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Abstract

This project has sought to answer the question ‘How is landscape made?’ by examining the landscape of the Otago Peninsula on the east coast of the South Island of Aotearoa/New Zealand. By taking a social constructionist approach, an in depth case study has been completed using ethnographic methods combined with discourse analysis.

The theoretical framework adopted led to the research question being refined and divided into two parts. The first seeks to determine the discourses that construct the landscape of the Otago Peninsula. Those identified include discourses of Mana Whenua, agriculture, environmentalism, gardening, heritage, neo-liberalism and the picturesque. These discourses interact and resist one another through networks of power. Thus the second part of the research question seeks to understand these networks and the distributions of power through them. The agricultural discourse is the most powerful, albeit under strong challenge from the environmental discourse and from the impacts of neo-liberalism. Mana Whenua discourses have gained significant power in recent decades, but their influence is tenuous. The picturesque discourse has significant power and has been utilised as a key tool in District planning in the area.

Thus, the landscape is seen to be made by the dynamic interactions of discourses. This has two consequences, the first, an emphasising of the dynamism of the landscape – it is a process which is under constant flux as a consequence of both the human interactions with and within it, and the biophysical processes which continue outside of human ken. The second consequence is to stress that the landscape is not a unitary object and that this needs to be recognised in the formulation of policy and landscape management.
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Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 The importance of landscape

The landscape of Aotearoa / New Zealand is one of its most valued possessions and, arguably, one of its most valuable resources. A cursory glance around almost any bookstore in the country will reveal dozens of glossy volumes of photographs of Aotearoa / New Zealand landscapes, many published in several languages. While many of the images are of our mountains, indigenous forests, lakes, rivers and coastlines, many are also of our agricultural countryside.

The last one hundred and sixty years of development in Aotearoa / New Zealand has been based upon agricultural production. Agricultural produce still forms the basis of our economy contributing over sixty percent of our export earnings. It is our largest industry and utilises over half of the total land area of Aotearoa / New Zealand (http://www.stats.govt.nz/domino/external/web/Prod_Serv.nsf/htmldocs/Agriculture,+Forestry+and+Fishing downloaded 14 Dec 2003).

The next largest industry in Aotearoa / New Zealand is tourism, contributing sixteen percent of our export earnings. The majority of tourists to visit here come to experience the landscape:

Since the beginnings of tourism to New Zealand, it has been our landscape that has been our key attraction. And this is still the case today. Research recently undertaken by Tourism New Zealand found that our natural wonders are still the icons that draw visitors here, eager to have tourism experiences in an extraordinary setting...For New Zealand these are things like our mountains, glaciers, and geothermal parks and interactions with the landscape like sea kayaking and bush walking or tramping (Tourism News March 2003 pp14-15).

The use of the landscape of Aotearoa / New Zealand as a backdrop to major film projects, such as The Lord of the Rings trilogy, has further extended the economic importance of that landscape. On the one hand it provides a setting for the movie industry leading, somewhat ironically, to a situation where:

1 Throughout the text I use Aotearoa / New Zealand in acknowledgement of the status of Māori as tangata whenua of this land.
...the New Zealand landscape, has also passed itself off in recent years as an Amazon forest, smalltown America, ancient Greece and a 19th century Japanese village in a growing movie industry (http://www.abc.net.au/arts/news/artsnews_1000231.htm downloaded 13 Dec 2003).

On the other hand, the use of the landscape as a backdrop within the films themselves further extends its role as a tourism destination, with about ten percent of recent tourists saying that *The Lord of the Rings* is a factor in them choosing to come here (http://www.abc.net.au/arts/news/artsnews_1000231.htm downloaded 13 Dec 2003).

Beyond this economic value, the communities of Aotearoa / New Zealand have strong affective ties to their landscapes. As stated in the introduction to a report from the New Zealand Historic Places Trust:

> Within New Zealand there are many landscapes which have heritage significance to communities, iwi and the nation. Communities feel strong connections with landscapes that reflect their past. Tangata whenua are linked genealogically to the land of their ancestors. Landscapes where important historic events occurred are part of our emerging national identity (*Think Tank Report* April 2003 P2).

Further, ‘Many rural communities are passionate advocates for their own distinctive landscapes, as expressions of community identity’ (Swaffield 1999a P1). The significance and attachment to landscapes reflects the history and memories of individuals and families as well as communities.

One could expect that an asset of such importance, both economically and affectively, would receive consideration within the country’s statutory and political frameworks. In fact Aotearoa / New Zealand has a long history of protection, beginning with the establishment of the first national park (the fourth in the world), Tongariro, in 1887. The central North Island volcanoes that make up the core of the park were gifted to the Crown by Ngati Tuwharetoa as a means of protecting the sacred peaks from alienation and subsequent subdivision for Pākehā settlement. In 1903 the Scenery Preservation Act was passed into law. While as Nightingale and Dingwall (2003) point out, there had been reserves created for recreation, to protect natural curiosities and to protect scenery since 1840, the passing of the Act enabled historic reserves to be created and the compulsory purchase of land to be undertaken to establish scenic reserves. In more recent times the plethora of environmental and planning legislation which had accumulated was superseded by the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA91). This
Act requires local councils to sustainably manage the natural and physical resources within their areas.

Despite the clear importance of the landscape to the wider public of Aotearoa / New Zealand, both economically and affectively, there are varied and diverse interpretations of what this might and should imply. Consequently there are also diverse interpretations of how the landscape should be managed. In fact, the landscape of Aotearoa / New Zealand is highly contested, as the following brief examination shows.

1.2 Landscapes contested

1.2.1 Colonisation

The current landscape of this place, Aotearoa / New Zealand, is vastly different to that which existed at the time of first human settlement. The process of this transformation has been an integral part of the process of colonisation. In the first instance, the forerunners of the Māori people burnt forest and built settlements, pa and extensive gardens. Hunting by people plus predation by the dogs and, most particularly, the rats brought with them, led to the extinction of indigenous birds and invertebrates. The wave of European colonisation beginning in the nineteenth century involved even more dramatic impacts on the environment including the clearance of vast areas of indigenous forest; the draining of wet lands; construction of towns and cities, roads, and dams; and the introduction of a great number of plants and animals (Wilson 2004).

In both instances this transformation was undertaken from a platform of beliefs about the environment and its relationship with human beings. It is clear from many sources that the nineteenth century European settlers not only believed themselves to be racially and culturally superior to the Māori but they also believed that the plants and animals with which they were familiar were innately superior to the indigenous. For example, in a lecture presented to the New Zealand Institute in 1869 WTL Travers said,

...the results already caused by the introduction of new and rival organisms satisfies me that the indigenous flora and fauna even on their own ground, are unable to cope with the intruders. I cannot but think that the former had reached a point at which, like a house built of incoherent materials, a blow struck anywhere shakes and damages the whole fabric (Travers 1869 P312).
A similar statement was made in 1873, in relation to attempts to legislate protection for indigenous forests, by J Sheehan. He said,

The same mysterious law which appears to operate when the white and brown races come in to contact - and by which the brown race, sooner or later, passes from the face of the earth - applies to native timber...The moment civilisation and the native forest come into contact, that moment the forest begins to go to the wall (cited in Wynn 1977 P128)

The parallel drawn between the indigenous people and the indigenous biota by this nineteenth century commentator is echoed in contemporary discourse as will be seen shortly.

Paralleling the physical transformation of the landscape have been processes of symbolic and political transformation. Surveying allowed the imposition of the private ownership of land. British law determined the rights and obligations of the new landowners, both Pākehā and Māori. Māori names for geographical features and areas were supplanted by European alternatives. The ‘civilising’ force of the British colonialist quite rapidly transformed the landscapes of Aotearoa into the landscapes of New Zealand.

This has become, to Pākehā New Zealanders like myself at least, only a matter of contest over the last thirty years. In 1976 a large group of Māori walked the length of the North Island to present petitions to Parliament in the hope of preventing the alienation of any more Māori land. Later that same decade saw Māori occupying land to prevent its sale and to demand the return of lands to traditional Māori owners. In the 1980s Māori gained the right to have grievances dating back to the Treaty of Waitangi of 1840 heard and resolved, and several substantial settlements were made between iwi and the Crown during the 1990s. In addition the Resource Management Act 1991 has given Māori unprecedented voice in environmental issues. These transformations have not been welcomed by all.

However, it would be seriously misleading to imply that the only tensions and conflicts in terms of the landscape and its management are between Māori and Pākehā. Contests and disagreements occur widely between differing groups, and some of these cross cultural boundaries. The following micro-case studies illustrate some of the complexities of the contestation of landscape in Aotearoa / New Zealand.
1.2.2 Micro-case studies

- One Tree Hill

In October 1994 a ‘Māori activist’, Mike Smith, attempted to cut down the loan pine tree on Auckland’s One Tree Hill (http://www.aucklandcity.govt.nz/council/projects/onetree/history.asp downloaded April 7th 2004). While little was reported at the time of his motivations, the audacity of an attack upon one of Auckland’s most pictorialised and iconic landmarks prompted howls of outrage. His act clearly threatened a landscape that was of great importance to many Aucklanders and other New Zealanders. The vitriol poured upon Smith was tremendous. Following close on the heels of the outrage was a significant investment of ratepayers’ money to attempt to save the tree, an exotic *Pinus radiata*.

![Fig 1.1: One Tree Hill dominates the skyline of much of Auckland city, seen here with its tree intact.](http://www.arc.govt.nz/volcanic/onetreehill.htm downloaded June 21st 2004)

When all efforts to save the One Tree Hill pine failed, it was eventually removed. In early 2002 a group of people surreptitiously planted a group of *Podocarpus totara* on the summit of the hill to replace the pine. *Podocarpus totara* is an indigenous species and one which had previously crowned the summit of the volcano. This act was responded to by with the immediate removal of the totara by council staff under the paradoxical logic of Auckland’s mayor, John Banks, who thought too much public money had been spent on the site already!

The combination of the exotic origins of the pine tree, and the apparently indigenous origins of its attacker, gave the event and its aftermath inescapably racial overtones.
Many saw the attack on the tree as a symbolic attack on the ascendancy of the Pākehā culture in New Zealand – the attempted overthrow of the exotic intruder. The response engendered by this interpretation was vitriolic from some quarters. A correspondent to the Sunday Star Times said:

If the pine on One Tree Hill is replaced by a native tree, then the radicals will have won again. But if it is replaced by an introduced tree, or perhaps a memorial to the early European settlers, then non-Maori New Zealanders will have won their first psychological battle since the end of the New Zealand Wars (Sunday Star Times, September 19, 1997, P A10).

This echoes the parallel drawn between plants and people in the nineteenth century mentioned earlier, and clearly emphasises the symbolic importance which can be attributed to the landscape, and to human actions within it.

**District planning under the RMA91**

The RMA91 devolves responsibility for environmental management to City, District and Regional Councils. These authorities are required, by the Act, to prepare comprehensive plans to ensure their management responsibilities are fulfilled. Many draft plans were first released in the mid 1990s and a number were notable for the level of outrage generated by them, particularly among the farming community. Three were particularly notable in this regard, the plans of the Far North District Council, the Hurunui District Council and the Banks Peninsula District Council. In all three cases Federated Farmers co-ordinated programmes of organised resistance and protest against the plans, succeeding in having the Far North’s plan withdrawn in January 1998 for rewriting, and in gaining significant modifications to the other two.

The Far North District Council plan attempted to implement environmental protection measures, in part to protect habitat of the endangered iconic bird, the North Island Brown Kiwi. Thus farmers were to be required to gain resource consents to develop areas of scrub, key habitat for the kiwi. A representative of Federated Farmers described the Plan as ‘crazy’. Complaints against the plan included that it ‘could place bizarre restrictions on farmers, including a limit on the number of people on a property’; that there had been ‘no consultation’; that ‘farmers are losing property rights to ridiculous council regulations’; and that ‘the council is turning rural assets into liabilities’ (The
The Hurunui District Plan came under severe criticism from Federated Farmers and landowners for its attempt to zone areas of rural land as outstanding landscapes. The then provincial chairman of North Canterbury Federated Farmers was quoted as saying:

[The Hurunui District Plan] strikes at the very heart of property rights. When an outside party, or local authority can impose their wishes and values on our property without compensation it threatens our security, our freedom and our heritage (The New Zealand Farmer October 2 1997 P17).

Another farmer complained that his entire farm had been initially listed as outstanding landscape. He said, 'The feeling is that it has gone too far. They’ve based the landscaping decisions on the Lucas Report, and we believe it should be set aside.’ This report was undertaken by a prominent landscape architect and used as a basis for the landscape protection policies in the Plan:

The Banks Peninsula District Plan raised issues of both landscape and environmental concerns. One farmer was quoted as saying, in response to this plan:

I don’t want to run a state farm. I want the council to sack the planners who came up with this anti-environment, anti-landowner, and anti-property rights document. This planning document will wipe out all the gains that have been made in improving the environment on Banks Peninsula over the last 100 years. Taking landowners management rights without compensation is very dubious. The council must compensate landowners who are to lose their management rights. The real test of the wackiness in the council’s proposed plan is whether ratepayers are prepared to stump up with the money (The New Zealand Farmer June 12 1997 P10).

Similarly, the Banks Peninsula landscape policies and rules were developed by planners from reports prepared by landscape architects.

• Indigenous versus exotic plants

A recent debate in the Christchurch Press newspaper illustrates clearly and intensely another landscape debate which has been active in Aotearoa / New Zealand for some years now. A move by designers, some local bodies and many private individuals towards promoting the planting of indigenous plants in gardens and public places, paradoxically an international movement, has been met with some vehemently negative responses.
In a letter to The Press on November 20th 2003, a correspondent described being ‘appalled at the desecration of our garden city image by the loss of our pristine river banks to tussocks and other native foliage.’ He continued to comment that he was ‘constantly embarrassed’ by the comments of overseas tourists ‘on the loss of our beautiful mowed river banks and reserve areas.’ He concluded:

We can do with all the tussocks the council produces on our Port Hills, but they have no place as a replacement for our lovely mowed river banks and reserve areas (The Press November 20th 2003 PA10).

