stern frontlet of Pone-kiri looms up again across Whare-ama, and then we glide over the placid waters of Te Totara, a lovely little bay, with a grassy slope running round to an inner bay, and before us is the picturesque and sacred isle of Pa-te-kaha (emphasis added, 1975: 86).

By taking a distant position in relation to what they are describing, Mansfield and Best organize the components of the view to create depictions of the land which appear complete and objective. Such manipulation implies a degree of control over that which is being viewed. By converting Te Urewera into a picture, they make the view of an unknown land intelligible to their readers. The authors call forth images of the land and its people that may be judged for aesthetic qualities. This establishes a basis for treating Te Urewera as a space of visual art for the enjoyment and consumption of literary
audiences. Mansfield and Best describe Te Urewera as a distant picture or framed vision rather than as a living cultural residence.

2.3.3 'Monarch-of-all-I-survey'

As I wrote in Chapter One, the 'monarch-of-all-I-survey' trope describes the author's assumption of authority and derives its power from the concept of perspective (Forbes 2000; Pratt 1992; Spurr 1993). This trope is similar to the 'picturesque' because of its use of distance. Derek Gregory (2001: 86) writes that colonial discourse confers the power to represent upon the agents of colonizing societies, who are supposed to have the self-evident right, critical capacity, and even bounden duty to exhibit otherwise inarticulate or inchoate subaltern populations before the gaze of metropolitan audience.

The authors' lack of self-reflexivity and exclusion of other voices creates the impression that the author is the privileged authority regarding the subject or landscape (Fabian 1983: 90-91; Pratt 1992; Spurr 1993; Weinstein 2002).

The significance of this trope is that it describes the attribution of heroic accomplishment to the author's visual consumption of the land, which is a passive act and, as Pratt (1992: 202) describes it from a narrative point of view, practically a non-event. As a rule, the "discovery" of sites...involved making one's way to the region and asking the local inhabitants...to take you there, whereupon with their guidance and support, you proceeded to discover what they already knew. "Crudely, then, discovery in this context consisted of a gesture of converting local knowledges (discourses) into European national and continental knowledges.

Neither Mansfield nor Best completed their journeys alone. Each was assisted in their journeys with transportation, portage of supplies, and guides.
In the following quotations, Best apprehends and portrays the views from positions of authority. In the first quotation, he clearly privileges the power of sight:

From this *point a fine view* of the surrounding country is obtained. Ranges, ranges, ranges! bush covered, lone, and silent, *as far as the range of vision extends* in every direction. Away before us looms the giant Huia-rau, over which our way lies a colossal range cutting the blue sky line, the pure snow glittering in the rays of a midday sun (emphasis added, Best 1975: 14).

In this next quotation, through distance and elevation Best claims that he has access to the entirety of the view.

But it was well worth the climb; for away below us lay the grand panorama of the lower country...the *whole* of this noble scene is spread out below us as we stand on the snow-wrapped crest of giant Huia-rau.... (emphasis added, 1975: 27-28).

Here again Best writes about a view from a height:

Looking back from the hilltop we see the fine open valley of the Upper Whirinaki, bounded by great forest ranges (1975: 13).

Mansfield also conforms to the trope of ‘monarch-of-all-I-survey.’ In this quotation Mansfield attributes “the greatest sight” as being one from a height. She even adds distance between herself and the object of her gaze by referring to the valley as “far below”:

But the greatest sight I have seen was the view from the top of Tarangakuma – You draw rein at the top of the mountain and round you everywhere are other mountains – bush covered – and far below in the valley little Tarawera and a silver ribbon of river (Mansfield 1978: 43).

The above quotations from Best and Mansfield illustrate the concept of ‘monarch-of-all-I-survey.’ They each confirm their own authority by utilizing height to privilege themselves with vast visual power over the land, which they reduce to a prospect or spectacle. Following on Emerson’s arguments, from such a vantage it appears as though
they, with their seeing eyes, are stable and at the center of the world which itself rotates unfixed about them (Olwig 2002: 190). It was believed that such elevated sites granted complete unfettered access to the underlying meaning of the world which was supported by the realism with which the authors depict what they see (Cosgrove 1984: 20-21, 26-27; Fabian 1983: 30-47; Said 1979: 55). This conforms to the notion that by seeing and beholding nature, man would understand his own place in the universe (Olwig 2002: 190).

2.3.4 ‘Separation of Nature and Culture’

Once colonists had rendered nature as a picture and established their own authority to speak, they separated nature from culture. As described in Chapter One, colonists would describe what they saw in great detail, but they would keep separate information into specific categories that gave the appearance that nothing was interrelated. Murton (2001: 14) writes that this

interrupted existing networks of spiritual, historical, and material relations among Maori and their natural world, distilled this complex socio-ecological world into neat unambiguous categories: primitive culture and pristine nature...[which suggests] that each could be apprehended entirely apart.

Mansfield’s text separates nature from culture. In these next quotations, Mansfield only describes what appear to be natural features:

Against the faint blue – the hills full of gloom – a little river with a tree beside it is burnished silver (1978: 51).

Here again, she only focuses on nature:

We begin to reach the valley – broad and green – red and brown butterflies – the green place in vivid sunlight and the silent and green bush – The
sunlight slanting in to the trees – an island – then a river arched with tree fern (1978: 55).

In contrast to these are the descriptions of cultural places:

At the City gates we pull up and walk into the ‘city’. There is a store – an Accomodation House – and a G.P.O (1978: 49).

Here is another example from Mansfield:

We came to the pah – It was adorable – Just the collection of huts – the built place for koumara and potato (1978: 53).

Mansfield does not describe the natural setting of the ‘city’ or ‘pah.’ The cultural places appear to be distinct and disconnected from the landscape around them. There are some contradictions in her text though. There are a few passages where she describes a natural setting that includes a whare (home) such as the following example:

On the way to Matatua the silver beech – the white flowers – that Elysian valley of birds – the red tipped ferns – the sound of the shot and then almost a bare hill among green hills with bare tree trunks and a strong blue sky – We meet a little flock of white sheep and a whare on a hill....From this saddle we look across river upon river of green bush then burnt bush russet colour – blue distance – and a wide cloud flecked sky (emphasis added, 1978: 54-55).

In these cases, the trope of ‘separation of nature and culture’ is subordinate to the ‘picturesque’ trope. The ‘whare’ is included in the scene as visual decoration in the style of a classic British landscape scene. At this point, the Maori presence has been naturalized for aesthetic purposes. This is still an outsider’s view.

Best’s text also separates nature from culture. Despite the fact that he claims to be an authority on Tuhoe, and has written extensively about their cultural practices he does not describe the cultural interactions of the people with their lands. In fact, he infrequently mentions a contemporary Maori presence. Here is a quotation from Best in
which he describes the land in detail. He does not include any reference to cultural occupation of the land:

From the dark-blue waters of Waikare-moana...gleaming between the wooded spurs 2,000 ft. blow: from the white cliffs of Pane-kiri to the massive range of Nga-moko, and far across the broken range of the great bluffs which guard Kupe and Ngake, in the long vale of Waiau, where nestle the lakelets of Te Putere...and sweeping northward across chaotic ridges, spurs, gulches, ranges, by the gloom-laden canons of Hanga-roa and the silent caves of Tae: and past the sullen Reinga...where the roar of the great falls crashes through the darkling gulch...and drifting over the lonely lakes of Waihau...to the bold peak of Whakapunake...then to the fair east-lands...with the great solemn ocean looking so near and yet so far away....From white-browed Whakapunake to the dim Matau-a-Maui, which looms afar off upon the horizon (Best 1975: 27).

In this text, Best rarely mentions any contemporary settlements:

All these lands traversed by use from Te Mimi to Waikare-moana are now unoccupied of man, though the Kaumatua points out many places up the Rua-tahuna Stream, and on the western shores of Lake Waikare-moana, where the Urewera of Tuhoe people lived in bygone times. But the old kaingas (villages) are once again dense bush, and [the Maori] are limited to a few scattered hamlets at Maunga-pohatu and Wai-mana, and the vale of Whakatane (emphasis in original, 1975: 21-22).

Here is another quotation from Best in which he describes settlements, but the emphasis is on the fact that they no longer exist. This overlaps with the next trope of ‘temporal fixing.’

Here is Te Wera-iti clearing, an old settlement of the Tuhoe, now long deserted. From here we travel down the channel of the stream...emerging into the Native clearing at Te Umu-roa.

We are now in the heart of Tuhoe land, and within four miles of Mata-atua, the principal settlement of the Rua-tahuna district. Here reside the main body of the Tuhoe or Urewera Tribe, and here they have been for unknown centuries....And across the dark forest ranges which shoulder the rising sun, dwelling within the shadow of the sacred mountain Maunga-pohatu, are the remnant of Nga-Potiki (1975: 16).
When he refers to Tuhoe or Maori he pays more attention to the sites of past battles and sieges rather than to places of peace, and all of these are temporally marked. It is as though all that matters is raw romantic nature and the mythic existence of ‘neolithic man’ whose feats echo from the past, but no longer have tenancy in the present.

Together, Best and Mansfield construct Te Urewera as separate from the people who live there. This completely contradicts Te Awekotuku and Nikora (2004) who write that Te Urewera and Tuhoe are synonymous and mutually co-constitute one another. Accordingly, they argue that neither can be understood entirely apart from the other. To present them as separate and distinct is to deny the lived materiality of Tuhoe and Maori connection to Te Urewera. Mansfield and Best do not focus on how Maori move through and inhabit the landscape in lasting ways. Instead, the lands are presented as essentially empty. Even when the line between culture and nature is blurred as with the above example from Mansfield, the effect is that Te Urewera is an aesthetic landscape, not a cultural one.

2.3.5 ‘Temporal Fixing’

As discussed in section 2.3.1, once nature had been separated from culture spatially, indigenous peoples were then contained in time, specifically in a past time. This justifies the appropriation of native lands and the imposition of colonial rule upon the resident populations. Fixing people in time was often accomplished by using temporally marked words to describe natives or their culture.

Best considered Tuhoe knowledge to be stories, myths, and legends and not history. In a recent report entitled “...That No Timber Whatsoever Be Removed: The
Crown and Reservations of Maori-Owned Indigenous Forests in the Urewera: 1889-2000,” Klaus Neumann (2001: 25) writes that Best “created a division between mythology and history, thereby interpreting the stories told by his Maori teachers in the context of contemporary European historical discourse.” Best appeared not to have much respect for Urewera history. In his article entitled “An Ambiguous Past, Representing Maori History” Michael Reilly writes that Best “carried out an extensive campaign to ridicule the texts themselves. Such ridicule included the choice of demeaning references, censorship, and belittling comments, which often willfully misrepresented the cultural meaning of the narratives” (1995: 25). Stokes, Milroy and Melbourne note that in his writings, he treated the natives of Te Urewera as though they were inferior culturally and racially and that it was inevitable that the superior ‘civilisation’ of Europeans would replace all others (1986: 32). With this in mind, he considered much of his ethnographic work to be ‘salvage’ in nature.