This letter was met with responses that were almost as vehement. The first, published on November 24th, described the ‘public planted landscape’ as ‘artificial’ and ‘the masses of tussock and other native foliage’ as ‘the true New Zealand heritage that Christchurch has lost.’ The Christchurch City Council was congratulated for ‘restoring to the urban areas some small remnant of what we have desecrated...to make us the England of the South Seas.’ On November 25th a correspondent described being ‘appalled’ by the original letter and commented that the use of native plants in public places led to ‘a great interesting variety of form, colour, texture, and better still they are part and parcel of our heritage.’

Further criticism of the original correspondent’s position was made on November 26th when a correspondent attributed the re-establishment of the indigenous bird species, Paradise Duck and Scaup, on the Heathcote River in Christchurch City to the re-establishment of indigenous flora on the river banks. Another correspondent put a further viewpoint, that the urban landscape already included many indigenous species. She concluded saying, ‘Diversity is the key for plants as well as people...the public landscape is just that, public, and should not be planted by purists of any persuasion.’

The final rejoinder, however, came in a letter published on November 28th. In this letter written by a ‘one-eyed Cantabrian now resident in Buller’ native bush is attributed with ‘dreary monotony’. The site of Christchurch’s settlement presented a ‘dismal view’ of ‘desolation, swamps, flax and insect-laden bushland.’

To say that a stinking swamp is what made or makes Christchurch unique is inane at best. The tremendous vision and effort to beautify our city from the earliest times with blooms from our English roots, those are what make us unique. We distain our native plants because they are boring, drab, and of little aesthetic merit. Let them be unique in Westland (The Press November 28th 2003 PA10).
What is perhaps most interesting and significant about this letter is not its cultural myopia – local Māori certainly do not consider their roots to be English – but that this letter received the paper’s ‘Letter of the Week’ award, winning its author a pen set valued at $260. While the majority opinion expressed in the letters argued against the original correspondent’s position, the local press used its institutional muscle to support it.

1.2.3 Some of the issues

There are a number of clear themes running through these micro-case studies. Present in all of them is a tension between the indigenous and the exotic or introduced. The embarrassed Press correspondent is willing to countenance tussocks in the open space reserves of the Port Hills but not in the city. The aesthetic value of indigenous plants is characterised as providing ‘a great interesting variety’ and, alternatively, of being ‘boring, drab and of little aesthetic merit’. This tension between the indigenous and the exotic is explicitly humanised in the case of One Tree Hill where the symbolic connection of the exotic with Pākehā and the indigenous with Māori is most clearly drawn echoing the nineteenth century commentators mentioned earlier. In the rural areas this tension is exhibited as a conflict between habitat preservation and agricultural practice.

The claims from landowners that they have a right to do as they please with their land, versus the right of the community to control those activities is another clear tension. Whilst most clearly stated in the rural context, this also weaves itself into the issue of public planting in Christchurch city, where it becomes a debate about what is an appropriate reflection of the public’s wishes.

Conflict about what is our true heritage is also a theme. The imposition of community control on private property is seen as threatening the heritage of farming. Debate about whether the actions of our forebears were desecration or the acts of people of vision extends from urban to rural settings. The planting debate raises the issue of whether our identity is better reflected by introduced plants (our English heritage) or indigenous (our Aotearoa / New Zealand heritage).
In conclusion, as these micro-case studies illustrate so clearly, the landscape of New Zealand is actually hotly contested in terms of appearance, in terms of function, and in terms of meaning. Thus it seems safe to assume that the taken-for-granted landscape within which we live is somehow a product of both these contests and the contesting viewpoints. We have made it what it is by the practices that we have used to manage the land — clearance, drainage, grazing, mowing, planting and so on. When changes in these practices are mooted or imposed there is often dispute about whether the changes, or their consequent impacts on the landscape, intended or otherwise, are appropriate. The inescapable consequence of this is that the taken-for-granted landscape reflects the values, attitudes and actions of people and the disposition of power in New Zealand society.

Michel Foucault said of his work:

I want to try to discover how this choice of truth, inside which we are caught but which we ceaselessly renew, has been made — but also how it was repeated, renewed and displaced (cited in Mills, Sarah 1997 P19).

In the terms of this study I want to try to discover how this choice of landscape which we ceaselessly renew, has been made — but also how it is repeated, renewed and altered. Or, put more simply, the key research question, which this thesis aims to answer, is, 'How is landscape made?'

A new understanding of how landscape is made, how social, political and economic forces mesh to produce particular landscapes, is of little purpose unless it facilitates some practical as well as theoretical benefit. To this end it is necessary to ask further questions about the implications of a new way of understanding landscape. These fall into two groups. Firstly, as landscape is so important to Aotearoa / New Zealand in so many ways it seems vital to ask, ‘What are the implications of this new understanding for landscape management, policy and practice?’ Further, the landscape architecture profession is deeply implicated in these contests over landscape.
In all three of the district planning cases discussed above landscape policies based on the work of landscape architects were major focuses of conflict. While there is certainly nothing wrong with a professional viewpoint causing controversy, it seems important to examine this as another example of contestation. Thus it is also necessary to ask, 'What are the implications of this new understanding of landscape for landscape architecture as a discipline and a profession?'

1.3 Research approach

In order to achieve an understanding of how landscape is made, this work presents a case study of the ‘construction’ of a notable landscape examining the practices which make, maintain and alter it. In the first instance this entails examining land management practices which, for the purposes of this study are defined as practices which entail the material manipulation of the land. These land management practices create, through their cumulative effects, this thing we call landscape. The study moves from examining land management to examining landscape management. Landscape management is more abstract in its execution utilising policy documents rather than spades, plans instead of bulldozers. However, in terms of this study, it is nonetheless considered a land management practice in that it too results in material consequences on the land.

The landscape on which this study focuses is that of the Otago Peninsula. This peninsula, the seaward side of a collapsed volcanic crater forms a discrete landmass, considered ‘almost an island’ by early European settlers who found it to be connected to the mainland by swamp and sandhills. Within its boundaries it encompasses city suburbs, commuter settlements, rural villages, agricultural lands, native reserve (Māori) land, lifestyle blocks and significant areas of Crown and other reserves.

2 Other researchers have investigated contested landscapes. See for example Armstrong, HB (1994) and the series of reports, Investigating the Cultural Landscapes of Queensland: CONTESTED TERRAINS. However, my interest in contestation is in how contests of value, moderated by networks of power, create landscape.
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Fig 1.2: Images from the Otago Peninsula illustrating key landscape features.
The study utilises qualitative research methods, primarily discourse analysis supplemented with ethnographic material, to ‘unpack’ the land management practices that are evident in the case study, arguing that management decisions are made on the basis of knowledge, and lead to actions which have material consequences. For the purposes of the study, land managers are defined as people who have the ability to make an actual impact on the landscape. This includes landowners (farmers, small holders, house holders), members of environmental and community groups, iwi, and professionals in a range of capacities, including local and national government officers.

Chapter Two presents the intellectual and disciplinary genealogy of the study. Landscape Architecture is a somewhat fuzzy discipline which draws on many older and more established disciplines for theoretical frameworks. This chapter examines related works from the fields of Geography as well as from Landscape Architecture, working to refine and clarify the research question(s). Drawing on these works and on ideas from Sociology and the work of Michel Foucault it formulates a theoretical framework within which to find answers to these questions.

Chapter Three presents the methodology used in the execution of this thesis. It stresses that the process of data collection and analysis is far from linear. The constant revisiting and re-examining of material through time brings new and deeper insights, as does the incorporation of new material. The researcher is fully implicated in this process and thus the role of the reflexive researcher is also examined.

Chapters Four to Eight present the substantive findings of the thesis. First, the Mana Whenua have a relationship with the Otago Peninsula extending back to the creation. Chapter Four examines the Kai Tahu relationship with the land in the southern South Island of Aotearoa / New Zealand. In addition it examines some of the impacts of colonisation upon both that relationship and upon the body of the land itself. The recent Māori renaissance is examined and its impact on the power and influence of the Mana Whenua with regard to land management within their rohe.

---

3 The Mana Whenua are the local Māori people who trace their connection with the place back to the creation.
4 Kai Tahu are the local Māori tribe whose territory encompasses most of the South Island of Aotearoa / New Zealand.
5 Rohe is the traditional territory of a tribe or sub-tribe.
Fig 1.3: Map of Aotearoa / New Zealand showing the location of the Otago Peninsula. See Appendix I for a topographical map of the Otago Peninsula.
One of the primary acts of colonisation upon the land, after surveying, was the clearance of forest for the pursuit of agriculture. Chapter Five examines both the processes undertaken through time and the contemporary agricultural discourse. While agriculture, nationally, is still a key economic activity, the agricultural discourse is diminishing in power and influence and this is particularly the case on the Otago Peninsula. The close proximity of the city combined with diminishing economic returns and the increasing influence of urban ideas in planning under the RMA91, are having a strong impact. Consequently the break up of many of the four and five generation family farms is impending.

One of the more recently developed discourses which offers strong resistance to the agricultural discourse, and one which has a major impact on the Otago Peninsula, is the environmental discourse. This discourse constructs agriculture as the major cause of environmental damage in the area. Concerned with ‘protecting’ and ‘restoring’ indigenous species and ecosystems it is in opposition to the agricultural discourse in a number of ways. These oppositions are examined in Chapter Six.

While these major discourses entwine and interact on the ground and in the community in complex ways, other discourses entwine with them also. This increases the complexity of the interactions and increases the number of points of resistance. Chapter Seven examines three of these other discourses: the gardening discourse; the heritage discourse and the neo-liberal economic discourse. Clearly these discourses are not of equivalent impact or scale. The gardening and heritage discourses are both relatively minor in their impact on the Otago Peninsula, although both are increasing in their influence. On the other hand, whole theses could (and probably should) be written about the impact of the neo-liberal discourse on the landscape. However, in this instance, the neo-liberal discourse is a bit like wallpaper – it is ubiquitous and goes largely unnoticed most of the time, but comes into stark relief at certain points, and it is these points which I discuss.

Chapter Eight focuses on a more abstract level undertaking an analysis of the Dunedin District Plan as it applies to the Otago Peninsula landscape. It identifies the naturalised picturesque discourse as the primary landscape management tool in use and raises some questions as to the appropriateness of this. In particular, the problematic nature of the
focus on the protecting scenery for the outsider’s (particularly the tourist’s) view, and the conflation of ecological health with scenic quality are examined.

Chapter Nine draws together the diverse threads of the thesis to clarify the answers to the research questions. The interactions of the discourses to produce the landscape of the Otago Peninsula are demonstrated, and the efficacy and weaknesses of the use of the theoretical framework as an analytic tool discussed. The implications for landscape management are examined and some recommendations made for improved practice. In addition, the implications of the study for the profession and discipline of landscape architecture are examined. Finally, in conclusion, some recommendations for further research are made.
Chapter Two: Surveying the Terrain

2.1 Introduction

Perhaps the most difficult aspect of conducting academic research within Landscape Architecture is in the definition of the field itself. Landscape Architecture can be described as a fuzzy discipline, having its institutional focus actually upon professional training. Disciplines as disparate as Soil Science and Anthropology; Ecology and Environmental Law; and Engineering and Horticulture, jostle for influence within professional training programmes, and academics might justifiably draw upon any of these fields in their work.

Further, Landscape Architecture as a discipline, as opposed to a profession, is a relatively recent arrival on the academic scene in New Zealand, doctoral degrees in Landscape Architecture having only been offered since 1995. Previously advanced studies would have been undertaken within the more established academic disciplines such as Geography. What this means is that these more established disciplines are still relied upon for the provision of theoretical and conceptual frameworks for Landscape Architectural research. Rather than seeing this as a weakness I consider it an opportunity, allowing for rich cross-fertilisation between disciplinary traditions. Consequently, this work draws extensively on the literatures of Geography, Sociology, Anthropology and other related disciplines as well as that of Landscape Architecture.

In Chapter One I indicated that my primary research question is, 'How is landscape made?' While a Geomorphologist or an Ecologist could, in fact, answer the fundamental question, my interest is in people, my background is in Anthropology as well as Landscape Architecture. Bringing these factors to bear on the contested landscape of Aotearoa / New Zealand leads to this study being firmly located within the area of socio-cultural landscape studies. This field has been formed and developed by Cultural Geographers, Anthropologists and, more recently, by academic Landscape Architects.
However, I have certainly not adopted an ‘off the shelf’ approach from any one of these disciplines. More accurately, the theoretical framework used in this study began as an intuitive understanding and was developed in a dialectical way, being influenced by literature and empirical experience, and consequently refined. That original understanding was that people’s values, desires and principles prompt them to act in certain ways towards their environment, which, in turn, produces, or changes, that environment. Simplistically, examining one’s motivations in the home garden can test the truth of this statement. Whether we want an aesthetically pleasing ornamental garden or a productive one determines our actions and may produce radically different results. Consequently, it seems likely that by unpicking the motivations behind people’s actions in the management of land, I might be able to find an answer to my primary question of how landscape is made.

Part One of this chapter, ‘Polishing the theoretical lens’, traces the development of the theoretical framework for this project. I begin with an examination of ideas about the study of landscape. From this foundation I refine the framework using ideas from Sociology, Social Geography, Political Science, Anthropology and Linguistics. Woven throughout are ideas from Michel Foucault. While this study owes an extensive debt to his ideas it is neither extensive nor specific enough to warrant an eponymous attribution. Rather I follow his own words when he said:

> All my books...are little tool boxes...if people want to open them, to use this sentence or that idea as a screwdriver or spanner to short-circuit, discredit or smash systems of power, including eventually those from which my books have emerged...so much the better (Foucault cited in Mills 1997 P17).

This examination leads me to argue that the answer to the question, ‘How is landscape made?’ is to be found in actions of discourses and in the operation of power in the interrelationships between discursive systems.

After having established my theoretical position in Part One, in Part Two of this chapter I examine the relevant literature of socio-cultural landscape studies. This literature stems mainly from the fields of Social Geography and Landscape Architecture. I undertake this review to illuminate the intellectual genealogy of this

---

1 I am indebted to my colleague and friend, Lucy Baragwanath for agreeing to ‘consult the master’ with me in the reading of some of Foucault’s key works. Her intellectual acuity and willingness to persevere were of great support to me in coming to grips with this difficult thinker.
study, and demonstrate the ways in which this study differs from, and builds upon, this literature.

Part One: Polishing the theoretical lens

2.2 On ‘landscape’ as the subject of study

The concept of ‘landscape’ is a complex one. To some, ‘landscape’ is the culturally modified environment, an object specifically reflecting the patterns and structures of its human creators. To others ‘landscape’ is an idea, a way in which people make sense of their world, ‘the symbolic environment created by a human act of conferring meaning on nature and the environment’ (Grieder & Garkovich 1994 P1). The term ‘landscape’ ‘...is variously interpreted as both idea and object, process and pattern, purpose and result’ (Kobayashi 1989 P165). Many other interpretations exist (see Swaffield 1991, 1993 and 1998 for a discussion of interpretations of ‘landscape’ in the New Zealand context), and scholars have made significant inroads into explaining why the concept of ‘landscape’ is so hard to define (Olwig 2002). These wide ranging and various conceptions of ‘landscape’ produce widely differing approaches to its study.

One discussion of the study of landscape which has influenced my thinking in important ways is ‘A critique of dialectical landscape’ by Audrey Kobayashi (1989). While this paper entails a complex discussion of the application of Sartre’s existentialism to landscape geography, it is two other, almost trivial, aspects of the paper which have captured my imagination as a means to facilitate this study. The first is Kobayashi’s use of the metaphor of dance to illuminate the nature of landscape. She says:

The process of landscape is very much like that of dance. In dance, there is a long journey from the barre to centre stage. Along the way, the discrete pliez and relevez of the classe give way to undifferentiated movement. The dance cannot be reduced to its basic elements, but extends beyond itself as a totalization that includes its history and its potential. It releases time, space, form and movement to bring dancers and audience into a common sphere of expression. And yet, we are fooled. For, the moment when the pas de deux reaches its exquisite climax, when the world seems to begin and end with a single subtle gesture, that moment, could never exist...without

2 From this point onwards I will use inverted commas (‘landscape’) to indicate when I am referring to the concept of landscape, and no inverted commas when I am referring to the apparent material reality of landscape.
each agonizing plié that has gone before, without every dedicated encounter with the cold reality of the barre (op cit p164).

Whilst eschewing the explicitly balletic aspect of the metaphor (a ballet, after all, has a choreographer, absent from the structuring of vernacular landscape, and is arranged for an audience of relatively passive viewers) what particularly captures my imagination here is the emphasis on movement. Landscape, like dance is never static, whether the movement (change) is caused by human intervention or biophysical processes. At times the movement is rapid, at times slow but change occurs constantly. Of course, some forces for change are equally constantly resisted by human actions resulting in what appears to be a relatively static landscape. Also, different sorts of changes can occur at different rates simultaneously (geological processes versus biological, for example).

Like dance, the experience of landscape is multi-sensory. With dance we see the movements, hear the music, feel the rhythms and together this embodied experience can move us literally, spiritually and affectively. With landscape, we see the land forms; smell the scents and odours which surround us; hear the sounds of wind, rivers, sea, birds, animals, humans; experience the rhythms of daily, monthly and annual cycles. We feel the impact of the landscape on our bodies as we work muscles to climb hills; feel the sun, wind and rain on our skins; and plumb the depths of our emotions as memories old and new mix in a kaleidoscope of experience.

Finally, as with dance, landscape is the product of that which has gone before. In Kobayashi’s words:

\[
\text{Landscape, too, is a process totalised, the extension and collection of human activity in a material setting...Both [landscape and dance] are irreducible to their constituent elements, both transcend their moments of expression, yet neither exceeds its physical features...Landscape is the assembly, the congregation, the panoply, of the dance of life (op cit Pp164 –165)}
\]

This rich and evocative exposition of landscape underlines two considerations. Firstly, the study of landscape must be situated within its historical context as what exists at any given point in time is but a moment in a process. Secondly, the study of landscape cannot be divorced from the human (cultural) experiences of that landscape, and these are complex and varied. These considerations, however, are
principles to be kept in mind rather than analytic tools to facilitate the process of understanding.

Kobayashi (op cit P182) herself provides a tool for analysis by suggesting that the key aspects of this dance of landscape are the interactions between discourse, action and object, a schema which parallels the intuitive understanding of landscape mentioned earlier. Without wishing to delve into complex definitions of these three aspects of landscape at this point (that will be the main focus of the rest of this chapter) simple definitions allow us to direct our attentions in a constructive way. ‘Action’, in this context, can be seen, simply, as human activity on the land, the most obvious of which lead to changes to the biophysical world (ploughing, forest clearance, planting, building roads and so on). This entails simply the day-to-day living of people and communities. It also, however, entails social actions such as planning and policy development, which, while not directly impacting the biophysical world, nonetheless may have major indirect impacts upon it. The ‘object’ is, most simply, the tangible world, the environment which can be seen and touched and experienced, the ‘land’ of landscape. ‘Discourse’, in this schema could be understood most simply, as talk or text, but it is not simply a means of description. Discourse is also the means, or expression, of understanding of both the object and the action.3

To Kobayashi the ‘dance of landscape’ occurs in the interrelationships between these three facets (see Fig 2.1 below). Experience of the object is interpreted through a particular discursive frame and appropriate actions are thus prompted. This creates the movement (change), but also the primary focus within the triad will change from time to time, sometimes being on discourse (as with arguments about appropriate management schemes), sometimes on the object, sometimes on the action.

3 Other terms such as ‘ideology’ or ‘cultural framework’ could be used in place of ‘discourse’ in this schema at this level of analysis. I maintain the use of ‘discourse’ as it is Kobayashi’s term and, as will become clear, a much more elaborate conception of discourse is a key part of the theoretical framework I am positing.
To return to the dispute over the Christchurch City riverbank planting discussed in Chapter One Fig 2.2 applies the discourse-action-object triad to the institutional impetus underlying the situation.
The initial letter (*The Press* Nov 20 2003) could also be analysed using the same framework. Note that in this instance the action is a social one, the writing of a letter to the editor, rather than a physical action (such as digging up the tussocks).

![Diagram](image)

**Fig 2.3:** Triad applied to the letter of Nov 20 2003

Clearly the object with which the writer is confronted does not match his view of what the riverbanks should be like. He is stimulated to act to restore harmony to his personal system. The same framework can be applied to the letter to *The Press* of Nov 24.

![Diagram](image)

**Fig 2.4:** Triad applied to letter of Nov 24 2003
What is clear from this analysis is that while the object may remain the same (that is, riverbanks covered with indigenous tussocks) the discourses and actions are, in each case, quite different. This suggests to me that the idea that a single triad can be used to explain the movements in the 'dance of landscape' is an oversimplification. In this instance the same object, the tussock planted riverbank, is interpreted in quite different ways resulting in quite different actions, ultimately to mow or to maintain the tussocks. These two actions are clearly in fundamental conflict, it not being possible to do both simultaneously in time and space. Thus, as this simple example illustrates, whether or not the riverbanks remain planted with tussocks and other indigenous vegetation, or are returned to mown grass could depend on the outcome of the conflict between the two triadic systems. (See Fig 2.4) I say 'could' because this is clearly still an oversimplification, and in fact there may be other triads in operation. It is in this interrelationship of triads such as these that I see the dance of landscape occurring.

![Diagram of discourse-action-object triads]

**Fig 2.5:** Discourse-action-object triads may share the same object

An examination of the object alone is clearly insufficient to lead to an understanding of how it came into being. It would also require the adoption of an objectivist epistemology which, as will become clear, would be contrary to the approach I am pursuing. An examination of the actions alone is similarly insufficient, as any understanding of the reasons behind the actions would be purely speculative. Discourse is thus the key to the triad, the means of accessing the meaning and
significance of both the action and the object. It would seem that to answer the question 'How is landscape made?' requires, firstly, focusing on the discourse aspect of any triad in order to gain an understanding of how it functions and, secondly, examining the interrelationships which it has with other triads that are operating in relation to the same object.

The examination of discourses of landscape is not a new or original activity. However, the way in which I use the term discourse, and the implications for our understanding of the object and the actions is new. I will spend the rest of this chapter examining and refining this triadic model of landscape, and illustrating how this approach differs from previous works. This will lead to the development of an analytic tool with which to approach the substantive material in order to find an answer to the research question, ‘How is landscape made?’

2.3 Discourse

As noted above in section 2.2, discourse appears to be the key to unravelling the discourse-action-object triads of the dance of landscape. Whilst the initial definition of discourse as ‘talk or text’ was adequate for setting the theoretical scene, it is now necessary to examine the concept in detail, and then to distinguish how its use is different in this work to other landscape studies.

2.3.1 Discourse theory

Definitions of discourse abound. In fact, it is probably as slippery a term as ‘landscape’. However, I utilise a fundamentally Foucaultian concept of discourse, which Hall (2001 p291) explains thus:

> By ‘discourse’ Foucault meant a group of statements which provide a language for talking about – a way of representing the knowledge about – a particular topic at a particular historical moment...Discourse is about the production of knowledge through language.

The most important aspect of this concept of discourse, particularly for this study, and also the most misunderstood, is Foucault’s view that discourse is constitutive of human knowledge. In the analysis of discourses ‘one sees the loosening of the embrace, apparently so tight, of words and things’ and this results in ceasing to treat
'discourses as groups of signs...but as practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak' (Foucault 1972 P49). This does not mean that the human mind is capable of transcending the biophysical world, although this position has been promoted by some ‘new age’ writers (see for example Richard Bach) simply that physical actions and objects, 'only take on meaning and become objects of knowledge within discourse' (Hall in Wetherell et al 2001).

There is no theoretical reason why there may not be an infinite number of different discursive constructions of the world, and indeed one only need read a few ethnographies before it begins to seem that there are! However, two factors do limit the number of possible variations. The first is simply the boundaries of culture. Within any given cultural group there are limits to the ways of making knowledge. Foucault terms this ‘the archive’, which he defines as, ‘...the general system of the formation and transformation of statements...’ (Foucault op cit P130 Emphasis in original). An institution, society, culture or civilisation can be said to have an archive. '[This] archive cannot be described in its totality, and in its presence it is unavoidable' (ibid P130). As there are a finite number of cultures (otherwise culture becomes indistinguishable from individual psychology) the number of archives is also finite.

The second reason that the number of possible discursive constructions within a culture at any given time is limited has to do with social intelligibility. It could be possible to make a discursive construction from within the cultural archive that, none-the-less, was outside these realms. For example, the attribution of spirits to natural features and organisms, such as rock spirits and tree spirits, would be an intelligible construction of ‘landscape’, but considered to be, at least a little, fringe in twenty-first century New Zealand, Pākehā society. Extremely different constructions might not even be recognisable by most other members of the cultural group, or might be seen as evidence of madness.

As the archive forms the basis from which a culture makes knowledge it follows that the discourses which arise from that archive could be seen as ‘cultural building blocks’ available to but not created by the members of that culture. Thus the individual creates their personal reality from within the limited choices of pre-existing discourses. In this way:
Culture is best seen as the source rather than the result of human thought and behaviour. It is a set of control mechanisms—plans, recipes, rules, instructions (what computer engineers call 'programs')—for the governing of behaviour (Geertz cited in Crotty 1997 P53).

These 'plans, recipes, rules, instructions' are expressed and constructed discursively, and thus discourses are, in this sense, anonymous.

This idea of the anonymity of discourse is a key challenge to the modernist presumption of the independent, rational subject. In Hackings words:

'It is a Foucaultian thesis that every way in which I can think of myself as a person and an agent is something that has been constituted within a web of historical events (Hacking 1986 P36).

This is, of course, a very contentious claim. Particularly in our individualistic western culture, accepting that, 'Men and women are always social creations, the products of codes and disciplines' (Walzer 1986 P61) is extremely difficult. We want to consider ourselves creative and independent thinkers, in control of our lives, capable of making sensible (and sometimes not so sensible) choices for ourselves.

I believe that we do make independent choices and that we do exercise individual creativity (Foucault himself is an example of a radical and independent thinker.) However, this independence and creativity is limited by the cultural archive from which we draw and, hopefully, reshape meaning. We have freedom, but it is within the limits of the discursive constructs of our own cultural system. In Foucault's own words:

...one cannot speak of anything at any time; it is not easy to say something new; it is not enough for us to open our eyes, to pay attention, to be aware, for new objects to suddenly light up and emerge out of the ground (Foucault 1972 p44-45).

Thus:

It is discourse, not the subjects who speak it, which produces knowledge. Subjects may produce particular texts, but they are operating within the limits of the episteme, the discursive formation, the regime of truth, of a particular period and culture (Hall 2001 p79)

It is clear from this line of argument that not only does the subject not author the discourse, but infact the opposite is true. The discourse constitutes the subject, and does so in two ways. Firstly, discourse constitutes subjects as figures who personify the knowledge the discourse produces. Thus, a person may occupy the subject
position ‘doctor’ in relation to the medical discourse, or ‘farmer’ in relation to an agricultural discourse. Secondly, a discourse will produce subject positions in the person subjected to the discourse, for example, the subject position ‘patient’ in relation to the medical discourse, or ‘environmentalist’ in relation to an agricultural one. This is important as these offer us ways of identifying discourses, a point I will return to.

In part the difficulty of coming to terms with the idea that our world is a discursive construction is due to the fact that we constantly do experience it in an embodied way. When I dig in my vegetable garden it is not turning over discourses that makes my back ache! However, I can only understand what I am doing, and complain about my pain, using discursive means. Even the concepts of ‘world’ and ‘embodied’ are discursive constructions, of course. This simply means that the ‘world out there’ is not dependent on our knowledge of it for its existence, or for its continued functioning.

Social structures and institutions, also, are discursively constructed. They too have a ‘real’ aspect to them which we experience in an embodied as well as a conscious way. It would be simply foolish of me to ignore that the university has the ability to fail this dissertation, for example. It has as much real ability to impact my life as a tree falling on me might. People weep at weddings because the ritual has meaning and produces real changes in people’s lives. However, the ‘reality’ of the academy is limited to cultural systems in which it has meaning, and wedding ceremonies which simply entail a couple stepping over a pole together, or where the genders celebrate separately, perplex and amuse us rather than raising a tear.

Most of the discursive frameworks in which we operate are so deeply imbedded as to seem innate. It is only when confronted with the conflicting frameworks of other cultures that it can be acknowledged that any given discourse is a ‘selection’ from a range of infinite possibilities. A small example of this from my own experience occurred when a Pakistani acquaintance cooked me dinner and asked that I eat his food in the traditional manner for him, with the fingers of my (right) hand. I found myself unable to overcome my own culture’s prohibition against dipping my fingers into my food and had to be provided with cutlery. My ‘knowledge’ of food, hygiene,
good manners etc were so deeply instilled within me that they were embodied making me unable to undertake the required physical actions, despite my rational knowledge that it was quite normal for my friend and that I was offending him by not complying.