In order to give his text a more romantic tone, Best filled it with Tuhoe history. However, he employs temporally marked terms which clearly set native narratives apart from European history. The following excerpt contains titles of various histories:

How Moetere and her lover perished amid the snows of Huia-rau: a legend of the great snow range....The story of Te Uoro....The story of Rua-kapana: a legend of the ancient people....Wars of Ngati Ruapani and Tuhoe....Mohaka’s raid on Tuhoe land (emphasis added, Best 1975: 18-20, 26-27, 63-68, 70-79, 79-83).

In this quotation, Best (emphasis added, 1975: 16) again uses temporally marked words:

Here resides the main body of the Tuhoe or Urewera Tribe...who are the remnant of a most ancient primitive race.
The following quotation is full of temporally fixing terms. Best also diminishes the "Multitude of the Marangaranga" by referring to their defensive effort at "a last futile stand":

An historic district this, for here the "Multitude of the Marangaranga," the ancient people of the land, made a last futile stand against the conquering Maori, and the place teems with legends and quaint old stories (emphasis added, Best 1975: 13).

Again Best (emphasis added, 1975: 13) ridicules Tuhoe history and temporally fixes it:

The Great Canon of Toi, from which rugged chasm this district derives its name, and connected with which is many a strange legend of the days of yore.

This quotation is another example of Best's (emphasis added, 1975: 14) use of armed conflict to imbue Te Urewera with mythic and romantic appeal.

And so on, every hill and gulch and streamlet having its tale to tell, of war and battle and sudden death, in token of the "good old days."

Here Best (emphasis added, 1975: 21) describes the Tuhoe in temporally significant ways:

And just here is a good example of the non-progressive barbarian, the conservatism of neolithic man.

Mansfield also suggests that Maori are disappearing. In this quotation her use of temporally marked words gives the reader the impression that Te Urewera is not a place of living breathing people, but one of a mysterious past beings. Here is an example:

Round us in the darkness the horses were moving softly with a most eerie sound - visions of long dead Maoris - of forgotten battles and vanished feuds - stirred in me (Mansfield 1978: 37).

In her description of the scene, Mansfield's inclusion of the 'little whares deserted' appears to confirm that Maori are passing from the land. She writes:
At the head of a great valley the blazing sun uplifts itself like a gigantic torch to light the bush – it is all so gigantic and tragic – and even in the bright sunlight it is so passionately secret…. And always through the bush the hushed sound of water running on brown pebbles – It seems to breathe the full deep bygone essence of it all – a fairy formation of golden rings – then rounding a corner we pass several little whares deserted – and grey – they look very old and desolate – almost haunted (emphasis added, Mansfield 1978: 55).

Stokes, Milroy and Melbourne write that “of all Pakeha writers perhaps Katherine Mansfield came closest to sensing something of the mauri, life force, of the land and forests of Te Urewera” (1986: 38). But, Klaus Neumann (2001: 25) comments that in the case of Pakeha tourists such as Mansfield, who travelled through the Urewera, the sensation of rapture was often predicated on the idea that Maori were not contemporaneous. These travellers clung to the illusion of a landscape permeated by secrets – ‘passionate’ or otherwise – and refused to recognise Maori living in the Urewera as people with aspirations for access to the same if not better education, employment opportunities, and housing as the travellers themselves.

Best and Mansfield construct Te Urewera as a place where Maori are dying out or are already gone. Their use of temporally marked words and descriptions in which they anticipate the passage of Maori compel the reader to believe that this is the case. These authors encourage the view that Te Urewera is infused with a romantic aura from ancient people, not living, and thus possibly threateningly mad about being colonized, people.

Another result of temporal fixing, as Braun (1997) points out, is that indigenous peoples are only authorized to exist in Nature as long as they remain traditional or primitive and do not incorporate modern cultural changes into their lives. But, as ‘primitives’ these peoples are unable to speak for themselves, which thus authorizes the voice of modern ‘disinterested’ ecologists and scientists (Willems-Braun 1997). As a
result, no matter what indigenous peoples do they are denied the ability to speak for
themselves. This process is laid out in the following trope.

2.3.6 ‘Authenticity’

As previously discussed, when colonists temporally fixed natives they created an
essentialized identity which was considered the yardstick against which indigenous
cultures could be judged for their authenticity. Europeans considered any evidence of
cultural change to be negative. ‘Hybridized’ natives were corruptions or bastardizations
because they threaten the cultural boundaries between ‘Self’ and ‘Other’ and thus the
justification for colonial domination. This trope of ‘authenticity’ deals with a European
evaluation of the cultural integrity of the ‘Other.’

Mansfield in particular reflects upon the hybridized Maori that she encountered.

This is how the editor of *The Urewera Notebook* describes Mansfield’s experience:

But after Umuroa, Te Whaiti was a disappointment. Some years
previously, a government store (under the charge of Elsdon Best) had been
set up there as headquarters for the construction of the road to Ruatahuna.
This had brought employment to the district, wages – and inevitable
Europeanization. [Mansfield] having met and been impressed by the
‘primitive’ Tuhoe people in their ancestral homeland [Umuroa], found in
the anglicized Maoris of Te Whaiti ‘nothing of interest’ (Mansfield 1978:
59).

Mansfield describes her reaction to many of the Maori she encountered. By juxtaposing
‘real’ Maori and English tourists with ‘the third rate article’, she clearly shows her belief
that cultural dynamism and mixture is not possible, but rather, is evidence of cultural
corruption and ‘inauthenticity:’

It is splendid to see once again real English people – I am so tired and sick
of the third rate article – Give me the Maori and the tourist but nothing in
between – Also this place proved utterly disappointing after Umuroa which was fascinating in the extreme – The Maoris here [in Te Whaiti] know some English and some Maori not like the other [read ‘authentic’] natives – Also these people dress in almost English clothes compared with the native [there in Umuroa] (Mansfield 1978: 61).

This recalls Bhabha’s (1987: 318, 322, 320) statement; “almost the same but not quite… Almost the same but not white”, which demonstrates the colonial unwillingness to see non-Europeans as capable of dynamic cultural change but rather as being unequal and essentially different from the colonizers.

Thus, Mansfield perpetuates the notion that there are only two true people, the English and the ‘Other’ or, in this case, the Maori. She indicates that those people who are in between are inferior which becomes the basis for the idea that the inauthentic native is not authorized to speak.

2.3.7 ‘Anticipatory Vision’

Nineteenth century accounts often include the trope of ‘anticipatory vision’ which is when the author writes about personal imaginations of how the land could be changed and improved by Europeans. This, of course, hinges on the notion that European uses of, and decisions about, the land are superior to native uses. These imaginings simultaneously to tie the use of the land to the interests of the nation while they cut the land away from Maori culture (Pratt 1992; Spurr 1993; Willems-Braun 1997). This way of writing also reflects the author’s expectation that European preponderance is inevitable (Murton 2001; Pratt 1992).

In the following quotation, Best demonstrates his expectation of European usage and control of Te Urewera. He clearly shows his belief that Maori will die out as “the
Steel Age is here,” which presumably signals an end to the Maori age. According to his work, it would appear as though Maori are a part of the past rather than culturally dynamic. Not only does Best again anticipate the arrival of the “Age of Steel” but also he somehow judges the incoming age as one that will be more peaceful. Best (1975: 9) also appears to believe that Western agriculture is somehow superior to the Maori economy:

Trails by which the incoming pioneers of the Age of Steel shall pass along, to leave behind them peace in place of war, thriving hamlets for stockaded pas, fields of waving grain for jungle and for forest.

But, while Best imagined Te Urewera as eventually being a space of settlement and European conquest, this was not exactly the same vision held by later Pakeha. For proponents of the national park, the main goal was to maintain the aesthetically conquered land in a supposed state of wilderness.

2.3.8 ‘Wilderness’

As discussed in the first chapter, the concept of wilderness is a cultural construction, one that has more to do with European aesthetics than with actual on the ground realities. This trope is made possible once the land has been enframed and the indigenous peoples have been temporally fixed. Many of initial colonial encounters with wilderness were actually with highly managed landscapes that were extensively and intensively utilized. Since indigenous forms of land use were usually not familiar to colonists, it was believed that the land was not being used and therefore going to waste. Even if a native presence was recognized, it was usually considered to be minimal, ‘traces on the earth,’ and not as significant as European definitions of civilization which reinforced the concept that natives were primitive.
Concepts of wilderness have a long history in European intellectual thought. For Europeans in settler colonies, wilderness became a symbol of their mythic national foundations. But, in envisioning this ‘pristine wilderness encounter’ they denied any preexisting histories and therefore claims to the lands.

Based on U.S. national park models, wilderness is defined by its absence of permanent human occupation, for any sign of habitation negates the pristine construction. This required the removal of natives. In addition to treating native land use practices as inferior, the criminalization of cultural uses of resources was a further means to justify native dispossession. This is underwritten by European assumptions of authority whereby they presume to know what is best for the environment.

Here are a few selections from Best where he depicts Te Urewera as a wilderness:

There comes to him...the desire to look upon the unwrought wilderness and note the war which has waged for untold centuries between it and primitive man – Neolithic man, who has opened up the trails through the great forest he could not conquer (emphasis added, Best 1975: 9).

Here Best again uses the words to convey the idea that Te Urewera is a wilderness. This clearly shows that he thinks of Maori as having only a minor presence on the land:

And all over the wondrous scene a great silence reigns, [here] lies the untouched wilderness as upon the morning of the first day (emphasis added, Best 1975: 27-28).

In this quotation, Best (emphasis added, 1975: 16) ignores the cultural occupation and integral connections to the land:

From here we travel down the channel of the stream through a wild forest gorge, with high ranges and rock bluffs on either side.

By referring to Te Urewera as a wilderness and as wild, Best projects the image that the Tuhoe presence is negligible and that there is a clear separation between Nature and
Culture, with Te Urewera as Nature incarnate. He describes the land as having been unchanged since “the morning of the first day” which creates the impression that it is a primeval place. Thus, he encourages readers to believe that there are no pre-existing histories and claims to the land.