As this discussion of embodied experience should indicate, I do not eschew the existence of a biophysical reality to the 'world out there'. What I do claim, however, is that this biophysical reality is, in a sense, an 'unspeakable truth'. It exists and we can confront it bodily but can only ever build knowledge about it discursively. This does not mean that the relationship between this embodied experience and the discursive construction of knowledge is that of a subservient body to a rational mind. The relationship is dialectical, with discourse impacting on embodied experience, and embodied experience impacting on discursive knowledge. In Crotty's words:

The world and objects in the world may be in themselves meaningless; yet they are our partners in the generation of meaning and need to be taken seriously. It is surely important, and liberating, to distinguish theory consistent with experienced reality from theory that is not. Objectivity and subjectivity need to be brought together and held together indissolubly. Constructionism does precisely that (Crotty 1997 P44).

Crotty defines 'social constructionism' as:

...the view that all knowledge, and therefore, all meaningful reality as such, is contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world, and developed and transmitted within an essentially social context (1997 P42 Emphasis in original).

The introduction of 'social constructionism'4 to the discussion foregrounds a major criticism of the theoretical position I have put forward here. Norman Fairclough (2003) presents such a critique and as I draw heavily on his work in my methodological approach to analysing discourse it seems both apt and necessary to focus on his criticisms, both in order to distinguish my approach and to justify still drawing on his methods.

Fairclough (2003 P123), despite adopting a number of key concepts from Foucault, complains in his latest book of the latter’s influence on the ‘...identification and analysis of discourses...across the humanities and social sciences’. This influence

---

4In the literature constructivism and constructionism are used interchangeably by some, and to mean different things by others, a point which I discuss further. I identify my own position as 'constructionism' and use this term consistently in my text to refer to ideas which fit with Crotty's definition.
has, he asserts, produced ‘...a rather bewildering range of overlapping and contrasting theorizations and analyses of ‘discourses’’(ibid P124). It is important to note that Fairclough is a linguist who, through the development of Critical Discourse Analysis, has developed a key role for himself in the sociology of racism and, more recently, in the critique of neo-liberalism particularly in the policies of Britain’s New Labour government.

Fairclough bases his challenge to social constructionism\(^5\) on his position as a realist. In his words:

> A realist would argue that although aspects of the social world such as social institutions are ultimately socially constructed, once constructed they are realities which affect and limit the textual (or ‘discursive’) construction of the social. We need to distinguish ‘construction’ from ‘construal’, which social constructivists do not: we may textually construe (represent, imagine, etc.) the social world in particular ways, but whether our representations or construals have the effect of changing its construction depends upon various contextual factors – including the way social reality already is, who is construing it, and so forth (ibid P8-9).

This opposing view he characterises as ‘idealistic’. However I dispute Fairclough's use of the terms ‘realist’ and ‘idealistic’ and his presumption that social constructionism necessarily implies the latter.

Crotty (op cit p11) characterises idealism as the belief that ‘reality’ exists only in the mind. I have already distanced my approach from this idea. Sayer (2000 P2) defines ‘realism’ as ‘...the belief that there is a world existing independently of our knowledge of it...’ This encapsulates my position clearly. Indeed, Crotty comments that:

> …accepting a world, and things in the world, existing independently of our consciousness of them does not imply that meanings exist independently of consciousness...The existence of a world without a mind is conceivable. Meaning without a mind is not. Realism in ontology and constructionism in epistemology turn out to be quite compatible (op cit P10-11)

Further, it makes a difference at what scale one is examining a culture, and Crotty offers a distinction between social constructivist and social constructionist which can be usefully applied. To Crotty, social constructivism ‘...is primarily an individualistic understanding of the constructionist position’ (op cit P58). Fairclough’s challenge is to constructionism (although he uses the term

---
\(^5\) Fairclough is here discussing what I would call, following Crotty, social constructionism, although he uses the term ‘constructivism’.
constructivism) but from the point of view of the experience of individuals and groups (constructivism) has merit – the university has the power to pass or fail me and thus have real impact on my life. The constructionist perspective, however, has little interest in what happens at this scale being more concerned with understanding how the culture endows the institution with this power, and how the institution uses it and maintains it.6

Unsurprisingly, Fairclough's view of discourse also differs from that which I have posited. He says:

I see discourses as ways of representing aspects of the world – the processes, relations and structures of the material world, the 'mental world' of thoughts, feelings, beliefs and so forth, and the social world (op cit p124).

The key term here is 'representing' implying as it does that there is an underlying reality, an absolute truth, which discourses may portray in a more or less accurate manner. He says:

Discourses not only represent the world as it is (or rather is seen to be), they are also projective, imaginaries, representing possible worlds which are different to the actual world, and tied to projects to change the world in particular directions (op cit p124)

This view is similar to those of other significant theorists of discourse analysis (see Potter & Wetherell 1987; Wetherell & Potter 1992; Potter 1996; van Dijk 1985, 1997) and emphasises their common materialist heritage.

As I have noted previously, I eschew the notion that there is any 'absolute truth'. However, in my view the main danger of the materialist position is a relatively pragmatic one. In assuming a privileged view of 'the truth', as is necessary if one is going to examine how discourses differ to the actual world, the materialists run the risk of failing to reflect on their own discursive position. This perspective is premised on the Marxist notion of ideology as false consciousness – which I tend to view as the understanding by an elite, that the other poor suckers have been duped. I simply do not believe that such elitism is useful or helpful in understanding or dealing with social conflicts.

---

6 I consistently use the terms constructionism and constructivism in this way in this text.
Thus Fairclough's view of discourse differs from mine in two ways. Firstly, he sees discourses as construals of reality whereas I see them as constructing knowledge about 'reality'. Secondly, he attributes significance to the author position saying:

Different discourses are different perspectives on the world, and they are associated with the different relations people have with the world, which in turn depends on their positions in the world, their social and personal identities, and the social relationships in which they stand to other people (op cit P 124).

I, on the other hand, ascribe to the view that discourses construct the subject. (This being said, who says what does have significance in terms of understanding the distributions of power, a point I will discuss further in the next section, 2.4.) We do not, however, disagree about the actual features of discourse, which Fairclough primarily defines as the representation of some part of the world from a particular perspective (op cit P 129). Thus despite our philosophical differences, Fairclough offers me a useful and sound methodology for the definition and analysis of discourses (see Chapter Three for a discussion of the methodology of discourse analysis.)

2.3.2 Discourse theory and 'landscape'

Before moving on to examine the interrelationships between discourses, it is necessary to revisit the discourse-action-object framework posited above, as a tool for understanding 'landscape', and examine the implications of this theoretical position upon it.

The most important implication is in the refinement of the conception of the object that is now possible. Clearly the object is simultaneously a 'real' thing and a discursive construction. We can only study the discursive construction, however as the 'real' object is forever beyond our ken. Processes, events, organisms and other biophysical phenomena out side of human control constantly impact this 'real' object. These are in turn discursively constructed, as this is the only way we can know about them. Thus the relationship between the biophysical 'reality' and the discursive construction of the object 'landscape' is a dynamic one. In turn, as events occur, we interpret them, initiate actions in response to them and reinterpret the object. (See Fig 2.6 below)
Fig 2.6: The discourse-action-object triad demonstrating the relationship between the underlying biophysical 'reality' and the discursive construction of that 'reality'.

Applying this more refined understanding of discourse and the construction of the object to the dispute over the river bank planting regime in Christchurch we come to this more sophisticated analysis:

Fig 2.7: The same biophysical reality is constructed differently by the different discourses.

This triadic characterisation of landscape is unavoidably dynamic. Not only is there dynamism inherent in even a passive relationship with the biophysical environment, human relationships with the environments are seldom passive. Changes in the environment prompt discursive dissonance and consequent actions are required to
restore harmony. Further, changes in discourses may prompt similar dissonance and require other actions to be undertaken. (For example, the growth in the discourse favouring indigenous biodiversity leads to the long standing mown river banks in Christchurch becoming dissonant, requiring the replacement of the exotic grass with indigenous plants to create harmony.) Further, the actions themselves gain meaning from the discourses that require them to be undertaken.

This strongly underlines the view that 'landscape' is a cultural framework for describing and knowing about and interacting with the environment, rather than a thing we can look at out of our window. As 'landscape' is, by definition cultural, distinctions between 'cultural' and 'natural' landscapes cease to be meaningful and can be dissolved. Also it underlines that, as the slipperiness of the term 'landscape' means that different discursive constructions may be applied to the same biophysical reality, it is important when seeking to understand how landscape is made that one does not begin by defining a 'landscape' for study.\(^7\)

As discourse is the means by which humans make meaning, its significance within the triad is re-emphasised, and its role as the key to understanding both the actions and the object is underlined. However, this also implies that the researcher is inevitably implicated within the research. While this will be discussed in detail in the next chapter the theoretical underpinning of this should be clear. As all human knowledge is discursively constructed the means of understanding discourses is also discursively constructed. I have to utilise linguistic and discursive resources both to understand what others say, and to formulate my analysis. There is no way out of this paradox as '...discourses always produce partial, situated knowledges and they are always characterised by particular constellations of power and knowledge and are always open to contestation and negotiation' (Gregory 2000 P 180).

---

\(^7\) See Chapter Three for a discussion of the methodological considerations which follow from this.
2.3.3 Conclusion

In this section I have examined some of the key theoretical and philosophical issues with regard to discourse theory and its relationship to 'landscape'. I have positioned myself as a social constructionist arguing that our knowledge of the world and ourselves is constructed discursively. However, I also consider myself to be a realist in that I consider the world (and my body) to have a biophysical reality independent of my knowledge of it. Thus embodied experience becomes a bridge between the biophysical world and the discursive one.

Thus, as discourse constructs 'landscape' and stimulates actions on (and in) the landscape, the analysis of discourse and the observation of the consequent actions taken, will answer the fundamental research question. It is now possible, therefore, to refine the original question thus:

How is landscape made?

1.1 What are the discourses that construct 'landscape'?

2.4 Power and the landscape

Having refined the research question, 'How is landscape made?' to include 'What are the discourses that construct landscape?' it is necessary to reflect upon the adequacy of leaving well alone at this point. What would an answer to this new question look like, and would it fulfil the possibilities of the overarching question?

I venture to suggest that the answer to this question as it stands would be little more than a list. It might be possible to produce some sort of hierarchy within the discourses described, perhaps based on the land area most influenced by them or by the number of people expressing them, but how meaningful or useful this would be is questionable. This list might be very interesting but it would, none-the-less, be a static description. Little would be discernable about the interrelationships between the discourses or the processes involved in both the development of the landscape or the management of its change.
The fundamental question, 'How is landscape made?' is intentionally framed in the present tense to underline the view that the landscape is dynamic in nature. To view the landscape as the static product of past actions is a mistake. Not only are biophysical processes beyond human control constantly acting upon the landscape but also human interrelationships with the landscape are ongoing and active. This does not in itself imply that the discursive systems which constitute the landscape are equally dynamic, there being many examples of intensely inhabited landscapes that have changed little in many centuries. However, as illustrated by the cases discussed in Chapter One, conflicts over the management of landscapes in Aotearoa / New Zealand suggest that the discursive systems involved in their construction are dynamic and changing.

Thus it is necessary to further refine the research question to find a way of examining and explaining the relationships between discourses, both historically and contemporaneously. A critical aspect of these relationships, I would posit, is the (ever changing) distribution of power. Changes in power through both time and space alter the discourses in both number and predominance, changing with them the landscape and its management. Thus, it is necessary to examine both what is meant by 'power', and how it operates, including its relationship with discourse.

2.4.1 Power

Hindess (1996) argues that two conceptions of power have dominated western thought through the modern period. The first is '...the idea of power as a simple quantitative phenomenon. Power, in this sense, is nothing more than a kind of generalised capacity to act.' He continues:

> The second, more complex, understanding is that of power as involving not only a capacity but also a right to act, with both capacity and right being seen to rest on the consent of those over whom power is exercised. (P1 emphasis in original)

Both of these conceive power as something which enhances the capacity of those who have it, but which imposes, by its very nature, on the freedom of others.
The conception of power as the capacity to act has been widely adopted and adapted by social theorists. These range from C W Mills (1959), a ‘father’ of sociology, who saw power as the preserve of social elites able to enforce their will on others without recourse, to Giddens (1995) who sees power as routinely involved in social practices. He argues:

The power sustained in the regularised practices constituting social systems can be considered as reproduced relations of autonomy and dependence in interaction. Domination refers to structural asymmetries of resources drawn upon and reconstituted in such power relations. ‘Domination’ here is used in the sense of ‘permitting dominion over’, ‘dominion’ concerning the sway actors have over others, and over the material world they inhabit. (P49 Emphasis in original.)

Both of these conceptions are readily intelligible and have a certain ‘common sense’ appeal.

The first view of power as a simple social phenomenon has immediate appeal for use in discussions of power and landscape. One could argue that, at least within the boundaries of their own property, people have the power to act upon the landscape. The cumulative effects of these actions could be seen to create the broader landscape. Others have power to act upon public lands or, under certain circumstances, on private land belonging to others. However, complex limitations exist with relation to this power to act. Economic and other realities may inhibit the ability to act as one wishes. Families and neighbours must be considered with a view to maintaining social relationships. It may also be necessary to comply with rules and regulations, which raises the second traditional conception of power.

This conception of power entails not only the ability to act, but also the right to act and is the definition of power which underlies the various modern models of liberal democracy. This conception of power is inextricably intertwined with ideas of governmentality. Thus, the government, local or national, is given consent by its electors to make rules/exert power over them to inhibit or exact certain actions.

This view of power also has relevance and use in understanding landscape and its production and management. In New Zealand the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA91), among other legislation, requires local authorities to exert power or control over the activities of people on private land. This power is legitimised by the assumption that the consent of those so controlled is given through the process of
democratic elections. While one could thus assume that some correlation is likely between the dominant social power and governmental power within a liberal democracy, this correlation is a likely rather than necessary condition.\(^8\)

It could be possible to interweave these two conceptions of power, and indeed this has commonly been done.\(^9\) I could say, 'Well, now I’m going to look at social power and how it enables X to do Y and prevents Z from acting at all; now I’m examining the application of governmental power through the application of planning restrictions.' However, firstly, this approach would not be consistent with the assumption that the 'landscape' is first and foremost a discursive construction. Secondly, I find this 'bifocal' view of power to be grossly over simplistic, requiring as it does, leaps between unconnected macro- and micro-scale analyses.