2.4 ‘Buried Epistemologies’

The ways in which both Best and Mansfield describe Te Urewera have had profound effects upon popular conceptions of the region both during their lifetimes and now. By describing Te Urewera in terms of the ‘picturesque’ they aestheticize the region. Following the trope of ‘monarch-of-all-I-survey’ the authors employ distance and height. They also present their observations of Te Urewera as authoritative. Both authors adhere to the trope of ‘separation of nature and culture’ by presenting naturalized landscapes and cultural places as though they can be apprehended separately from one another. Both texts ‘temporally fix’ native Maori with temporally marked words and create essentialized identities against which the Maori would be judged for ‘authenticity.’ The many Tuhoe stories and connections to the land that are included in Best’s text served to imbue Te Urewera with a romantic mythic quality rather than to be evidence of their continued occupation of the land or basis of any claim to it. While Best recognized the different ways in which Tuhoe had interacted with the land, he continuously described Tuhoe, along with their claim to the lands, as vanishing. Best clearly envisioned that Europeans would take over. In fashioning Te Urewera as a wilderness he masked all Tuhoe connections. Both authors treat Te Urewera in such a way as to set it up as a place
for Pakeha aesthetic consumption and this representation ignores the lived reality that Tuhoe themselves have articulated as I mentioned before.

Their works are just two examples of the literature on the region which, taken together, forms a textual landscape that exhibits and affirms European attitudes towards nature and culture. In New Zealand this popular understanding of Te Urewera changes it from a Tuhoe place-scape into a space within the national territory. It is commonly believed within Western scientific epistemologies that it is space “about which we must have general knowledge, whereas we possess merely local knowledge about place” (Casey 1996: 16). But, Casey (1996: 33-34) argues that it is space that is local, that is particular to Western science. It is the preponderance of Western culture and science that have convinced us otherwise. 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 of erasing cultural ties or going back to a pre-placial, or pre-human, state. However, reconstituting the landscape as space is an imposition of Western logic and thus an act of colonization that only masks the lived place. Therefore, the textual conversion of Te Urewera from a Tuhoe place-scape into a space of national interest by people such as Best and Mansfield authorize the appropriation of that realm within the national consciousness. This renders the land available for colonial use and is the foundation upon which the state places its claim of authority to establish and maintain a national park.

Braun writes that “present-day displacements…occur in part through the reiteration of these earlier erasures” (Braun 2002: 27). The reiteration of these tropes and erasures can be found in current management plans for Te Urewera National Park.
CHAPTER 3. PARK MANAGEMENT PLANS

3.1 Introduction

It is now commonplace in most Western countries to think of nature and culture as separate. Wilderness is usually considered to be the epitome of true nature and the most common associations of wilderness are national parks. Because of the popular belief in the pristine characteristics of these parks, they can often be focuses for conflicting views over how the land should be used. National parks are envisioned as the bastions of a variety of important conceptions of nature. Among these are: the remnants of a wild, raw, and primeval nature which mythically nurtured the birth and development of the nation; nature as reserves of biodiversity for scientific analysis and the salvation of the human race; nature as a place for the education and the civilization of the populace; nature as wilderness; and nature for recreation. These intense ideas which are attached to national parks do not coexist easily with one another especially when compared to how many indigenous peoples experience their lands.

But, these ideas about national parks and nature are products of European and American intellectual movements. They mask a series of perceptual practices which call nature up to perform in very specific ways. More importantly, the metaphor of enframing and the tropes of ‘temporal fixing,’ ‘anticipatory vision,’ and ‘wilderness’ erase pre-existing and ongoing indigenous connections to land and convert it from a Maori cultural place to a space of national interest, which leads to many contradictions and conflicts. Examples of these are played out in Te Urewera.

In this chapter I will analyze Urewera National Park Management Plan 1976
(written by the Urewera National Park Board) and Te Urewera National Park Management Plan Draft (2001) (authored by the Department of Conservation). The authors of both of these management plans continue to draw upon colonial tropes to organize their narratives.

In his report entitled ‘Cultural Ecologies of Te Urewera’ (2003) Brad Coombes describes the particularities of Te Urewera National Park, its management, and how this has influenced the native Maori of the region. He points out that it is extremely important to contextualize in historic and spatial terms the development and implementation of the various plans, which is something that the authors of those same plans repeatedly fail to do.

The Urewera National Park Management Plan 1976 (hereafter 1976 Plan) owes much to contemporary US national park management styles, which were then based on preservationist concepts. At the time that the Urewera National Park Board first began designing a management plan, “there were few New Zealand models to learn from and local and national practice became a derivative of ‘master planning’ experience from the USA” (Coombes 2003: 257). Laws pertaining to national parks emanated from Wellington “with no consideration of local particularities” but with some flexibility for application of national legislation to individual parks (Coombes 2003: 257). “There was little attempt to determine an endogenous form of park planning which was more attentive to human and historical values” (Coombes 2003: 258). The concept of a ‘master plan’ as well as its emphasis on resource quantification, ‘planning’ for future development, reliance on experts, and ‘technicism,’ were all based on the US approach (Coombes 2003: 258). Notably, the NPA (National Parks Authority) decided that it
would adhere to this quotation from the US hand-book for master planning (1959): ‘The Master Plan is a plan for preservation and use. It is this only. The Master Plan proposes action, but it is also an instrument of control and restraint.’ ‘Use’ in this instance was restricted to recreation and all park uses were required to conform to the needs ‘preservation.’ There was no real consideration of whether this model was relevant or appropriate to the New Zealand context (Coombes 2003: 258).

Furthermore, the development of the Urewera master plan was intended to serve as an exercise to determine whether or not the application of a master plan was suitable for running New Zealand’s national parks. “The experimental nature of this planning exercise...[is a possible] excuse [for] some of the lapses in judgement which the planning team were to exhibit in forthcoming years” (Coombes 2003: 259). Therefore there was pressure to finish quickly, but also to have positive results.

Also, the relationship between tangata whenua and the Crown, and subsequently between the former and park management, has been fraught with difficulties which have resulted in the displacement of Maori rights and the criminalization of Maori subsistence practices along with a general abrogation of rights as guaranteed in the Treaty of Waitangi. The ownership of the majority of the state controlled park lands is contested and yet management has largely ignored this reality which has only served to complicate relations with local hapu and iwi. This has led to a deeply established sense of distrust among many Maori of overall Crown intentions and policy in Te Urewera.

Despite the fact that subsequent legislation has changed the obligations of park management, Coombes (2003) writes that the recent Te Urewera National Park Management Plan Draft (2001) (hereafter Draft 2001) is not much different from the 1976 plan. Even though the management authority is now required to observe and honor the Treaty of Waitangi principles, the Department of Conservation has resisted such
responsibilities pending the completion of the claims process regarding Te Urewera ownership. Therefore, in spite of appearances and claims to the contrary, the 2001 Te Urewera National Park Management Plan Draft is "little more than a conservative place-holder" for past policy (Coombes 2003: 386). Thus, it continues the same displacements and exclusions of previous plans.

Coombes (2003: 5-8) also points out that the management of the national park has been based on a number of assumptions which can be traced to European concepts. Among these are the concept of pristine wilderness, the belief that conservation is a neutral project, that nature and culture are separate, that indigenous people and their practices cause environmental problems, and the idea of "preservation in perpetuity" (Coombes 2003: 5-8). These are all examples of 'buried epistemologies.'

But, following Braun's approach, I argue that such commonsense beliefs are not just incorporated into management, but are the means by which Te Urewera was made available for Crown appropriation in the first place. It was the initial constructions of colonists and their writings which helped to fashion Te Urewera from a Maori place and turangawaewae, home territory, into a space of national interest for aesthetic enjoyment (Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne 1986: xiv). Through the practices of enframing, colonial travel writers created a series of erasures. Nature has been made over into a picture, management's opinion has been constructed as complete and authoritative, nature and culture are separated, native Maori are narrowly circumscribed and denied any meaningful connections to the land, Te Urewera is held up as an important component of New Zealand's national progress to be realized through its maintenance as a space of
wilderness. Taken together, these buried epistemologies erase Maori claims to Te Urewera.

Again, it is through the reiteration of past erasures that it is possible for the Crown to claim control of, and thus assert its right to manage, Te Urewera. But, management chooses to either ignore issues of contested ownership and the history of bad relations with tangata whenua or to deny their relevance to the administration of the park. In this chapter I will show that in the 1976 Plan management focuses on Te Urewera as a wilderness while the 2001 Draft frames the park as a space of scientific interest which necessitates that it be managed by experts. While the main goals regarding the park have changed from the 1976 Plan to the 2001 Draft, both ignore the moral question of their right to manage and focus instead, respectively, on the aesthetic value and their technical expertise at environmental conservation. By doing these, they complete earlier erasures and render Maori silent and unable to participate.

3.2 Te Urewera NP: Background and Establishment

During the time period in which Elsdon Best (1897) and Katherine Mansfield (1907) made their journeys into Te Urewera, the concept of scenery preservation was not popular. The majority of Pakeha felt that land should be converted into productive uses (Star and Lochhead 2002: 121). However, there was small but growing support for setting aside pieces of land which was found in scenery preservation societies. These were mainly comprised of middle-class urban men, especially those with backgrounds in science or surveying or those who did not depend directly upon the land for their livelihoods (Star and Lochhead 2002: 124). These men actively pushed for reservation of
lands that were scenic as well as ecologically important in terms of wildlife habitat and native species (Star and Lochhead 2002: 125). They recognized that one of the best ways to encourage reservation was by promoting the economic benefits of tourism to such reserves. One of the most powerful ways in which this was done was by making the uniqueness of New Zealand’s native environment a focus and source of national pride and thus a means of developing a national identity (Star and Lochhead 2002: 128).

The first piece of legislation to reserve land for scenic purposes was the Land Act 1892, which did not provide means to establish a national park (Campbell 1999: 6). New Zealand’s first national park required special legislation to be created; this was in the form of the Tongariro National Park Act 1894 (Campbell 1999: 6). The second national park was gazetted in the Taranaki region by the Egmont National Park Act 1900 (Campbell 1999: 7). However, up to the turn of the century, reserves were only made with Crown lands though there was a great deal of dispute over government claims to the lands in question.

As a result of the political campaigning of the scenery preservation groups, Parliament passed the Scenery Preservation Act 1903, which was formative for the national reservation system (Star and Lochhead 2002: 126). This legislation created the Scenery Preservation Commission which functioned to assess land for scenic value (Campbell 1999: 8). Significantly, this Act also provided for the compulsory acquisition of Maori land, with compensation for the owners (Campbell 1999: 8). But, soon after, in 1906, this bill was amended to remove the provision regarding Maori land (Campbell 1999: 8). However, it appeared that the Crown still retained the ability to reserve Maori land under the Public Works Act 1905 (Campbell 1999: 8). In 1910, the Scenery
Preservation Act was again amended so that Maori land could be acquired for scenic preservation and to uphold any previous acquisition that had been made under various legislation (Campbell 1999: 10).

Scenery preservation societies continued to lobby for conservation of scenic places. They began to shape the park system; focusing on the need for active management and the protection of indigenous species (Star and Lochhead 2002: 130-131). Their efforts led to the first legislation designed specifically for the establishment of national parks.

The Public Reserves, Domains, and National Parks Act 1928 gave the Governor-General the power to create national parks (Campbell 1999: 21). It established which lands could be subject to gazettal as national parks and the means to structure park management. However, management was only at the park level; there was no incorporated national management body. The Act also detailed park offences and penalties as well as defined the source of park funding (Campbell 1999: 21-22).

Te Urewera first came to the attention of scenery preservation interests in the 1890s. The idea of creating a reserve in the area was discussed as early as 1909 (Campbell 1999: 12). Tuhoe had proposed reservation for their own use while various conservation groups pushed for national scenic use (Campbell 1999: 12-13).

But, the Crown was concerned about other economic uses of Te Urewera. The Jordan and Pollock report was commissioned to determine the resource use value of the Te Urewera region (Campbell 1999: 13). In their findings they recommended that the Te Whaiti Block held great timber stock and that the entirety of the Waikaremoana region should be reserved for scenic purposes (Campbell 1999: 13-14). Both settlement and
mining possibilities were limited (Campbell 1999: 14-15). The government pursued the timber possibilities, but delayed upon the scenery preservation recommendations until much later (Campbell 1999: 15). The Urewera Lands Act 1921/22 provided for the transfer of title for the whole of the Waikaremoana block to the Crown without the full consent of the owners (Campbell 1999: 16). While this action was contested through various branches of the judiciary, the Crown ultimately retained power (Campbell 1999: 16-17).

In the 1920s the prevailing attitude of the government was that Te Urewera should either be reserved for scenic purposes or set aside for timber (Campbell 1999: 159). But, no action was taken for the time.

Matters, however, appear to have been put on hold. For one thing the Urewera consolidation scheme was not completed until 1927, then the Depression and a tightening up of finances, combined with Ngata’s appointment as Native Minister made land development a greater priority in this region than preservation for a national park or reservation for a State forest (Campbell 1999: 20).

In 1934, the Department of Lands and Survey commissioned a report to establish what the government would do with Te Urewera. The Shepard-Galvin report included six recommendations:

“Firstly, that private alienation of land and timber be prohibited pending completion of negotiations for their acquisition by the Crown. They also recommended that certain areas of Native land be acquired by the Crown, that various public works be carried out, that telephone communication be installed at Maungapohatu, that the Crown discourage all European settlement in the Urewera, and lastly, that suitable river flats between Waimana and Tawhana be brought into a Native Land Development Scheme” (Campbell 1999: 29).

But, World War II and a lack of funding prevented the government from the full execution of those recommendations. In the meantime, the government did make sure
that until Maori could be convinced or forced to sell their lands, they would not make any changes to those lands that would conflict with government plans. This meant a ban on all timber cutting without the Crown’s permission, which was generally denied (Campbell 1999: 160-161). Instead the government offered to buy the land, but Maori refused. Campbell (Campbell 1999: 161) writes:

“No consideration appears to have been given to the potential economic benefits for Maori of milling, or to the possibility of arranging some sort of compromise whereby controlled milling could be employed or the owners could receive some form of compensation for being unable to realise on their forestry assets. Maintaining a good relationship with Tuhoe certainly seemed to be of rapidly shrinking importance.”

At the national level, the conservation movement underwent several changes. In the 1930s and 40s, the same factors that had halted activity in Te Urewera affected public support of national parks, which were seen as an unnecessary expense. But, increasing prosperity in the 1950s buoyed the movement. In 1952, under the direction of the Minister of Lands, Maori Affairs, and Forestry, E.B. Corbett, the National Parks Act was passed (Campbell 1999: 41). This provided the criteria for park selection, which was “to be based wholly upon scenery preservation and conservation” (Campbell 1999: 41-42). The Act also created the National Parks Authority, which would administer parks at the national level (Campbell 1999: 42).

Following those developments, Urewera National Park was gazetted in 1954. However, there were many difficulties. “Maori still retained areas of land adjacent to, or within, the proposed national park boundaries” (Campbell 1999: 162). While Corbett acknowledged that Maori did not want to part with any more land and he said that he had
“no intention of forcing them to do so,” the government clearly wanted to acquire much more land to add to the national park (as quoted in Campbell 1999: 163).

The above paragraph brings up an important point. The park was first gazetted under the name Urewera National Park. Though I refer the actual region as Te Urewera, when referring to the park, I follow the style of the 1976 Management Plan which calls the park Urewera National Park. This is a highly problematic matter. Berg and Kearns note the importance of naming as a function of cultural autonomy and empowerment (cited in Coombes 2003: 150). The word ‘Te’ had been omitted from the park name.

Coombes (2003: 153) writes: “Obviously, Tuhoe had not ‘chosen’ the ‘Urewera National Park’ and the... matter of changing the name was..., not at all small. It represented an important request for Tuhoe to reclaim its own history.” It was not until 1999 that requests to add ‘Te’ to the name were implemented and the park was officially recognized as Te Urewera National Park (Coombes 2003: 155). Throughout this thesis I refer to the national park by its proper name, Te Urewera National Park, or Te UNP, and when referring to the actual greater region I use the name Te Urewera. However, in the section that details the 1976 Plan, I follow the style of the authors and refer to the park as Urewera National Park or UNP.

3.3 The 1976 Management Plan: Buried Epistemologies?

3.3.1 Introduction

The Urewera National Park Board was formed in 1961. From the 1960s to the mid-1970s the major concerns of the park board were gaining control of key tracts of Maori land as well as the rights to the lakebed (Campbell 1999: 162). As an alternative to
outright ownership of the lake, the Park Board (henceforth PB) considered the possibility of a long term lease. The board used various means to achieve these goals. At the same time the application of Soil Conservation and Rivers Control Amendment Act to Tuhoe land strengthened the government’s position (Campbell 1999: 165). Under this legislation lands that were considered potential risks for erosion or flooding if clear cut were denied cutting rights. Significantly, the government was unwilling to assess the value of lands that it did not plan to use commercially (Campbell 1999: 167). It contended that it could not set a price on lands that would be used for scenic and aesthetic purposes. This refusal to determine appropriate compensation frustrated negotiations with Maori for their lands. Therefore, despite the fact that the Act granted compensation for the loss of revenue to landowners, no Tuhoe received compensation.

For a long time, Maori had been accorded a rate or property tax exemption on their lands (Campbell 1999: 79). But, in 1964 this was eliminated from parts of Te Urewera. While the government argued that the timber companies with cutting rights to Maori land would largely be responsible for the burden of taxation, it was clear that once the timber was gone that Maori would bear the brunt of the taxes. Furthermore, the owners of lands that had been denied cutting rights or that were being farmed would face difficulties in meeting those financial obligations (Campbell 1999: 80). Much of such land was not monetarily productive enough for Maori to meet the rates requirements. This would result in many Maori being forced into selling their land, those same lands which the government had been pressing to buy.

Taken together, the timber restrictions and the lifting of the rate exemption created a financial burden upon Tuhoe which served to pressure them into selling their
lands to the Crown (Campbell 1999: 168). Until the government got what it wanted it
denied Maori owners the ability to use their lands unless it fit with national park
intentions (Campbell 1999: 168).

It was in this context that the idea of master plans was introduced. In 1969 the
National Park Authority decided that master plans were a necessity to the administration
of the parks (Campbell 1999: 106). Te Urewera was chosen as a test case for this idea.
The master plan was to be written by a team of professionals from various different fields
of expertise. Notably, there was no stipulation for Maori representation on the team.

3.3.2 The Plan

In the Summary and Introduction, the authors introduce the major aspects of the
1976 Plan. They state that

throughout the plan the emphasis has been placed on retaining the
wilderness character of the Urewera and the major challenge has been to
ensure the preservation of the integrity of the Park, while at the same time
realistically and sensitively providing for the large number of people who
visit it each year. It is towards these ends that this management plan has
been developed. Its principal features being directed towards –
- Permanent protection of the ecology.
- Retention of the wilderness character.
- Initiating boundary adjustments based on ecological considerations.
- Offering appropriate recreational opportunities.
- Provision of public facilities compatible with use.
- Encouraging development of visitor facilities outside the Park (Board

Clearly the primary concern is for the wilderness character of the park. This is tempered
by the need to serve the recreational interests of the public. A scientific emphasis is also
evident through the use of the words ‘ecology’ and ‘ecological.’ It is notable that the
resident Maori receive no mention.
In the plan, the authors describe the park. First, there is an historical account of how the park was established. Then, there is geographical information about the site and situation of Te Urewera including its location, access, topography, geology, climate, and a description of park assets in terms of flora and fauna. To give flavor to the park, there is a section on the history of the region. The authors also describe the importance of Te Urewera as part of the national park system and to New Zealand as a whole because of its extensive native bush.

The authors then explain the management objectives, concerns, and how best to deal with them. When the team first met in 1970, it established basic objectives for the management of the park. ‘Preservation of the wilderness character’ was of primary importance (Campbell 1999: 107). The team indicated that it would be responsible for interpreting Maori history for park visitors. Finally, one of the main goals was the further acquisition of Maori land as well as the control of the lakebed of Waikaremoana. This land objective was in contrast to the Crown, which had decided in 1957 to end such pursuits (Campbell 1999: 166). But, the National Park Authority, the Park Board, and the Department of Lands and Survey continued to press Maori in the hopes of enlarging the park and increasing the scope of state power over the resources. These issues are clearly addressed in the plan. Further concerns include the definition of prohibited activities and restricted or permit based behavior, impacts of commercial use, and the regional importance of Te Urewera in terms of water control and hydropower.
The actual composition of the UNP Board deserves attention. It was noted above that the plan demanded a team of experts, but there was no provision for Maori representation. Coombes (2003: 270) writes that in 1969, a Tuhoe member of the UNP Board by the name of Mr. John Rangihau “stated that the Maori people had nominated Mr. T.R. Nikora to discuss with and advise the Master Plan Committee on any aspects of the plan involving Maori interests.” However, from the standpoint of the PB, Mr. Nikora was desirable because of his planning background and position as surveyor of the Lands and Survey Department, Gisborne, rather than because of his Tuhoe affiliation. While he eventually became a member of the team, there was a great deal of ambiguity as to his actual role. Referring to Mr. Nikora, the Chief Surveyor of Gisborne wrote “I cannot make him available as a representative of that body [the Tuhoe Trust]…as it would be outside his normal Departmental functions” (Coombes 2003: 271). Yet, “despite the ambiguity about [his] role, the Park Board used his presence to claim that it was liaising suitably with local Maori” (Coombes 2003: 272).