Power is a dynamic which exists in all human relationships. Power can be domineering and destructive, as in a violent and abusive relationship. It can also be creative and sustaining, as when a parent fosters independence in their child. The same person can have vastly different experiences of power in a short space of time depending on the relationships they are experiencing. At one point in the day an individual may be a dominated spouse; at another a parent; at another an employer; and at yet another an employee. Even within these roles different experiences of power are likely depending on such constructs as gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation and disability. The nature of the power experienced in these different circumstances will also vary. The domination of an abusive spouse is a different form of power than the productive power which aims to enhance and develop an individual through the application of discipline. Governmental power is different in nature again, both constraining behaviour and demanding certain actions, protecting freedoms and limiting them.

At most, if not all, points in this process, it is entirely feasible for the individual to be oblivious to the power that they wield, and often even to the power which is used against them. As McNay (1994) says:

---

\(^8\) In fact, conflict about the imposition of regulations by local government is a key theme in this study.

\(^9\) Hindess (1996) identifies confusion between these two conceptions of power as a major problem in western political philosophy.
Modern disciplinary society operates fundamentally through analogous strategies of normalization. The judges of normality, in the figures of the social worker, the teacher, the doctor are everywhere assessing and diagnosing each individual according to a normalizing set of assumptions of what Foucault calls the 'carceral network of power-knowledge'. Individuals are controlled through the power of the norm and this power is effective because it is relatively invisible (Pp94-95).

This relative invisibility of power facilitates its actions, and is actually supported by the conventional modernist view of power as dominance or governmentality. This led Foucault to say, '...power has remained under the spell of monarchy. In political thought and analysis, we still have not cut off the head of the King' (1978 P88).

But power does not only act upon and through individuals. Groups and organisations are also caught up in the 'multiplicity of force relations' that is the functioning of power. Thus some groups are able to harness resources and create opportunities to fulfil their goals, while others are not. Which group is which is under constant flux and change leading Foucault to say, '...power is not an institution, and not a structure; it is the name that one attributes to a complex strategical situation in a particular society' (ibid P93). Implicit in these webs of power relationships is the action of resistance. In fact, Foucault claims that if resistance is impossible, then power cannot be said to exist. Thus, power and resistance are opposite sides of the same coin. In Foucault's words:

These points of resistance are present everywhere in the power network. Hence there is no single locus of great Refusal, no soul of revolt, source of all rebellions, or pure law of the revolutionary. Instead there is a plurality of resistances, each of them a special case...Resistances...are the odd term in the relations of power; they are inscribed in the latter as an irreducible opposite. Hence they too are distributed in irregular fashion: the point, knots, or focuses of resistance are spread over time and space at varying densities, at times mobilizing groups or individuals in a definitive way, inflaming certain points of the body, certain moments in life, certain types of behaviour (ibid P95-96).

Thus, an image forms of power as a dynamic network weaving throughout all the layers and aspects of society. Where threads of the network cross or entangle, the points of resistance, then conflict is clear and obvious and power becomes an observable phenomenon. Where they do not cross or entangle, power is obscured. In this way Foucault's model of power 'offers an original way of overcoming the macro/micro split' (Silverman 1985 P88).
2.4.2 Power and discourse

An implication of Foucault’s theory of discursively constructed knowledge is that the modernist view of knowledge as neutral and objective is unsustainable. Knowledge and power are indissociable. As Best and Kellner (1991) point out, Foucault’s use of the term ‘subject’ has dual meanings as both the personal identity and experience of the individual, and being subject to the control of others (P50). Thus, the very creation of subject positions within discourse (the dominated spouse, employer and so on that I spoke of earlier) inheres power relationships. As Sarap (1993 P74) states, Foucault:

…wants to shift attention from questions such as ‘Who has power?’ or ‘What intentions or aims do power holders have?’ to the processes by which subjects are constituted as effects of power.

The traditional view that knowledge implies power is thus challenged, and indeed reversed, by Foucault. In Sarap’s (ibid P74) words:

…the exercise of power itself creates and causes to emerge new objects of knowledge. Conversely, knowledge induces effects of power. It is not possible for power to be exercised without knowledge, it is impossible for knowledge not to engender power.

As the creation of subject positions within discourse inheres power relationships we begin to see how power operates within and between the discourse-object-action triads which construct landscape. Returning to the example of the dispute over the planting regimes on Christchurch’s river banks, it can be seen that the subject positions created by the conflicting discourses are quite different. The initial discourse constructs the subject as the indignant protector of the ‘garden city image’ and, in later correspondence, of ‘our English roots’. The contradictory discourse constructs the subject as the protector of ‘our true New Zealand heritage’. (The connections between this mini case study and that discussing the treeless One Tree Hill become clearer at this point.) However, the point here is that the outcome of the resistance between the two discourses will determine which actions and outcomes will predominate, whether the riverbanks will continue to be planted with tussocks or returned to mown grass. (See Figs 2.8 and 2.9)
Of course this is still a gross simplification of the situation, as many other discourses may impact upon the system. However, it suffices to give an indication of how these dynamic interrelationships might operate.
As I have stressed, discourses are anonymously authored, as the example given above illustrates. Knowledge of the identity of the writers of the letters in the original controversy is not relevant to our understanding of that controversy. However, while the authorship of the discourse is irrelevant, the personalities which promulgate the discourses can have a huge impact on the significance attributed to them within social settings. I have no doubt that this could be explained in turn, with reference to the subject positions created by other intersecting discourses. However, a detailed analysis of this does not seem to be either warranted or likely to be particularly productive. Suffice it to say that discourses are simultaneously anonymously authored, meaning that who says what is of no significance in terms of the discourse itself; but at the same time, who says what, and when they say it, has significance in the movement of power through the discursive web.

2.4.3 Power and landscape: a conclusion

In this section I examined conventional and poststructuralist conceptions of power. I have adopted a Foucaultian conception of power and understanding of its relationship with discourse. The key point which arises from this discussion is that discourse will become most readily identifiable at points of resistance. I have illustrated this with the example of the controversy over the riverside planting regimes in Christchurch. The flow of power through the networks determines which discursive constructions are actualised and through time this changes. Thus, I can further modify the research question at this point.

How is landscape made?

1.1 What are the discourses that construct landscape?

1.2 What are the networks of power in operation in landscape?

It is also clear that the power which is exerted by discursive systems is most readily observable in terms of the actions they provoke and the consequent impacts they exert on the underlying biophysical reality. Thus discussion of the non-discursive practices that construct the landscape will be intertwined with the discussions of both discourse and power.
Part Two: An examination of socio-cultural landscape studies

2.5 Landscape studies and the postmodern turn

It is useful to acknowledge at this point that this study is situated under the broad philosophical umbrella of postmodernism. Earmarth (2000 P699-700) offers a clear and simple definition of what could be described as a complex of, sometimes, very difficult ideas when she states:

Although diverse and eclectic, postmodernism can be recognized by two key assumptions. First, the assumption that there is no common denominator - in 'nature' or 'truth' or 'God' or 'the future'- that guarantees either the Oneness of the world or the possibility of neutral or objective thought. Second, the assumption that all human systems operate like language, being self-reflective rather than referential systems - systems of differential function which are powerful but finite, and which construct and maintain meaning and value.

Dear (2001), in his review of the impact of postmodern thought on Geography and Planning, isolates a series of postmodern themes within the geographical literature. These include studies of cultural landscape and place-making; philosophical and theoretical debates especially relating to space and language; problems of representation in geographical and ethnographic writing; and the historical and contemporary politics of postmodernity including postcolonialism. This study can claim some intellectual inheritance from all these themes. However, it is from a particular approach that cuts across these groupings that its most central genealogical thread runs. This approach is widely referred to as 'the turn to the text' and reflects the postmodern assertion of self-reflective human systems and a desire to understand how they construct and maintain meaning and value.

Over the last decade of the twentieth century, socio-cultural landscape studies in the western academic tradition were strongly influenced by this 'turn to the text', as were the broader humanities and social sciences. The 'turn to the text' can be attributed to the influence of the French poststructuralists on western (particularly American and British) postmodernists. Poststructuralism is a somewhat flexible term but has been described thus:
Poststructuralism shares with structuralism its anti-humanism: The autonomous, rational self is replaced by discursive or linguistic structures as the principal logic of social explanation. Poststructuralists underscore the role of language in forming individual subjectivity and social institutions. Language is the place where meanings are produced; linguistic meanings play a major role in organizing the self, social institutions, and the political landscape. Hence, language is a principal site for the production of social realities and political conflict... Whereas structuralism was a ‘constructive’ project intent on identifying linguistic and social order, poststructuralism had a ‘deconstructive’ aim: to demonstrate that all claims to identify an order to society, knowledge or morality were unwarranted and concealed a will to power (Seidman, S 1994 P210).

Bertens (1995) argues that there have been two phases to the influence of French poststructuralism upon Geography. The first of these was derived from the work of Roland Barthes and Jacques Derrida. It is linguistic in orientation and focuses on the analysis of texts and intertexts. The second phase of influence described by Bertens derives from the work of Michel Foucault and, to a lesser extent, Jacques Lacan (ibid P7). This phase emphasises the workings of power and the constitution of the subject. Bertens (ibid P8) argues that:

This postmodernism interrogates the power that is inherent in the discourses that surround us – and is continually reproduced by them – and interrogates the institutions that support those discourses and are, in turn, supported by them. It attempts to expose the politics that are at work in representations and to undo institutionalised hierarchies, and it works against the hegemony of any single discursive system....

Thus the initial focus on language is extended to the wider social realm.

This division can be loosely applied to the landscape studies of the past fifteen or so years. The former approach is exemplified by studies which utilise a linguistic metaphor, either of text or narrative, to describe landscape, making it amenable to textual or narrative analysis, in a similar manner to literary texts. The second phase is exemplified by some of the studies which examine actual language as it relates to the landscape. While the intellectual genealogy of this study began with those works utilising the linguistic metaphor of landscape it is firmly located within the group of actual language studies.
2.5.1 The linguistic metaphors: landscape as text and narrative

The use of linguistic metaphors in landscape studies has a relatively long history with commentators such as American Geographer J B Jackson (1984) and D W Meinig (1979) both using the metaphor of 'reading the landscape'. However it was not until the 1980s that, under the influence of postmodernism, the metaphor received explicit theoretical examination. This resulted in its extension to the idea of 'landscape as text'.

The metaphor of 'landscape as text' was first developed by James and Nancy Duncan in a paper published in 1988 entitled '(Re)reading the landscape'. This paper was to become a key work in the application of literary theories to landscape studies. The Duncans adopted key ideas from literary theory to the interpretation of landscape, drawing the parallel that landscapes, as with texts:

...are usually anonymously authored; although they can be symbolic, they are not obviously referential, and they are highly intertextual creations of the reader, as much as they are products of the society that originally constructed them. (Duncan & Duncan 1988 P120)

They acknowledge limitations in the application of literary theory arguing that while meaning is unstable, plurality of landscape meaning is finite. ‘Interpretations are the product of social contexts of historically and culturally specific discourses; they are constructed by interpretive communities and frequently, but not always, reflect hegemonic value systems’ (ibid P120). The existence of such textual communities allows the Duncans to pre-empt the criticism that the textual metaphor privileges the literate, by arguing that such textual communities also exist in non-literate societies.

Discussions and applications of the metaphor of landscape as text continued in the geographical literature through the early 1990s (eg Duncan 1990, Barnes and Duncan 1992, Daniels & Cosgrove 1993, Smith 1993, Stock 1993). Within the landscape architecture literature it began to make an appearance, in a somewhat un-theorised form, in the early 1990s (eg Corner 1991). Interestingly there seems to be
little explicit cross-fertilization between the two literatures, both rather being responsive to a similar zeitgeist, in particular the works of Barthes, Derrida and Foucault.

In 1995 the academic journal, *Landscape Review*, was established at Lincoln University, New Zealand and in 1995 and 1998 the proceedings of two conferences entitled ‘Languages of Landscape Architecture’ were published in the Journal. Together these events led to an explosion of publications utilising the metaphor of landscape as text within the landscape architecture literature. The metaphor was applied, extended and modified in a number of ways. Simon (1996), for example, applied the metaphor in a literal manner in the ‘reading’ of a cemetry landscape. Others (Hertz & Burton 1996) narrowed the metaphor of text to that of scripting as in a play or film. A further example of landscape as text is provided in a paper by William Field (1997) that applies semiotic theory to the practice of ‘reading’ the landscape in the process of landscape assessment for planning rather than design purposes. Unlike the geographical literature the application of the linguistic metaphor in these works tended to avoid, and possibly even obfuscate, issues of the expression of power.

A problem of some concern in these works is the lack of a comprehensive historical context. Whilst northern hemisphere landscapes may, arguably, be home to fairly homogenous and long lived cultural groups, New Zealand is a recent European colony, the first Europeans settling here around 1800 and systematic settlement only occurring after 1840. The power dynamics between the indigenous Māori culture and the colonising ones are far from settled, as should be clear from the discussion in Chapter One. Thus, attempts to ‘read’ the New Zealand landscape without examining the power dynamics between the reader, their cultural perspective and those of the other inhabitants is highly problematic.
The second variation of the linguistic metaphors entails the idea of landscape as narrative (e.g., Spirn 1998, Simon 1998, Potteiger & Purinton 1998 a & b). Whilst the Duncans considered that the ‘landscape as text’ metaphor allowed the reader to take an active role in the construction of meaning, the idea of narrative is preferred by its proponents as allowing for the possibility of interaction and perhaps even conversation. As Katrina Simon (1998 P10 emphasis in original.) argues:

The idea that landscape ‘speaks’ is more direct and personal than the notion that it is a text and can be ‘read’. It suggests that the landscape intends to communicate, rather than just the possibility that if read it can communicate. It also implies the need for an answer or, in the language of a landscape architectural proposal, a response. This gives a different emphasis from the more ambivalent strategies of ‘re-writing’ or ‘re-inscribing’ that are associated with the metaphor of landscape as text.