3.3.3 Buried Epistemologies?

3.3.3.1 Enframing Te Urewera

The authors of the 1976 Plan employ the same metaphor of enframing (see sections 1.3.2 and 2.3.1) to organize their narrative. The plan incorporates the trope of the ‘picturesque’ where the lands are aestheticized and presented from the perspective of an outsider similar to Cosgrove’s concept of landscape. This first excerpt indicates the centrality of ‘picturesque’ qualities to the function of a national park:
The National Parks Act 1952 establishes in general terms the purpose and appropriate uses of National Parks.

Section 3 (1) of the Act states inter alia

"The provisions of this Act shall have effect for the purpose of preserving in perpetuity as National Parks, for the benefit and enjoyment of the public, areas of New Zealand that contain scenery so beautiful or so unique that their preservation is in the public interest" (emphasis added, Board 1976: 11).

In this quotation, the authors again emphasize the park in terms of its aesthetics:

No other lake in the North Island can compare with the scenic beauty and natural qualities of Lake Waikaremoana (emphasis added, Board 1976: 11).

Following the aestheticization of the lands, the authors construct their authority. Recall from the trope of ‘monarch-of-all-I-survey,’ which was demonstrated by Best and Mansfield, that even without a view from an elevated height, the realism or thoroughness of a description gives it the appearance of being authoritative. In the Plan, the PB describes its management of Te Urewera as though it is the only body charged with the maintenance of the land. In this first quotation, the PB (1976: 1) indicates that it will “produce a general policy” for the Park and how such policy will be important to Te Urewera:

In initiating this management plan the aim of the Urewera National Park Board has been to produce a general policy for the Park’s preservation and better use and in so doing ensure the conservation of the amenity which now brings people to the Park.

In this next quotation, the PB (1976: 14) again cites how it “has formulated specific policies” for the Park:

To ensure that management objectives are achieved and visitor use has a minimum impact on the Park environment, the Park Board has formulated specific policies aimed at achieving an acceptable balance between preservation and use.
This sense of authority also rests on the PB’s careful re-construction of the past, wherein the violence of colonial appropriation of Tuhoe lands is erased, and of the present, wherein the native claims to sovereignty are ignored and ongoing residence on the lands is downplayed. This enables the authority of the government to appear natural and uncontested, rather than being a point of ongoing struggle. The Plan specifically omits any mention of illegal confiscations or coercions of Tuhoe into parting with their lands. Instead, the history of the area is re-written wherein the Crown is depicted as an heroic mediator who finally brings peace to quarrelsome ‘primitives’ as is evident in the following quotation: “Government forces succeeded eventually, however, in establishing peace amongst the turbulent Tuhoe people in the 1870’s” (Board 1976: 8-9).

Finally, the PB separates nature and culture. As explained earlier (see section 1.3.2) the trope of the ‘separation of nature and culture’ describes the author’s depiction of the two as though they are unrelated to one another instead of integrated. Primarily the PB describes the park as being natural. In the second section of the plan, the authors list the different resources of the park as though they are disconnected entities. The headings are:


Each of those subsections includes a detailed description of ‘natural resources’ but there is no mention of people or how those resources have been and continue to be used by people. The following excerpt depicts the park in natural terms:

Much of the significance of the Urewera lies in the fact that it is the largest remaining area of unspoilt indigenous forest remaining in the whole of the North Island (Board 1976: 11).
This next example implies that Maori are not a part of the total environment.

Management policies are directed first to the care and management of the natural features and the ecosystems within the resource. The primary objective is the preservation of the total environment, as compared with the protection of a single feature or plant or animal community (Board 1976: 13).

In the next quotation, the authors focus on the park as a natural place and the only people who are mentioned are tourists, who pass through rather than live in the area.

Throughout the plan the emphasis has been placed on retaining the wilderness character of the Urewera and the major challenge has been to ensure the preservation of the integrity of the Park, while at the same time realistically and sensitively providing for the large number of people who visit it each year (Board 1976: 1).

Since the authors of Plan 1976 present nature and culture as separate and treat Maori as though they have nothing to do with the management of park, there is not much information on contemporary Maori. This reinforces their exclusion. Here is one example from the section on proposed additions to the park where the PB describes “Maori enclaves”:

There are numerous enclaves of Maori land throughout the Park and although these have usually been either farmed or cleared in the past they are of considerable historical significance. The Board’s policy is to maintain the closest possible liaison with the Maori communities within and bordering upon the Park. If any of the enclaves of Maori land within the Park become available they should be considered for possible addition to the Park (Board 1976: 18).

This is ironic considering that the ownership of the lands within the park have been and continue to be disputed. The actual possibility of Maori willingly parting with more lands is slim.
Just as Best and Mansfield did earlier, the PB enframes Te Urewera. First, the park is aestheticized. Then the PB uses rhetoric to create the appearance that they are the uncontested authority for the park. Finally, the place is approached as though it can be broken down into distinct realms of nature and culture. The lack of references to contemporary Maori gives the appearance that they have nothing to do with the park. This reinforces the authority of the PB over Te Urewera.

3.3.3.2 ‘Temporal Fixing’ and ‘Authenticity’

As indicated in the previous section, there are few references to contemporary Maori. However, there are more descriptions of Maori history. Following the pattern of Best and Mansfield, the 1976 Plan cultivates the image that the region is a romantic place of myth and therefore continues to temporally fix the Maori (Fabian 1983: 30; Neumann 2001: 23-26; Pratt 1992: 64). Not only does this deny Maori their current habitation of Te Urewera, but it also silences them. It does this in two ways, first by describing Maori as part of the past and thus unable to speak, and second, by creating a static Maori identity so that those Maori who change, as is the way of all cultures, are no longer considered ‘authentic’ and thus cannot represent Maori. Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne write that the assumption that Te Urewera is a scenic wilderness with a romantic Maori past has been deeply entrenched in management policy for the Urewera National Park (Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne 1986: 36).

This is evident in the following excerpt from the 1976 Plan wherein the use of the temporally laden terms serves to mythologize Te Urewera. These same words were used throughout Best’s text.

The Urewera National Park abounds in history, song and legend and was
the scene of *feuds, intrigue* and many battles (emphasis added, Board 1976: 8).

Here is another demonstration of the same tendency to depict a romanticized version of Maori history which is significant in that it is perceived to be over. This quotation defines ‘authentic’ Maori as static and a part of the past in opposition to the reality of cultural dynamism, which is something that Best and, later, the PB, attribute only to ‘modern man.’

The interpretation theme to be developed for the Aniwaniwa Visitor Centre is intended to present the Urewera as a vast, unspoilt wilderness, despite hundreds of years of human occupation, the aim being to interpret Maori and natural history by showing how the *Maori lived in almost complete balance with the ecosystems as compared to present day* pollution and environmental problems resulting from a heavy emphasis on materialism (emphasis added, Board 1976, 39).

Other passages highlight the absence of contemporary Maori while maintaining a romantic appeal as is demonstrated by this next excerpt:

> Today economic pressures are forcing more and more Tuhoe to live away from their lands but the bond which has been forged by history still remains” (Board 1976: 9).

I take this to mean that though the Tuhoe are not on site bodily, that they remain in spirit, which thus leaves the Park Board the space to assume the authority to speak on their behalf. This neatly leads to one of the secondary objectives of the Plan, which is to

> INTERPRET BOTH THE RESOURCE AND ITS MAORI HISTORY IN SUCH A WAY AS TO MAKE THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PARK MEANINGFUL TO THE VISITOR (capitalized in original, Board 1976: 12).

Thus, the PB claims the responsibility and authority to interpret the Park and its history.

> By temporally fixing Maori, the PB reinforces its authority over the ‘natural’ park and extends its authority to speak for Maori history. This is part of an ongoing denial of
the cotemporality of natives. According to this logic, the native is not modern or trained in cultural analyses and is therefore unable to interpret and communicate native culture in a meaningful way. Those that are modern are no longer 'authentic' and thus again cannot speak for themselves or for nature. This authorizes the voice of the modern 'disinterested' ecologists and scientists (Willems-Braun 1997: 22-23).

3.3.3.3 'Anticipatory Vision': The Park as State Property

In his tourist book, Best envisioned the future of Te Urewera as belonging to Pakeha and the Age of Steel. Though the creation of a national park does not explicitly follow Best's visions, his main expectation was the imposition of national control. The Plan 1976 reiterates the incorporation of Te Urewera into the space of national interest. As mentioned above in section 3.3.3.1, the wording of the Plan presents Crown authority over Te Urewera as a foregone conclusion. It does not even hint at the various contestations as described earlier (see section 1.2). Instead, the park is constructed as being public property. To quote the National Parks Act 1952, the national park contains:

for the benefit and enjoyment of the public, areas of New Zealand that contain scenery so beautiful or so unique that their preservation is in the public interest” (emphasis added, Board 1976: 11).

In this next excerpt, the PB ties Te Urewera into the national system of parks:

The Urewera National Park should not be allowed to develop in isolation but only in the context of an integrated recreation system (Board 1976: 10).

In terms of creating its own 'anticipatory vision,' the PB writes:

The Park will be subject to increased visitor pressures in the future (Board 1976: 10).
The conversion of Te Urewera into a national park is a realization of Best’s expectations. Not only does the PB present the park as public domain, but it clearly anticipates that it will remain so. This ignores the ongoing contestations. This again strengthens the authority of the PB as a representative of the state.

3.3.3.4 The Contemporary Primeval

For Te Urewera, the concept of wilderness changed over time. Initially it was seen as a threatening place to the national integrity; as a haven of ‘wild’ and dangerous men and a place of political dissidence. The manufacture of Te Urewera into a ‘threat’ to the New Zealand nation was useful as a justification for the military pacification of the area. Subsequent to that, Te Urewera was redefined in romantic tourist terms. Best and Mansfield were important in recreating the region as: an aesthetic space of national interest; one of ‘picturesque’ beauty; one of sublime nature separate from culture, and romantically infused with the myths of the dying Maori race. As shown above, these tropes are repeated in the 1976 Plan. Yet, none of these visions of Te Urewera mesh with its lived reality as a place, as a cultural homeland, for Tuhoe. In their report Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne critically engage the 1976 Plan and write that

Pakeha notions derived from the Romantic movement underlie modern perceptions of the Urewera and preservation of the forests. The Wilderness Policy (Lands and Survey 1985) describes something called “wilderness experience”:

The idea of wilderness is very personal. It embodies remoteness and discovery, challenge, solitude, freedom, and romance. It fosters self-reliance and empathy with wild nature. Wilderness is therefore principally a recreational and cultural concept which is compatible with nature conservation (Stokes, Milroy, and Melbourne 1986: 34).

These notions clearly tie in to European concepts of wilderness which were previously
discussed in section 1.3.4. These include the idea of wilderness as a place of aesthetic consumption; as sacred; as a source of inspiration and education; as a symbol of national identity; and as a source of renewal of civilization. The specific use of the word ‘recreational’ shows the connection to Thoreau’s ideas about the value of nature as a place to learn by actively interacting with it. The term also directly relates to Best’s and Mansfield’s use of the region. The use of the terms ‘wilderness,’ ‘remoteness,’ and ‘romance’ also echo the sentiments of colonial writings about Tuhoeland.

The 1976 Plan treats Te Urewera as though it is a wilderness. Descriptions of UNP as such dominate the text and the authors clearly indicate that maintaining the ‘wilderness character’ is the highest priority as in this first quotation:

It therefore seems that much of the Park’s present attraction comes from the fact that it appears to be a vast impenetrable wilderness completely unspoilt and unmodified by man.

It is the aim of this plan to retain and, where possible, to reinforce this feeling and as a result, within the broad framework of the National Parks Act, the specific object of management will be to –

Other descriptions throughout the text reinforce this sense of Te Urewera as a wilderness, which is exactly how Best described it over and over. Here is another example:

Much of the park’s present attraction lies in its size and the seemingly impenetrable wilderness of the Urewera...this feeling of vastness...would be lost if it were bisected by further roads (emphasis added, Board 1976: 10).

Other passages describe the UNP as ‘primaeval,’ ‘undeveloped,’ having ‘unique qualities,’ or as being ‘completely natural’ (Board 1976: 13, 41, 22, 32, 22, 43 respectively). These references are notable for their emphasis on the separation of nature,
or wilderness, from culture. The authors do acknowledge that according to National Park Authority land use classifications,

there are no designated Wilderness Areas in Urewera National Park but the whole of the Urewera has always been regarded as wilderness and it is an object of management that it remain as such (emphasis added, Board 1976: 43).

Clearly, what is at issue is the appearance of wilderness and its attendant meanings. In the words of the authors:

Throughout the plan the emphasis has been placed on retaining the wilderness character of the Urewera (emphasis added, Board 1976: 1).

Not only is the representation of Te Urewera the dominant trope in the 1976 Plan, but its preservation is the main goal of the PB.

3.3.3.5 Analysis of the 1976 Plan

Overall the 1976 Plan constructs Te Urewera and Tuhoe in a series of ways that hinge on European epistemologies. First, Te Urewera is enframed spatially: it is aestheticized, the PB presents itself as the sole authority, and nature is separated from culture. Then, the Maori are temporally fixed to further exclude them from having a role in management. The park is constructed as being public domain, which the PB anticipates will not change. Finally, the dominating theme of the management plan is to treat Te Urewera as a space of primeval wilderness which divests Tuhoe of any claim to it as a lived cultural place. The 1976 Plan continues to employ the tropes that were used by Best and Mansfield to convert Te Urewera from a Tuhoe place-scape into a space of national interest. It does not address a Maori sense of connection to Te Urewera such as has been described in section 1.2. Furthermore, it ignores all the contestations over park
ownership. Through the reiteration of colonial erasures, the 1976 Plan re-creates Te Urewera as the self-evident domain of the PB rather than the occupied homeland of Tuhoe.

3.4 The 2001 Draft Plan: Modified Epistemologies

3.4.1 Introduction

As discussed in section 3.2 by 1999 the park was officially recognized as Te Urewera National Park (Te UNP). Also, and the Park Board management body had been replaced by the Department of Conservation (henceforth DoC). In addition to those changes, the creation of the Draft 2001 occurred in a different context from the 1976 Plan where it had to respond to the many contestations regarding ownership as well as address new legislation.

Public concern for human environmental impacts increased during the 1960s (Murton 2001: 67), and this resulted in the creation of new legislation and agencies to regulate the environment. It became mandatory to determine how all government projects would impact nature (Murton 2001: 67-68). Such ecological concern was built into legislation and it emphasized preservationist attitudes (Murton 2001: 67-68). However, up until the late 1980s, such legislation did not take Maori rights or customary usage into account (Murton 2001: 69). The first major shift occurred with the passage of the Conservation Act 1987 which requires that government conservation works, including national parks, “give effect to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi” (Coombes 2003: 387). Following this, the Crown undertook a reorganization of resource management law which culminated with the 1991 Resource Management Act. This law replaced almost 60
acts (Murton 2001: 69) thereby ideally endowing resource management law with unity of function and purpose. Significantly, the RMA also requires that Treaty of Waitangi principles be incorporated into conservation practices. However, there are a variety of ways which these legislative changes have failed to resolve conflict.

As states earlier (see section 3.1), Coombes (2003: 387) notes that though the new legislation, such as the 1987 Conservation Act, requires the consideration of the Treaty of Waitangi, the act is still itself preservationist in its approach. Furthermore, while it demands efforts at a Crown-Maori partnership, it speaks of consultation, not co-management, which is entirely antithetical to what Maori are seeking. Coombes (2003: 386) writes that the Draft 2001 maintains the status quo and prolongs grievances:

During the 1990s, [Department of Conservation] DoC prepared itself to develop better relationships with tangata whenua under the new management plan. However, it has abandoned this search for better and more formal relationships until the Tribunal has heard claims relating to the Park, and the new plan is little more than a conservative place-holder.

Park management refuses to address the historical context of Crown-Maori relations and how conflicts between the two have created an environment of distrust. Basically, the new plan does little to address the many grievances regarding the park (see Coombes 2003; Coombes and Hill 2005).

From a different perspective, what I argue is that despite recognition of the contested issues regarding ownership and new legislation requiring acknowledgement of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, the rhetoric of the Draft 2001 actually works to strengthen the authority of DoC. The authors continue to organize the narrative using the same basic tropes that are in the 1976 Plan and the Best and Mansfield texts. Again, as I argue in the introduction to this chapter, these ‘buried epistemologies’ are not just a part
of the texts, but are the means by which Te Urewera was made available for Crown appropriation in the first place. The major difference is that the emphasis has shifted from wilderness to science. But, as I will show, this is an epistemological device that serves to further legitimate the authority of the park managers.

3.4.2 The Draft 2001

The authors of the *Te Urewera National Park Management Plan Draft* (or Draft 2001) explain their intentions for the plan as well as give a brief summary of what the plan includes:

> The purpose of this plan is to express the Department’s overall management intentions for Te Urewera National Park for the next ten years (DoC 2001: ii).

The plan was designed by the East Coast Hawke’s Bay Conservancy of the Department of Conservation in consultation with the East Coast Hawke’s Bay Conservation Board. The authors received input on the plan from “the wider community” both public and governmental, as well as tangata whenua “through a series of consultative hui and through the lodging of written and verbal suggestions” (DoC 2001: ii). DoC acknowledges the mana whenua status of tangata whenua and that the ownership of the entire region is contested by tangata whenua.

The authors explain the reason for the plan. The creation of the plan fulfills the National Park Act 1980 requirement that all national parks have a management plan and that these must be reviewed every ten years. The plan is limited by existing legislation and only deals with management. The authors state that they are only vested with the authority to deal with management concerns and not with issues of ownership. Therefore,
they make a clear distinction between management and how it impacts ownership concerns.

After the introduction, there are nine sections that deal with managing the park. There is a section that details physical and historical park resources. These include: indigenous versus introduced flora and fauna, water bodies, geomorphology, geology, climate, and archaeological assets. The authors then explain their main management objectives for the park. These deal with “natural, historical, cultural, ecological and recreational values” and the relative weight given to each (DoC 2001: 2). The plan includes management objectives and policies for each of the following concerns: “community relations; ecological and natural resources; historic resources; non-indigenous species; access, recreation and use; concession assessment” (DoC 2001: 3). The last section explains the process for “implementation, monitoring and review” (DoC 2001: 3).

3.4.3 Modified Epistemologies?

3.4.3.1 Introduction

With all of the changes in legislation and new awareness of Treaty of Waitangi obligations to work with tangata whenua, there should have been some real changes in the way that Te Urewera was actively managed and management should have addressed some basic grievances. But, in reality, there were no significant changes in how the park was managed. In terms of the tropes, the focus of the plan shifted from the aesthetics of wilderness to its scientific value. Instead of temporally fixing Maori in order to silence
them, the Draft 2001 employs other means to maintain its presumed authority to speak for them and their lands.

3.4.3.2 The Enframed Landscape

The Draft 2001 continues to be organized by the metaphor of enframing. Unlike the preceding three texts, this one does not describe Te Urewera as 'picturesque' or aestheticize it to the same degree. The 'picturesque' trope draws its power from the concept of perspective, which DoC does utilize in the Draft 2001. The authors establish distance between themselves and Te Urewera and treat the latter like an object which can be analyzed.

DoC re-asserts its authority over Te Urewera. Just as the authors of the 1976 Plan, the authority of DoC is treated as a foregone conclusion. The authors of the Draft 2001 (DoC 2001: 35) write that

the Department of Conservation is responsible for the management of Te Urewera National Park.

A noticeable difference is that the Draft 2001 actually mentions the ongoing contestations over the actual ownership of park lands. However, as demonstrated in this first quotation, it immediately dismisses these as not pertinent to its role as a manager:

The purpose of this management plan is to guide the Department of Conservation in the administration and management of Te Urewera National Park in accordance with legislation...aspects of the status of land ownership in relation to Te Urewera National Park land is outside the scope of this plan. The Crown is addressing land ownership claims through the Waitangi Tribunal Claims process and the Office of Treaty Settlements. The Department of Conservation is not legislated to address these issues and this plan is focused on management aspects of the park (DoC 2001: 1).
Here is another example in which DoC maintains its authority despite Treaty claims:

As Treaty claims have yet to be resolved, public conservation land of Te Urewera National park must legally be administered by the Department of Conservation on behalf of the Crown, in accordance with legislation (DoC 2001: 31).

Coombes and Hill (2001: 394; 2005) point out that this refusal to recognize the relevance of ownership and management to each other just prolongs grievances rather than possibly addressing some of them.

Next, DoC separates nature from culture. The authors of Draft 2001 do mention tangata whenua throughout the document. However, there are still significant absences. DoC breaks Te Urewera down into separate and seemingly unrelated components just as the PB did in the 1976 Plan. The chapter on “Resource Description” includes the following headings:

“Indigenous Flora,” “Indigenous Fauna,” “Park Waters,”
“Geomorphology (Landform),” “Geology,” “Historic Resources,”

Here is an excerpt from “Indigenous Flora” section:

The ecological district concept…provides a useful framework in which to discuss and assess the park’s physical and biological resources. Each ecological district encompasses an area with a similar pattern of climate, geology, landform and vegetation distinctive from other ecological districts in New Zealand (DoC 2001: 12).