This metaphor of conversation has immediate appeal in that it characterises the landscape as an active participant in the relationship between people and itself. This characterisation is probably more realistic, in point of fact, than that of the textual metaphor which characterises the landscape as passively awaiting the active reader for interpretation, as landscapes can change independently of human involvement. However, the attribution of intent to the landscape, known as ‘the pathetic fallacy’, is problematic. As Seddon (1995) points out, while commonly used in English language discussions of landscape, ‘In rationalist terms, the universe is neither aware nor unaware of our existence; it is simply the universe’ (P5).

The major problem which I have with the linguistic metaphor as a means of understanding ‘landscape’ is that its proponents presume the landscape to be a unitary object amenable to direct interpretation. I have already illustrated that different discourse-action-object systems can create different landscapes from the same biophysical reality. The proponents of the linguistic metaphor seem to believe that the observation (albeit educated) of the object can be undertaken without analysing the constructing discourse (Fig 2.10). Of course this is a gross over simplification of what is happening. In fact the observer is constructing the object via their own discursive frameworks (Fig 2.11). As these remain obscured in the application of the linguistic metaphor, they also remain unexamined and un-critiqued. That this is problematic can be seen in the lack reflexivity amongst those utilising the linguistic metaphor, discussed above.
I have a further concern with the use of metaphors as explanatory devices. This is, that as they become familiar, the fact that they are metaphors becomes less immediately apparent. One can readily slip from 'landscape as text' into 'landscape is text' or 'landscape as narrative' into 'landscape is narrative' (Spirn 1998). Further, metaphors are highly culturally specific, and their use limits the potential for cross
cultural communication. Once the metaphor is naturalised in this way, it becomes just another myth about landscape. In other words, a once useful tool of understanding may become a screen discouraging critical analysis.

2.5.2 Actual language studies

As indicated previously, the second field of landscape studies focusing upon language is that in which the actual language used by people in relation to the landscape is the focus of study. Many, but not all, of these studies owe a debt to the Duncans, as does this study. However, these studies have moved from focusing on the landscape (as text / narrative) to examining the discourses used to structure and describe it. This is, in part, a broader acknowledgement of the limitations of the metaphor, discussed above, but in some cases it is also a response to the increasing influence of poststructuralism on socio-cultural landscape studies. These types of real language studies vary widely in their aims and specific foci, but, most importantly, they vary in terms of what it is that they purport to explain. That is, the relationship between language and the landscape is understood in widely differing ways.

A transitional work, which has feet in both camps, is James Duncan's 1990 publication, *The city as text: the politics of landscape interpretation in the Kandyan Kingdom*. In this work Duncan expands on the linguistic metaphor of landscape, whilst introducing a concern with discourse. While his focus remains on ‘reading’ the landscape as text, these texts, he argues, combine to form narratives which together form discourses which, in turn are parts of a discursive field. Or, working in reverse, Duncan aims to examine how two competing discourses of kingship, reproduced in a series of political and religious texts, produce different material (designed) landscapes.

---

10 This point was brought home to me when an English as a Second Language tutor related to me the alarm which non English speaking students experience when confronted with such naturalised (English) metaphors as ‘rolling hills’!

11 Interestingly the majority of these studies are located in New Zealand. Any explanation as to why this is the case must remain speculative but factors which may have influenced this include a rich theoretical basis in Landscape Architecture; our late colonisation and strong moves towards a postcolonial socio-political structure; and an articulate and vocal indigenous people. Consequently this discussion will develop both the theoretical and empirical backgrounds to this study.
However, there is a theoretical problem in this conceptualisation of discourse as constituted by narratives and texts. This problem is to be found in a number of other significant landscape studies, including, in particular, Barnes and Duncan (1992), and Potteiger and Purinton (1998a & b). Barnes and Duncan, for example, define discourses as ‘...frameworks that embrace particular combinations of narratives, concepts, ideologies and signifying practices, each relevant to a realm of social action’ (P8). Potteiger and Purinton similarly state that, ‘Attention to discourse focuses on the uses of stories, the purposes to which they are put, and the institutions and world views they create and sustain’ (1998a P60). Whilst both these authors clearly indicate a connection between discourses and power, a connection I will return to, both clearly see narratives (stories, texts) as language forms which are subordinate to discourse. That is, narratives (stories, texts) occur within discourses. As a consequence these authors retain a focus on the landscape-as-text / narrative, considering it to be a product of a ‘parent’ discourse.

I dispute that the relationship between narrative / text and discourse is so straightforward and ‘parental’. Both these authors are, in my opinion, confusing the idea of discourse as body of language, such as the ‘discourse of medicine’ or the ‘discourse of science’, with the idea of discourse as constitutive of reality. Texts and narratives are quite different things to discourses. A ‘text’ is variously defined by the *Oxford Compact English Dictionary* (1996) as, ‘1 the main body of a book...2 the original words of an author or document...4 a subject or theme...7 data in textual form.’ ‘Narrative’ is defined as, ‘1 a spoken or written account of connected events in order of happening 2 the practice of or art of narration.’ Consequently, while it is quite apparent that a text or narrative may, in concert with ‘...concepts, ideologies and signifying practices...’(Barnes and Duncan 1992 P8), be part of a discourse, there is no logical reason why many discourses may not be drawn upon within one text or narrative. This point is supported by Fairclough (2003 P127) who states clearly that texts draw upon discourses and not the other way around.

---

I demonstrate this in later chapters. See in particular Chapter Five.
The major contribution of Duncan’s work is, thus, not so much in its contribution to the linguistic study of landscape as in its contribution to the theoretically informed study of landscape. James Duncan himself states that:

Landscape study...is typically presented as an atheoretical undertaking...In this study I offer a broader approach, more social, more political, more theoretical than has been customary. I hope by this to convince not only fellow cultural geographers but also scholars in other fields that, as a pervasive and surprisingly disingenuous cultural production, landscape is a signifying system of great but unappreciated social and political importance and that it offers enormous promise as an object of study (Duncan 1990 P 3).

This is a sentiment with which I agree and I intend that this work should both deepen the theoretical perspective of the study of landscape, and also provide an exposition of the social and political significance of landscape.

It is possible to array these ‘real language’ studies along a conceptual continuum from those which treat actual language as a simple social phenomenon to those which treat it as constitutive of social reality. The former position is characterised by studies such as those by Accati and Devicche (1998) and Stuart-Murray (1996). Place names are seen by these authors as relating directly to physical, historical or economic phenomena in the landscape. Stuart-Murray takes the most extreme position concluding that, in Scotland:

...most new place naming is carried out in a disarticulated cultural vocabulary. With the possible exception of outdoor enthusiasts, it seems that we are out of practice when it comes to naming places whose character is largely determined by natural processes. Such landscapes have become unnameable (P40)

This position is extremely problematic when one examines a landscape from differing cultural perspectives. For example, Stevens’ (1976) study of traditional Māori place names on the Otago Peninsula catalogues them according to their relationship to certain physical features, important people and events, and to sources of raw materials and foodstuffs. What is interesting is comparing these names with those currently listed on contemporary maps. The vast majority of these traditional names are not present and the pattern of Pākehā names, and their dominance in the public record, implies not only differing understandings and perceptions of the landscape but also of clear power dynamics in terms of whose view has gained official sanction. Thus this position is culturally specific and may efface such differences and associated power
dynamics by presenting itself as the one true interpretation. This position is conceptually similar to that discussed in 2.3.1 above, in that the observer is denying their own construction of the object they are observing.

A social constructivist position is in evidence in the work of Harrison and Burgess (1993). Their study is one of alternative social constructions of nature as evidenced in a conflict over a development proposal. The authors note that their study is part of ‘...the rapid growth of academic interest in different discourses through which social relations with nature are mediated’ (p291). This explanation of the role and function of discourses is similar to that of Fairclough discussed above. Clearly ‘nature’, in this context, has some sort of independent reality and the discourses that Harrison and Burgess study are, rather than social constructions, perhaps, social distortions of nature. Indeed, they state that their ‘...paper explores the identification of distinctive myths of nature associated with particular socio-political formations...’ (P291).

While this approach is useful in the pragmatic sense that it convincingly illustrates how those with access to resources may promote their discourses, it is epistemologically problematic. Harrison and Burgess imply that the truth about nature is somehow knowable and by implication see their respondents as somehow having been sucker into accepting untruthful ‘myths of nature’. However, just who does have access to ‘the truth’, or the means by which it could be accessed are unclear.

A social constructionist position is evident in the work of Dominy (1996) who sees ‘...landscape as a central metaphor in the conceptual systems of [the] settler descent inhabitants,’ of the Aotearoa New Zealand South Island high country. The focus of her study is on:

...the discursive practice of naming and its use as a way of dividing up the landscape to designate location and create meaningful spaces, as well as to understand high country people’s conception and construction of place (P 16).

She sees the landscape, not in terms of an objective reality, but in terms of a social, and, indeed discursive, construction, and also as part of the construction of place. The study of language is, for Dominy, a way of coming to understand how people shape the environment in which they live conceptually and, eventually, physically. This approach allows the people being studied to have their own voice and does not claim
to judge the appropriateness of their viewpoints against some sort of objective standard.

Azaryahu (1996) and Berg and Kearns (1996) also see the landscape as a social construction. However, they do not see it in such benign or neutral terms as the previous authors. Berg and Kearns (1996 P119) define landscape as ‘...ideological constructs that legitimate hegemonic material interests...’. In a similar vein, Azaryahu (P319) states that:

Landscapes do not merely reflect and articulate social relations; by reifying them they are also active in legitimating these same relations. Commemorative street names, which are a conventional element of the urban texture, play a special role in naturalizing a prime cultural construct: and hegemonic version of history

This is a study of the imposition of street names in cities in Israel celebrating its Zionist history. Azaryahu details the process by which the translation of the ‘names as historic heritage’ into the ‘name as signifier of place’ has led to ‘...the operation of the authorized version of history as a semiotic constituent of social life in its most intimate level: that of everyday life’ (P 328). For Azaryahu, the socially constructed landscape is redolent with signifiers of the greater society’s power relations.

Berg and Kearns’s (1996) study confirms Azaryahu’s assessment of the political nature of the process of place naming. Their study is of the submissions to the New Zealand Geographic Board on a proposal to replace several Pākehā place names with traditional Māori ones in the official record. This proposal caused a heated controversy resulting in the failure of the petition. Berg and Kearns, similarly, see place names and their significance to local people as a reflection, or perhaps rather, facet, of the power relationships in the larger society.13

A further study that sees landscape as a social construction is that of Bowring (1997). This is a study of the discourse of the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects, and simultaneously uses a metaphor of design-as-language in its analysis. Thus, while Bowring studies the actual language used by landscape architects in their

13 As a consequence of the Ngai Tahu Treaty of Waitangi Settlement, many South Island locations of importance to Māori, including the sites involved in this controversy, have had their traditional names restored. Now all maps and signage are required to include both their Māori name and their Pākehā one. This underlines the political significance that place names can have. However, this restoration of names is not without controversy within Ngai Tahu, illustrating the high degree of complexity which these issues can entail. See Russel (2000) for further discussion.
professional journal, utilising ‘discourse’ to mean a body of language, she is seeking
evidence of another discourse, that of the Picturesque design ‘language’. Bowring
makes a very convincing case for the transposition of the Picturesque as a design
language into the picturesque as a taken-as-natural aesthetic and the underlying
discourse of this professional group. I use some of her observations in my own
subsequent analysis of the Dunedin City Council’s landscape planning practices.
However, her concern is with the aesthetics that this profession brings to bear in their
assessment of the landscape and in the designs they create. This could be seen as
examining a particular aspect of the social construction of landscape, rather than the
more general discursive constructions of landscape evident in the general community.

Occupying a more extreme social constructionist position is the work of Baxter
(2001). This study is one utilising discourse analysis to study the community
management of a foreshore reserve in a small, periurban community in Aotearoa New
Zealand. Baxter is explicit in his adoption of a Foucaultian definition of discourse. In
this sense his study is of how people construct their landscape and their actions within
it. Baxter’s work is, however, limited in both its scope and its analysis, focusing, as
he does, on key points of resistance without seeing their interconnections.

This brief survey of actual language studies of landscape demonstrates the wide
dispersal in terms of the degree of theorisation evidenced in their approaches. I find
the extreme occupied by Stuart-Murray fundamentally unsatisfying, failing as it does
to clarify the position of the observer. I have provisionally placed my own study in a
more radical social constructionist position, developing and extending the approach
taken by Baxter, but adding in the tripartite framework as an explanatory device.

2.6 Conclusion

This chapter locates this study in the context of socio-cultural landscape studies, but
distinguishes it from prior works. I take a strong social constructionist position
arguing that all knowledge is discursively constructed, using a fundamentally
Foucaultian definition of ‘discourse’. However, I combine this epistemological
relativism with ontological realism in accepting that there is a biophysical reality ‘out
there’ which is independent of our knowledge of it. Thus ‘landscape’ is a discursive
construction, or rather a group of discursive constructions, of the biophysical reality which, together, makes our environment. ‘Landscape’ is then, by definition, a cultural phenomenon that can only be understood by attention to the discourses that construct it.

In order to provide a framework for analysis I have adopted and adapted a tripartite model of landscape incorporating the dynamic relationship between discourse, the discursive and biophysical objects created by our knowledge of our environment, and the actions which occur within the system. Discourse, at once, interprets the biophysical reality and constructs the known landscape. Discrepancies between what should be (according to the discursive construction) and what is lead to actions being required, permitted and precluded. Actions in the landscape impact both the discursive understanding of it and the underlying biophysical reality leading to further actions and so on.

As different discourse-object-action systems can exist contiguously in one physical location, understanding the interrelationships between them is crucial to answering the research question, ‘How is landscape made?’ Power is seen as a dynamic, creative force inhering in discourse and affecting the interrelationships between the different systems. Thus, not only is the discourse-object-action triad dynamic and ever changing but the relationships between different systems is dynamic also. The dispersal of power will determine which discourses hold the most sway at any given time and consequently what actions are acceptable or required. Thus an understanding of the discourses, the landscapes they construct, the actions they require and preclude and the relationships between these discursive systems is necessary to understand how the landscape is made, and how it can be maintained and changed.
Chapter Three: Unpacking the tool box

3.1 Introduction

The theoretical framework visited in the previous chapter mapped out the intellectual territory to be examined and the questions to be asked in the course of this research project. In Chapter Two the research questions were refined and can now be reiterated:

How is landscape made?