In this chapter there is no information about cultural usage of these different entities or any other cultural information. As Pratt argues, this kind of erasure of cultural connections allows to justification of colonial appropriation of lands and resources (Pratt 1992: 51-52, 59). In keeping with the trope, major references about Maori are in the
chapter on “Community Relations.” In these sections there is a blurring of the separation of nature and culture in a limited sense as demonstrated in this quotation:

Tangata whenua...retain knowledge of the area important for management of the park. They also use the park for deer and pig hunting and for collection of plants for cultural purposes (DoC 2001: 35).

But, this description of the relationship to the park does not even come close to the integrated connectivity that some Maori have expressed (see section 1.2).

As before, park management enframes Te Urewera. The result is that the park is treated like an object over which DoC presumes authority despite contestations. Also, nature and culture are separated, which excludes Maori from the discussion of management of natural resources.

3.4.3.3 Speaking for Tuhoe

As mentioned before (see section 3.4.3.1) the way in which park management depicts Tuhoe has changed. Instead of the romanticized and temporally fixing descriptions about Maori that were included in the 1976 Plan, DoC recognizes the cotemporaneous presence of Tuhoe. This is partially a result of having to acknowledge the contested ownership of park lands. In order to maintain its role of managing the park, DoC presumes to speak for tangata whenua. First, it coopts the voices of tangata whenua by claiming that they participated in the creation of the Draft 2001 in a pre-consultative phase. In the Preface, the authors write:

tangata whenua...have also had input into this plan prior to the draft being prepared, through a series of consultative hui and through the lodging of written and verbal suggestions (DoC 2001: ii).
This places DoC as the authority to which Maori submit their opinions. By showing that Maori have given input, it thus indicates that they are participating and accept the terms. Yet, there was a great deal of dissatisfaction on the part of Maori over the consultation process none of which is mentioned in Draft 2001 (Coombes 2003: 405-416). In terms of the actual management of the park, is no real attempt to actually incorporating Maori into decision making process:

The Department must...seek to actively involve tangata whenua is the protection of taonga [treasures such as resources] in the park...[and] will undertake to gather sufficient information and advice from tangata whenua regarding their views, to ensure that informed decisions are made on the management of the park (DoC 2001: 37).

This in no way indicates the weight that Maori opinions will carry when decisions are being made. There is no reason to believe that their input will matter. Clearly, the authority to make decisions still rests with DoC. Coombes (2003: 387) argues that consultation is a meaning palliative in comparison with more collaborative and participatory approaches. In the Draft 2001, Maori are constructed as only having a circumscribed role, one which is essentially limited to consultation.

Finally, attention is drawn to the ways in which Maori negatively impact the park. DoC describes how certain behavior and demands conflict with park values and to what extent that interaction is appropriate. In the section “Access, Recreation and Use,” the authors indicate that further development of roadways is not in the best interests of the park, according to the current management regime. Then, the document states that landowners in the Maungapohatu area want vehicle access to said area which they note is very important to the Maori (DoC 2001: 94). However, the authors do not indicate what measures are being taken to meet those needs. It would seem that despite the importance
of access for Maori DoC does not intend to aid them. The Draft 2001 mentions Tuhoe in relation to access within the park by horse which is allowed under the regulations (DoC 2001: 98). The document notes the importance of horses to tangata whenua historically. But, it also writes that horse use inside the Park can be detrimental to park values. Draft 2001 describes the extent of Maori use of park resources. The fishing of eels is recognized as a cultural right, but only for traditional, non-commercial uses (DoC 2001: 134). Collection of flora for cultural purposes is acceptable for a certain set of uses, again non-commercial (DoC 2001: 137).

The above paragraph highlights the ways in which Tuhoe are depicted as having a negative impact upon the park. There is subtle implication that such impacts are not traditional since they are not in keeping with the park. This works to disqualify Tuhoe from speaking for their lands by presenting them as ‘inauthentic.’ In total this section demonstrates how DoC works to deny Tuhoe their many voices in regard to how the park is managed and assumes that right for itself. Once again, the authority of DoC remains apparently intact.

3.4.3.4 Anticipated Vision

Once again, extension of state power over Te Urewera is a realization of Best’s anticipatory vision and Te Urewera National Park is the expression of national authority in the area. DoC reaffirms this national connection in several passages. For example:

National parks are established for the preservation of an area with outstanding qualities of national interest and for the preservation of indigenous animals and plants within the park (DoC 2001: 45).

Here is another example:
Research is continually being undertaken at a conservancy and national level, and this national park management plan needs to recognise this and provide flexible policies guiding ecological management lest the plan becomes outdated (DoC 2001: 44).

What is being shown is that the park is a part of and subordinate to a wider national system. The last quotation also shows the importance of research and science to park management.

3.4.3.5 Modified Rhetoric

I have shown that the Draft 2001 is not significantly different from the 1976 Plan or Best’s and Mansfield’s texts in terms of the tropes. Not only does it enframe Te Urewera and Tuhoe spatially, but it also silences tangata whenua. The end result is that DoC has reasserted its authority over Te Urewera National Park and appropriated the power to speak for Tuhoe. But, unlike the previous documents, Draft 2001 does not emphasize Te Urewera as a wilderness. This is partially because of the changing character of the park as human impact is increased, and also because of the Maori insistence that Te Urewera be recognized as their cultural homeland, not a ‘howling wilderness.’ There is a marked decrease in the frequency of references to the park as such. The wording has shifted from ‘wilderness’ to ‘natural’ and ‘natural values’ as is evident in the following quotation:

Preservation of the scenery, ecological systems, native plants and animals, natural features, and sites and objects of archaeological and historical interest as far as possible in their natural state. Extermination as far as possible of all introduced plants and animals that threaten values to be preserved.

To retain the natural character of Te Urewera National Park as an area with significant and unique natural values” (emphasis added, DoC 2001: 32).
Here is another example of how ‘natural’ has replaced ‘wilderness’ and also reinforces
the sense that nature and culture are mutually exclusive:

Due to the isolated location of the park and the national park status
protection against development, most of the natural character values
remain dominant in the area. Management must ensure that these values
are retained (emphasis added, DoC 2001: 32).

Instead, wilderness becomes valuable because of it serves science as is demonstrated in
the next quotation:

The islands in Lake Waikareiti are unique in the park in that they remain
in a near-pristine state and are therefore of special scientific interest”
(emphasis added, DoC 2001: 51).

Science becomes the dominant theme of Draft 2001 as I will show in the next section.

3.4.3.6 Science

The Draft 2001 focuses on the theme of science as it relates to Te UNP. This
again is based on the idea that nature is separate from culture. The two tropes involved
are “distinctiveness” and “ecology” (see section 1.4.3), which were first introduced as
important for the ideological arguments about New Zealand’s landscape as symbols of
national identity. The former trope focuses on the uniqueness and special character of the
habitat. The latter trope deals with Cockayne’s argument about the scientific importance
of “‘the manner in which [species] are associated together’,” which is similar to the
contemporary support for biodiversity (quoted in Star and Lochhead 2002: 128). Star and
Lochhead (2002: 128) write that these botanical arguments “provided an influential
rationale for conservation for over the ensuing decades.” There is a great deal of overlap
between these tropes. Together they serve as an argument for the protection of the
environment, either for scenic value in terms of its ‘distinctiveness’ or for the scientific value of its ‘ecology.’

These tropes of science have become a substitute for the ‘wilderness’ trope of the previous texts. However, the theme of science still relies on representing Te Urewera as isolated and pristine. It is argued that such isolation has allowed rare and significant species to remain intact. In other words, this is still a depiction of Te Urewera as a wilderness, though the specific word is largely absent. References to the scientific value of the park and DoC’s scientific management strategies permeate Draft 2001. These sections are often very technical. There is no discussion of human occupation or impact, but instead there is a great deal of reference to the scientific importance of the park’s various resources.

In accordance with the trope of ‘distinctiveness,’ the Draft 2001 demonstrates how rare and unique Te Urewera is in terms of its indigenous flora and fauna and the necessity of expertise in order to ensure the park’s natural integrity and maintenance. In this first excerpt, the authors indicate how special the park is:

The park is ranked by Shaw as outstanding wildlife habitat in the Urewera/Raukumara area. Because of its size the park supports a greater diversity of species and many of these are rare, uncommon or otherwise ‘sensitive’ (restricted in range throughout New Zealand) species (emphasis added, DoC 2001: 13).

This next quotation also draws attention to Te UNP’s ‘distinctiveness’:

The limited research on terrestrial and aquatic invertebrates has located some significant species – that is species that are rare, or are at the limits of their distribution, or occupy vulnerable habitats (emphasis added, DoC 2001: 14).
This next quotation serves to show how the ‘distinctiveness’ of the environment serves a scientific function, which leads to the trope of ‘ecology’:

The islands in Lake Waikareiti are unique in the park in that they remain in a near-pristine state and are therefore of special scientific interest. The vegetation on these islands may be used as a benchmark for evaluating the health of other forest areas at a similar altitude and aspect (emphasis added, DoC 2001: 51).

This quotation also highlights the ‘ecology’ of the communities:

Howard-Williams et al., discusses some aspects of particular scientific interest about macrophyte communities of Lake Waikaremoana which distinguishes it from other New Zealand lakes, particularly North Island ones (emphasis added, DoC 2001: 13).

The following quotation clearly indicates the park’s value:

The Park is the largest protected natural area in the North Island. Large representative examples of indigenous vegetation of five ecological districts are reserved within the park, with a full range of bioclimatic zones represented for three ecological districts. Several significant species and communities are present, and other scientifically important features such as threatened species also occur (emphasis added, DoC 2001: 12).

But, the main issue is the need for expertise in managing such valuable scientific resources. In order to do this, DoC draws attention to the various threats to the scientific/biologically diverse splendor of Te Urewera. These threats come in the form of plants and animals which are characterized as ‘noxious’ or ‘pests’. James Scott (1998: 13) writes that

the vocabulary used to organize nature typically betrays the overriding interests of its human users. In fact, utilitarian discourse replaces the term “nature” with the term “natural resources,” focusing on those aspects of nature that can be appropriated for human use. A comparable logic extracts from a more generalized natural world those flora or fauna that are of utilitarian value (usually marketable commodities) and, in turn, reclassifies those species that compete with, prey on, or otherwise diminish the yields of the valued species. Thus, plants that are valued become “crop,” and the species that compete with them are stigmatized as
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"weeds," and the insects that ingest them are stigmatized as "pests." Thus, trees that are valued become "timber," while the species that compete with them become "trash" trees or underbrush." The same logic applies to fauna. Highly valued animals become "game" or "livestock," while those animals that compete with or prey upon them become "predators" or "varmints."