1.1 What are the discourses that construct landscape?

1.2 What are the networks of power in operation in landscape?

The job of this chapter is to detail the tools necessary to gain the data to answer those questions, and the processes used to analyse them. However, it is necessary to stress that ‘theory’ and ‘methodology’ are not, in practice, clearly separate entities.

While some theorists argue that the separation of theory from methodology should be ‘completely rejected’ (Bordieu & Waquant 1992 P 225), I consider the convention of dividing theory from methodology, a carry-over from the experimental approach of scientific research, to still be useful. ‘Theory’ and ‘methodology’ are abstractions of intertwined processes, but they represent different sorts of things. ‘Theory’ is about intellectual process and denotes something that is, in its essence, abstract.

‘Methodology’, on the other hand, is fundamentally practical. The danger which Bourdieu and Wacquant alert me to is the failure to adequately examine methodological decisions to assess any implicit theoretical assumptions which might exist in their construct.

Thus, while this chapter will examine the methodological tools used in the execution of this research project, it is important to remember that a research project is a process. The reality is that while a theoretical approach was developed first in that process, it bares only a resemblance to the theoretical framework developed in the previous chapter. Similarly, while methodological tools were selected on the basis of the original theoretical approach, they were changed and adapted as the need arose,
and the theoretical framework was, in turn, adapted in light of these decisions. Further, while the methodological tools which I will examine shortly are ordered in such a way that a (chrono)logical process is apparent, the actuality was much more complex and reflexive.

Far from being a linear process, or one which can be completely defined in advance, the activities of data definition, collection and analysis were contiguous processes constantly informed by practice, reading, and the knowledge gained from the ongoing, and often informal, analysis of data as it came to hand. As Lofland and Lofland (1995) assert, considering social science research, ‘Your overall goal is to collect the richest possible data. Rich data mean, ideally, a wide and diverse range of information collected over a relatively prolonged period of time (Lofland and Lofland 1995 P11).’ Rich data does not make itself available according to a timetable, and there is always the possibility (and danger) that more relevant material can be gathered.

This chapter is divided into five subsections, roughly coinciding with five major methodological processes. The first examines the use of a case study and details the reasons for the selection and delineation of the study area. The second focuses on the selection of qualitative research methods and its consequences for both the process and outcome of the project. Data collection is always the guts of the project. The third subsection examines the choices made and methods used to develop the data set or corpus. Raw data must be analysed in order for it to be of use in answering the research questions. The fourth subsection details the methods used for analysing the data and identifying discourses. Finally, the chapter closes with an examination of the strengths and weaknesses of the methodological processes chosen and their application.

3.2 The case study approach

The research questions are, at this point, still highly theoretical. They are focused on ‘landscape’ as a conceptual frame, a generalised phenomenon. Clearly, from a methodological perspective, it is necessary to refine the question further — it is not
feasible to study how all landscape is made. The first obvious refinement which could be made is to focus on the landscape in which I am situated, that of Aotearoa / New Zealand. However, the study of this would still be a large scale undertaking with a necessarily broad but shallow focus. As a desire for a deep understanding is what motivates me, this approach does not appeal: much better to focus on a manageable chunk, an area small enough for a single researcher to be confident of collecting rich data. Thus, a case study approach has been adopted.

Lofland and Lofland (1995 P21) define a case study as 'a holistic investigation of some space- and time-rooted phenomenon'. As a contained example, complete in itself, the case study is but one of a series of methodological options for the sort of study being undertaken here. Yin (1989) argues that the case study, histories and experiments are alternative approaches for answering ‘how’ and ‘why’ research questions, such as the one that drives this project, as they require explanatory answers which allow the tracing of connections through time. Histories investigate past phenomena and the experiment requires the researcher to be able to exert control over behavioural events. While historical research plays a part in this study, creating the temporal context, experiments are clearly inappropriate.

A crucial aspect of the case study is its relationship to theory. A case study makes no claims to be representative of a broader reality. Thus its findings are not generalisable to other sites or situations. However, a case study, to claim validity, must be based on articulated theory (Silverman 1985), and it is the investigation of this theory that is its focus.

...in a case study, the analyst selects cases only because he believes they exhibit some general theoretical principle. His account’s claim to validity depends entirely on demonstrating that the features he portrays in the case are representative, not of a population but of this general principle (P 113).

In this study, the theoretical framework articulated in the previous chapter forms the justification for the selection of a case study approach. The refined research questions frame the theoretical principle at issue as the efficacy of the use of discourse as a model for the explanation of the production and maintenance of landscape. This theoretical principle needs to be tested through the in-depth study of a clearly defined, but complex site. The case study, then, seeks to find and explain logical and causal
connections and can be said to have succeeded if a compelling case can be made (Silverman P114).

Yin describes research design as 'an action plan for getting from here to there' (Yin 1989 P28). He notes that five components are particularly important for the design of case studies. These are summarised in Table I. It is important to note that the use of a case study approach does not automatically imply the use of qualitative research methods. (This study did utilise qualitative methods and the next section will examine their use.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yin’s components of case studies</th>
<th>Evidenced in this project by:--</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The study's questions;</td>
<td>How is this landscape made?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>its propositions, if any;</td>
<td>That landscape is firstly a discursive construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>its unit(s) of analysis;</td>
<td>Land management practices on the Otago Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the logic linking the data to the propositions; and</td>
<td>Land management practices are determined by the discursive construction of landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the criteria for interpreting the findings</td>
<td>Discourse analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Adaptation of Yin’s case study components (Yin 1989 P29-35)

A further consideration is involved in the selection of a case study approach for this research. Situated as it is within the discipline of landscape architecture it owes a debt to both the discipline and the profession. Mark Francis (2001) advocates strongly that:

Case study analysis is an effective way for landscape architecture to advance and mature as a profession, providing a promising tool for the profession to train students, develop a research base and improve practice (Francis 2001 P22).

Citing Yin, Francis points out that the value of case studies lies in their potential to 'retain holistic and meaningful characteristics of real life situations' (Yin 1994 P 3 cited Francis 2001 P 17). He lists the benefits to landscape architecture of the use of case studies as: their efficacy in teaching, which is mainly conducted by case studies; research on design, aesthetics, landscape perception, design theory and post occupancy evaluation; their potential impact on practise by the study of individual projects; the development of theory; critique; and communication and outreach.

While the selection of a case study approach was, in practice, very straightforward, the selection of the site of the case study was even more simple and personally
motivated. The Otago Peninsula is a place that is dear to my heart. I have lived in its proximity most of my life. Some of my earliest memories are of visits to it. I have had many friends who have lived there, and I have memories of many happy times spent with them. When, early in the process of developing this research project, a paper was published in a professional magazine about aspects of the Peninsula landscape and community, I was shocked to find how little I really knew about it. Using the Otago Peninsula as a focus for my case study seemed an ideal way for me to learn more about this place I loved.

![Fig 3.1: The author, aged three, at Pilot's Beach with her mother (right) and an unknown friend. The hills of the Peninsula extend behind and the sand dunes of Aramoana can be seen to the right.](image)

However, there were other, much more intellectually and logically driven reasons for selecting the Otago Peninsula as a site for a case study. It is a relatively small and discrete geographical feature, allowing ease in the drawing of boundaries around the site. The area includes city suburbs, rural farmland, small rural communities, holiday settlements, lifestyle blocks and Māori lands. It has long been an important site of
Tourism and recreation are important economic and social activities on the Peninsula and they bring significant numbers of non-residents onto the Peninsula as participants. In addition, the Peninsula forms an important, highly visible backdrop to the city of Dunedin. As a consequence of these characteristics the Otago Peninsula could be seen to evidence most of the land use types common in New Zealand, and most of the contests in land management as well.

Thus the primary research questions can again be refined:

**How is the landscape of the Otago Peninsula made?**

1.1 What are the discourses that construct this landscape?

1.2 What are the networks of power in operation in this landscape?

Fig 3.2: The Otago Peninsula from the air looking southwest to Dunedin city. Also see the topographical map in Appendix I. (Photo – Institute of Geological and Nuclear Sciences)
3.3 Qualitative research methods

As was indicated in the previous section, undertaking a case study does not automatically lead to the choice of either a quantitative or qualitative research methodology. Either, or both, might justifiably be employed. Nor does the focus on discourse necessarily preclude a quantitative approach. However, the theoretical discussion in Chapter Two locates this study firmly within the framework of social constructionism which emphasises:

...the pluralist and plastic character of reality – pluralistic in the sense that reality is expressible in a variety of symbol and language systems; plastic in the sense that reality is stretched and shaped to fit purposeful acts of intentional human agents (Schwand 1998 P236).

Thus the methodology employed must be adaptable and flexible in order to cope with this fluidity.

Denzin and Lincoln (1998) define qualitative research as:

...multimethod in focus, involving an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. Qualitative research involves the studied use and collection of a variety of empirical materials – case study, personal experience, introspective, life story, interview, observational, historical, interactional, and visual texts – that describe routine and problematic moments and meanings in individuals’ lives. Accordingly, qualitative researchers deploy a wide range of interconnected methods, hoping always to get a better fix on the subject matter at hand (P3).

As the aim of this project is to come to a deep understanding of how landscape is made, and, as the theoretical discussion has shown, this is most likely through a complex process entailing networks of power dispersed through discourses, it seems clear that a qualitative approach is most likely to be appropriate. However, qualitative research methods are not without their critics, and it seems necessary to examine some of these criticisms, and conversely, to detail the means used to ensure that excellence is, at least, aimed for within qualitative research.
The major criticism made of qualitative research is that it lacks objectivity. Good research, this line of argument says, must provide a trustworthy and objective view of the world, uncontaminated with personal bias or prejudice. In attempting to make sense of, or interpret, the meanings people bring to their lives, qualitative researchers run the risk of imposing their own views upon those of their subjects, obscuring the true situation. Criteria for assessing the quality of quantitative research are well established (as validity, generalisability, reliability and objectivity) and these principles are used in the design as well as the evaluation of projects. While this argument is clearly underlain with an objectivist/positivist epistemology, rather than a constructionist one, it does raise a valid point.

As qualitative projects are, by their very nature, temporally and spatially specific, they cannot be replicated. So how do we gain a sense of confidence in the results of qualitative projects? And how do we tell which piece of research has been done well, and which is not of high quality? Criteria for assessing the excellence of qualitative research are debated in the literature and a wide range of positions are to be found. (See, for example, Baxter and Eyles (1997), Altheide and Johnson (1994), Popay et al (1998)). Baxter and Eyles occupy a position with a strong positivist epistemology underlying their approach. They propose an adaptation of the traditional quantitative criteria of validity, generalisability, reliability and objectivity, and I will briefly discuss each of their adapted criteria.

Validity is replaced with credibility in Baxter and Eyles' schema, and is defined as '...the degree to which a description of human experience is such that those having the experience would recognize it immediately and those outside the experience can understand it' (Lincoln and Guba cited in Baxter and Eyles 1997 P512). To this end, the processes utilised to select respondents must be reported. Interview practices should be critiqued, and prolonged and persistent observation should be used to
complement the interviews. Triangulation of sources, methods and, if possible, researchers provides 'one of the most powerful techniques for strengthening credibility' (ibid P 514). During the analytic phase further techniques can be employed, particularly utilising discussions with research peers about analytic processes. In addition, Baxter and Eyles recommend what they call 'member checking' whereby respondents have the opportunity to check that their opinions and meanings have been adequately represented (ibid P 515). As should be clear from this very brief description of Baxter and Eyles' criterion of credibility, the primary goal is to provide as accurate as possible reflection of the 'reality' of social system which is being studied.

The second criterion in Baxter and Eyles' schema is that of transferability, which they define as 'the degree to which findings fit within contexts outside of the study' (ibid P515). This criterion they relate closely to those of generalisability or external validity used in quantitative research. To this end the research context should be described in as much detail as possible in order to allow other groups to assess the meaningfulness of the research constructs to them and their situations. However, as discussed earlier, the importance of case studies lies in the ability to generalise from their results to theory and not to other empirical settings at all.

Baxter and Eyles' third criterion for assessing the excellence of qualitative research is dependability which they define as 'the degree to which it is possible to deal with instability/idiosyncrasy and design induced change' (ibid P516). They imagine an ideal situation of consistency through time and space, 'whereby multiple applications of the same research instrument are expected to yield similar findings' (ibid P516). Again this is clearly underlain with a positivist view that there is a truth out there which we should be able to find, and if I can find it, then so should someone else if
they repeat the process as I undertook it. My earlier discussion of the implication of the researcher in the construction of the research object should indicate clearly my disagreement with this position.

Baxter and Eyles’ final criterion is that of confirmability. Confirmability is defined as ‘...the degree to which findings are determined by the respondents and conditions of the inquiry and not by the biases, motivations, interests or perspectives of the inquirer’ (Lincoln and Guba cited ibid P 517). I have already discussed at length the researcher’s inevitable implication in the creation of the object of research. Suffice it to say at this point that it is impossible to identify all of one’s own biases, if that is even the correct word to use to describe what are an infinite number of different subject positions which we assume or are placed in at different times. Thus, great tomes of self-exposure are probably pointless. However, by the same token, more common or more predominant roles which we take are probably of significance and need to be described. Gender is an obvious example. What is more important than rambling autobiography, and more meaningful than attempts to pretend that the ‘motivations, interests and perspectives of the inquirer’ are not relevant to the study, is a genuine effort to be critical of the inquirer in the research process and to be as self aware as possible, that is to employ the practises of reflexivity.

As can be seen from this discussion, these criteria for assessing the excellence of qualitative research are based on a strongly positivist epistemology. An example of an alternative approach based on a constructionist epistemology is that of Popay et al (1998).1 Rather than criteria, they provide a series of principles and associated questions to assess the excellence of qualitative research. Their primary concern is that:

1 Whilst the radical postmodern position is that there can be no criteria for evaluating qualitative outcomes (See Fuchs (1993)), I find this position unhelpful, and have therefore chosen to disregard it. If there is no means of evaluating the worth of research, there can be no point in doing it.
Research concerned with the appropriateness of care and with understanding the basis of lay and professional behavior and action must privilege subjective meaning or lay knowledge if it is to provide good evidence to inform practice and policy. We would term this the primary marker of standards in qualitative research relevant to these questions. In evaluating qualitative research output in terms of this primary marker, the key question to be addressed is, ‘Does the research, as reported, illuminate the subjective meaning, actions, and contest of those being researched?’ (Popay et al 1998 P345).