Here are some examples of how the plan shapes and identifies the threat. Noticeably, this first example extends the threat from Te Urewera to New Zealand and finally to the world:

*Introduced plants* *impact* on New Zealand by affecting the long term survival of native species, the integrity of survival of natural communities or the genetic variation within native species. *Globally invasive weeds* *reduce bio-diversity* as more places become increasingly alike.

The [introduced] plants identified above have already become established in the park. There is also a considerable *threat* that many other plants, currently growing in private gardens and collections, or being used in agriculture, horticulture or forestry may also become naturalised (emphasis added, DoC 2001: 21).

Here is another quotation where the authors define the threat to the park:

*Introduced animal pests have serious detrimental effects* on ecosystem form and function, affecting native plants, animals and other organisms and their habitats.

Effects of introduced animals include direct *predation* of indigenous plants and animals, *competition* with indigenous organisms, and habitat *degradation* (emphasis added, DoC 2001: 24).

It is notable that there is no admission of responsibility for the presence of exotic animals with this minor exception: "Humans have generally introduced animals to New Zealand, either unintentionally or through deliberate release" (DoC 2001: 23). For further details on the history of alien introductions see Coombes (2001).

3.4.3.7 Authority and Science
Once DoC has established that Te Urewera is a place of significant scientific value that is plagued by threats, management constructs itself as the right entity to safeguard the park’s ecological survival. It discusses strategies for dealing with the threats and improving the biodiversity and scientific value of the park. Thus, as readers, we are led to believe that despite the difficulties that arise in managing such a vast and biologically diverse resource, DoC will prevail and successfully achieve its stated intentions and goals. But, the problem is that by participating in the discussion of whether or not DoC is skilled enough as managing the resources of Te Urewera we allow the continual separation of nature and culture and thus ignore the moral issue of whether or not they should be managing in the first place. According to Willems-Braun (1997: 6), this runs the risk of continuing a colonial pattern which denies natives a voice with regard to the land.

3.4.3.8 Analysis of 2001 Draft Plan

In response to ongoing contestations and new legislation, the authors of Draft 2001 incorporate several changes into the management plan. However, these changes are cosmetic and only serve to reinforce the authority of DoC in its management of the park. DoC continues to enframe Te Urewera as an object and construct their authority as complete. The rhetoric in Draft 2001 separates nature from culture denying Tuhoe the right to represent their lands. The 2001 Draft notes the DoC attempt to include tangata whenua in consultation on the design of the draft and acknowledges contestations over land ownership. However, the authors make it clear that such disputes are not pertinent to the management of natural resources. Therefore, DoC still presumes that its own
authority to run Te UNP is intact. The Draft abandons the concept of preservation and its description of the park as primeval. Instead the main focus is the scientific importance of the biodiversity that Te Urewera houses. The Draft deals with DoC’s skill at management rather than right to manage. Issues of who is authorized to administer the region are never addressed; those elements are considered irrelevant to the scientific management of the Park. This line of argument serves to abstract attention away from the moral issue of tenure to focus instead on DoC’s ability at scientific management of resources. This still becomes a means by which tangata whenua are denied meaningful participation in the stewardship of their ancestral lands.

3.5 Conclusion

There is a clear connection between the colonial texts of Best and Mansfield and the management plans of Te Urewera National Park. The 1976 Plan and the 2001 Draft both rely on reiterations of the cultural erasures created by such colonial texts in order to establish their authority. Te Urewera is still treated as object for the use and benefit of the New Zealand national public. The only significant difference is in the style in which the plans mask their appropriation of the land. While legislation subsequent to the 1976 Plan mandates that management bodies take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, there is no significant change in the relationship between tangata whenua and park management. The 2001 Draft merely incorporates the recognition of Te Urewera as a contested space and shifts its focus from the land as ‘wilderness’ to the land as having ‘biodiversity.’
CHAPTER 4. SUMMARY

4.1 Findings

In this thesis I have demonstrated the links between European cultural concepts of nature, colonial era depictions of Te Urewera, and the management plans of Te Urewera national park. I have based this work on the writings of Bruce Braun (1997, 2002) who argues that environmental entities such as the forest or, for my purposes, national parks are not self-evident objects but rather are constituted by political, economic, cultural, and historical practices and relations of power to become invested with multiple layers of meaning. To accept nature as self-evident means that certain understandings of nature will be emphasized at the expense of others which risks maintaining the power relations that are a part of those dominant conceptions of nature (Braun 2002: 17). Braun (2002: 3) utilizes Foucault's theory of archaeology to uncover how nature came to be understood in its present forms. He refers to these lasting influences of colonial discourse as 'buried epistemologies' (Braun 2002: 4-5).

Chapter Two introduced the idea that the constructions of Te Urewera have changed over time. At one point it was seen as a harsh and difficult land that was a haven of lawless men and thus a threat to the national integrity. That view served to justify the government's invasion and pacification of Tuhoe. Once that was done, the land was free to serve national aesthetic interests. But, before that could be accomplished, it had to be re-envisioned as a romantic and wild landscape. Katherine Mansfield and Elsdon Best were two influential writers who helped shape public attitudes towards this region.
Best and Mansfield employed several tropes in their descriptions of Te Urewera. I first introduced these tropes in Chapter One as products of European epistemologies about the world. The primary metaphor I focus on is enframing. I use three tropes associated with the concept of enframing. The first is the ‘picturesque,’ in which the land is aestheticized, but most importantly, the authors rely on distance and objectify what they see. The second trope is the ‘monarch-of-all-I-survey,’ in which the authors again use the concept of perspective to establish their own authority. But, primarily authority is achieved by presenting the author’s opinion as authoritative. The third trope is the ‘separation of nature and culture,’ in which order imposed is treated as order revealed. Integrated places are treated as though they can be broken down into unrelated entities. While there is a bit of overlap and contradiction between the tropes the overall effect is the same. Together, these tropes of enframing promote the objectification of place, the authority of the writer, and break the cultural connections of peoples to their lands.

Once Te Urewera and Tuhoe have been spatially separated, Best and Mansfield employ temporal tropes. Tuhoe are cast back into a primitive Time by Best and Mansfield through the trope of ‘temporal fixing.’ This creates an essentialized identity against which dynamic Tuhoe are measured for their ‘authenticity.’ Together, these tropes silence Tuhoe from speaking for themselves, or for their lands. Then, Best demonstrates the trope of ‘anticipatory vision’ where he imagines that the Crown will extend its authority over Te Urewera, which further eliminates Tuhoe from participating in their lands. The final trope that I draw out of Best and Mansfield is ‘wilderness.’ Spatially and temporally emptied of a human presence, Te Urewera is treated like a primeval place.
Through the words of Mansfield and Best, Te Urewera was transformed from a cultural place-scape into a space within the broader national realm and thus one subject to all the competing interests of the nation. This enables it to later be remanufactured into the place Te Urewera National Park. In doing this, Tuhoe, the long-term stewards and residents of the region, were demoted to a mere minority interest in the management and fate of their own lands. It is these textual displacements as based on colonial epistemologies that authorize the managing bodies of Te Urewera National Park to claim that they are administering a public space.

In Chapter Three I point out the ways in which Te Urewera is treated by first the PB in the 1976 Plan and then DoC in the 2001 Draft. In the 1976 Plan, the authors write that Te Urewera is a wilderness. They reiterate the metaphor of enframing and the tropes from Best’s and Mansfield’s texts. Once again, Te Urewera is treated as an object, the PB presents its own authority as uncontested, and nature as separate from culture. Tuhoe are temporally fixed and then measured for ‘authenticity.’ The national park is the realization of Best’s ‘anticipatory vision.’ Finally, the park is depicted as a vast, pristine wilderness. The colonial tropes resonate strongly in the 1976 Plan.

Draft 2001 is slightly different to the 1976 Plan. DoC needed to respond to ongoing contestations by Tuhoe over the ownership of park lands and new legislation that required park management to acknowledge the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. But, the Draft 2001 is not significantly different from the 1976 Plan in terms of the above mentioned tropes. Te Urewera is still treated like an object, but not asetheticized to the same extent. DoC still asserts its authority to run the park. Nature and culture continue to be separated from each other. Tuhoe are not as clearly temporally fixed; DoC recognizes
that they are cotemporaneous. However, Tuhoe are not allowed to speak. Instead, they are coopted by DoC’s offers of consultation over the plan and management. DoC’s efforts to incorporate Maori into the consultative process lend credence to DoC’s claim of authority, for not only do they speak for nature, but they also speak for the Maori whom have had input into the design of the plan even though such input meant virtually nothing when it came to the actual decision-making structure of the park. As stated before, Coombes (2003: 387, 405-416) questions the overall value of consultation and points out that tangata whenua found the process frustrating. Furthermore, DoC acknowledgement of park ownership contestations is immediately followed by a denial of their relevance to management. In sum, DoC assumes that its authority is complete.

In place of the trope of ‘wilderness,’ the theme of ‘science’ dominates the rhetoric of Draft 2001. This theme incorporates the tropes of ‘distinctiveness’ and ‘ecology,’ both of which hinge on the presentation of Te Urewera as a pristine place. Thus, the theme of ‘science’ continues to rely on the construction of Te Urewera as an isolated wilderness. But, this does not just reflect a new understanding of natural resource management. As previously discussed (see section 1.4.3), science was incorporated into preservation arguments as early as 1908 by people like Leonard Cockayne. By focusing on science, DoC argues about the importance of the park to the nation as a whole, which justifies the need to have trained experts in the maintenance and conservation of the park. Again, this relationship of Te Urewera to the greater nation was only possible because it had been converted from a Tuhoe place to a space within New Zealand. Most importantly, by focusing on science, the Draft 2001 frames the question in terms of whether or not DoC
is skilled enough at managing the park which obscures the more pressing question of whether or not it should be there in the first place.

4.2 Implications

These colonial texts and management documents clearly show the continuity and salience of European epistemologies. As Braun has argued, uncritical acceptance of nature privileges certain understandings at the expense of others which risks maintaining unequal power relations that are a part of that concept of nature (2002: 17). The current exclusion of Tuhoe from ownership and management of their Te Urewera is the result of the reiteration of colonial era erasures. The reiteration of these tropes and erasures can be found in current management plans for Te Urewera National Park. DoC continues to construct Te Urewera in ways that are completely contrary to Tuhoe understanding of it. Instead of a Tuhoe place-scape, Te Urewera is represented as a pristine repository for significant scientific research. This emphasis on science becomes the justification for expert management, which ignores the moral questions about tenure. This further excludes the meaningful participation of Maori in the conservation process, which only prolongs Maori grievances while it hides that fact and thus maintains the unequal power relations that have been produced by colonialism. Unless these European-produced wilderness constructs and the context in which they were produced are critically examined, there will never be a place for Maori epistemologies within park management, and thus Maori will continue to be excluded from meaningful participation as stewards of their ancestral homes in direct disregard for the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.
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