Whilst their field is health research, this fundamental principle applies well to a study such as this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Strategies / practices to satisfy criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Credibility | Authentic representation of experience                                    | - *Purposeful sampling*  
- *Disciplined subjectivity / bracketing*  
- *Prolonged engagement*  
- *Persistent observation*  
- *Triangulation*  
- *Peer debriefing*  
- *Negative case analysis*  
- *Referential adequacy*  
- *Member checking* |
| Transferability | Fit within contexts outside the study situation                     | - *Purposeful sampling*  
- *Thick description* |
| Dependability | Minimisation of idiosyncrasies in interpretation  
Variability tracked to identifiable sources | - *Low-inference descriptors, mechanically recorded data*  
- *Multiple researchers*  
- *Participant researchers*  
- *Peer examination*  
- *Triangulation, inquiry audit* |
| Confirmability | Extent to which biases, motivations, interests or perspectives of the inquirer influence interpretations | - *Audit trail products*  
- *Thick description of audit process*  
- *Autobiography*  
- *Journal* |

Table 3.2: Criteria for evaluating qualitative research adapted from Lincoln and Guba, cited in Baxter and Eyles (1997). Those practices utilised in this research are in highlighted italics.

I have summarised Popay *et al*’s principles for assessing the excellence of qualitative research in Table 3.3. The differences between their principles and Baxter and Eyles’
criteria discussed above, should be immediately apparent. Where Baxter and Eyles aim for maximum objectivity, Popay et al. state as a principle that 'pure or objective data' do not exist. Where Baxter and Eyles aim for dependability, Popay et al. aim to ensure research is responsive to the context of and variations within the research field.

However, when one examines Popay et al.'s criteria and compares them with Baxter and Eyles' strategies, it becomes clear that both authors recommend similar practices, albeit for different reasons. Purposeful sampling is necessary to ensure that the research is able to gain the data necessary to answer its research questions (the illumination of subjective meanings/the authentic representation of appropriate experience). Thick description is required in order to allow the researcher or reader to interpret the meaning and context of what is being researched and may enable some generalisations to be made to other contexts. While Baxter and Eyles recommend strategies they see as removing the impact of the researcher's idiosyncrasies, biases and interests, Popay et al require that the views and analysis of the researcher are identifiable.

My purpose in drawing this comparison is to underline the point that despite differing underlying epistemologies the purposes given for doing qualitative research by these differing theorists are actually very similar: on the one hand, qualitative research is to provide an authentic representation of others' experience, on the other, it is to illuminate the subjective meaning, actions, and context of those being researched. The practices they each recommend to ensure excellence in qualitative research are also very similar. It seems to me, however, that evidence of these practices and goals are not, alone, adequate to assess excellence in qualitative research. My argument is that the assessment of excellence actually hinges on the application of two intersecting principles.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Privileges subjective meaning or lay knowledge| Does the research, as reported, illuminate the subjective meaning, actions, and context of those being researched?                                                                                       | * Shows how behaviours are viewed from within a culture, society or group.  
* Accords lay knowledge equal worth to other forms of knowledge                                                                                                                                  |
| Maximises the use of context as a means of locating lay knowledge and understanding subjective meaning. | Is there evidence of the adaption (sic) and responsiveness of the research design to the circumstances and issues of real-life social settings met during the course of the study?                               | * Shows some evidence of adaption (sic) and redesign in the writing up of the research.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Aims to illuminate the subjective meanings shaping action and behaviour. | Does the sample produce the type of knowledge necessary to understand the structures and processes within which the individuals or situations are located?                                                | * Process by which individuals or cases were sampled is adequately described.  
* Shows that respondents were selected on the basis of their appropriate knowledge.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Provides in-depth description that is also purposeful. | Is the description provided detailed enough to allow the researcher or reader to interpret the meaning and context of what is being researched?                                                             | * Thick description is evidenced.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Acknowledges that there is no such thing as pure or objective data. | How are different sources of knowledge about the same issues compared and contrasted? Are the subjective perceptions and experiences treated as knowledge in their own right?                                      | * The processes of data collection, analysis and presentation are transparent.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| Demonstrates theoretical and conceptual adequacy. | How does the research move from a description of the data, through quotation or examples, to an analysis and interpretation of the meaning and significance of it?                                              | * The views and analysis undertaken by the researcher can be separated from the description of the setting and the interactions and accounts given by those studied.                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| May enable some logical generalisations to a theoretical understanding of a similar class of phenomena. | What claims are being made for the generalizability of the findings to either other bodies of knowledge or to other populations or groups?                                                                    | * If claims to generalisability are made, sufficient background information is provided to support the claim.  
* External sources of information are used to support judgements of typicality.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |

Table 3.3: Criteria for evaluating qualitative research adapted from Popay et al (1998). Criteria fulfilled in the execution of this research are highlighted in bold italics.
The first of these principles is, I consider, transparency, by which I mean that the processes applied and the decisions made by the researcher should be made as clear as possible to the audience of the research. This is not to enable transferability or replicability but so that the reader can gain an in-depth understanding of the processes undertaken and thus make them amenable to critique. Not only should the logic of the processes be open to examination, but also the practice of them, the on-the-ground experiences of what worked and what did not; what went smoothly and what was painful and difficult for the researcher.

This transparency will not ensure excellence on its own, however: it will only provide information. The intersecting principle which is necessary to enable the evaluation of the information is an ethical one, and that is a commitment from the researcher to be as honest as possible. This need for honesty extends from the researcher’s relationship with themselves and their respondents, to their relationship with their data. This is not to fulfil some idea of ‘goodness’ or moral rectitude. It is only through the commitment to honesty on behalf of the researcher/writer that a reader can trust the reportage of the project.

If the processes entailed are reported clearly by a researcher with a commitment to honesty, then the quality of the research may be assessed. In a sense, the reader is being cast in the role of a meta-researcher. The researcher studies, analyses, and interprets the research subject. The reader must study, analyse and interpret the researcher and their report. The rest of this chapter aims to provide an honest explication of the methods exploited in this research.

### 3.4 Data collection

Following Lofland and Lofland’s (1995) requirement for the richest possible data, Yin’s (1989) requirement for multiple sources of evidence, and Baxter and Eyles’ (1997) and Popay et al’s requirement for thick description, the collection of data was
undertaken following a number of approaches. These were undertaken in order to create a corpus of linguistic data for discourse analysis and also to gain empirical data on land management practices. In addition, some participant observation was undertaken to ensure that what was talked about had some empirical reality, and a large number of relevant documents were accumulated.

3.4.1 Getting in

Following from the research question, 'How is this Otago Peninsula landscape made?' and from the theoretical framework developed in Chapter Two, it is clear that not just anyone would provide the sort of material which could form a useful corpus. Thus the first selection process which was made was the decision to gain data from people who had the ability to influence land management practices on the Peninsula in some observable way. This meant they were almost certain to be landowners, or members of groups active in aspects of land management on the Peninsula. However, as the population of the Otago Peninsula is around five thousand people this does not narrow the field adequately. Thus, a number of further means were used to access and select appropriate candidates.

These means of accessing appropriate candidates for interview fell into two main approaches. The first means has been categorised as a ‘stratified purposeful’ sampling technique (Marshall and Rossman 1999 P78). This involves seeking out respondents from pre-identified sub-groupings. The second strategy, used contiguously, has been categorised as ‘snowball’ sampling (ibid P78). Here respondents are asked to suggest further people who would be good candidates for interview.

- Personal contacts

While Lofland and Lofland meant by 'starting where you are' that the basis for sound research begins with the personal interest of the researcher, the idea can be extended
to the practice of the research itself. At the time of beginning this project, I had two colleagues who had both been in positions in which they were able to influence land management on the Otago Peninsula, and, 'starting where I was', I approached them for assistance in gaining entry. They were both instrumental in helping me gain access to key informants.

The first of these colleagues was a fellow student who had been a long time resident of the Otago Peninsula. He had been professionally and personally involved in environmental issues on the Peninsula and is still a trustee of a Peninsula based environmental organisation. Through him, I also met his wife who had also had professional and personal involvement in environmental issues on the Otago Peninsula. The second colleague was a Landscape Architect who was then on the staff of Lincoln University, but had previously been the staff Landscape Architect for the Dunedin City Council (DCC), which is the local authority of the region in which the Otago Peninsula falls. I interviewed these three people, both as informants in their own right, but also to gain their advice as to who would be key people for me to approach in Dunedin. From these interviews, I formed a list of people to contact when I began my field work.

- Cold contacts

This initial 'snowballing' was very useful in providing me both with a list of potential interviewees and with entrée to parts of the Peninsula community. However, it was clear from the start that these lists were slanted towards the interest groups that the original respondents were involved with. In order to ensure I gained access to a wide range of perspectives (ie 'stratified purposeful sampling'), it was necessary to make 'cold contacts'. The following is a discussion of the differing groups and methods used to make these 'cold contacts'.

Plan submitters

When this study began, the DCC was in the process of developing its District Plan in accordance with the requirements of the RMA 91. As this was a key part of land management practices affecting the Peninsula, I made the supposition that people who
had made submissions to the plan were people with a concern about land management issues. Consequently, I trawled the archives of the DCC’s Planning Department and pulled out all the submissions made on the Draft District Plan that were either made by Peninsula residents or related specifically to Peninsula issues.

One of the key proposals in the Draft District Plan relating to the Otago Peninsula was to prohibit the construction of dwellings on lots of less than fifteen hectares in size. The Draft Plan provided a two-year grace period for people who owned smaller lots to build before the moratorium came into effect. This proposition resulted in many submissions from the owners of small lots who considered they were not in a position to build within the two year period, and who objected to the proposed rule on the grounds that they had bought their land in good faith on the understanding that they could, one day, build on it. As these submissions were so specific and uniform in their content, I chose to ignore them as a source of both contacts and data, save recording the level of protest which the rule provoked. However, submitters who raised other relevant issues as well as the fifteen hectare rule were included.

Thus, submissions were pulled on the relevant sections of the Plan. These I decided included Mana Whenua, Rural, Landscape, Trees and Significant Ecological Areas. I copied the submissions which referred specifically to the Peninsula and those which were made by people who were apparently Peninsula residents. I say apparently as some submissions were made by lawyers or surveyors on behalf of clients, and in these cases the identification as Peninsula resident was made from a reading of the text of the submission. Thus I made a list of potential interviewees and added a body of written submissions made independently of the research project to the corpus, enabling future triangulation.

**Gardeners**

The DCC produced a booklet of gardens open to the public, a number of which were on the Peninsula. I considered that gardeners, particularly those who maintained public access to their gardens would assist in fulfilling my aim to people able to
influence land management. I approached all of the garden owners and all agreed to interviews which were subsequently undertaken.

**Mana Whenua**

The Mana Whenua were approached via the management committee of the local Runanga. This was consequent to the advice given by a Kaumatua of the iwi who I met at a small hui I attended at the Otakou Marae with a group of Otago University planning students. I explained the nature of my project and asked for their assistance in accessing their members. They recommended two candidates for interview and both were subsequently interviewed.

The relationship with the local iwi was problematic, not for any fault of theirs, but as a result of my inexperience and personal reticence. I will discuss this situation in much more detail in the next chapter. Suffice to say now that the Runanga offered me explicit assistance which I accepted and implicit assistance which I failed to recognise at the time.

**Federated Farmers**

As much of the Peninsula land area is in agricultural use I was concerned to gain contact with the local farming community. I made contact by letter with the secretary of the Peninsula branch of Federated Farmers and was invited to attend a meeting to explain to the assembled members what I was doing and how they might help me. However, when I telephoned to check the details just prior to the meeting I was informed that the President of the branch did not want me to attend as he saw this to be a gesture of support for my project and thus inappropriate. This was my first, and only, experience of being confounded by a gatekeeper during the research process. I subsequently made contact with farmers by other means, developing a number of

---

2 A Kaumatua is a male elder.
what Lofland and Lofland describe as 'allies' (op cit P 60), who supported my entrée into the farming community and gave me invaluable assistance.

**Professionals**

A number of professionals with responsibilities for land management on the Peninsula were also approached. All five landscape architects who were practising in Dunedin at the time were interviewed, both with a view to gaining their professional insights into the land management issues on the Peninsula, particularly the District plan, and to learn about their actual practice in relation to the Peninsula. Dunedin City Council staff with land management responsibilities were interviewed, including planners, parks management staff and roading staff. Department of Conservation staff with particular responsibilities on the Peninsula were interviewed also.

**Other organisations and businesses**

Publicity brochures collected from the Dunedin Visitors' Centre identified a number of significant organisations and businesses. These organisations are mainly concerned with tourism, such as Larnach's Castle and Penguin Place, but included the Otago Peninsula Trust which, while involved in tourism through the operation of the Royal Albatross Colony at Taiaroa Head, is also involved in other land management and environmental activities on the Peninsula. These organisations were contacted by mail first and then their owners, or managers, were interviewed.

### 3.4.2 Making contact

Potential respondents were first contacted by mail. In addition to the letter introducing myself and my project, a form outlining the purposes of the study, the commitment requested of the respondent and their rights was included\(^3\). This form incorporated a consent form for respondents to sign, which offered them the ability to withdraw at any stage from the project and to be provided with a copy of the their anonymity. Respondents were able to request a copy of the transcript of their interview on this form, but few did so. Several did, however, request copies of any

\(^3\) See example in Appendix I
instances when I quoted them in my final text. The form also promised the protection of respondents' confidentiality and committed me to the use of pseudonyms to protect this.

Once sufficient time had elapsed for the potential respondent to have received the letter and had time to consider it, I followed it up with a telephone call to make an appointment for the interview. Only seven of the sixty-eight people approached refused to be interviewed. Most interviews occurred at the respondent's home. This was the most desirable location for interviews of people active in managing their own land, whether that be a garden or a farm. I was keen to be shown around people's properties, but this only occurred on smaller properties and gardens. Professionals were interviewed at their places of work, although in three cases these were also their private homes. One interview took place in a shearing shed while crutching was being done in the background!

3.4.3 Depth interviews

The aim of the tape recorded interview was to gain linguistic data with which to build a corpus for discourse analysis. In addition, however, the data had an empirical role being evidence in itself of land management activities. Thus while I gained material to analyse, I also learned first hand about land management practices. The method used to gain this material and information was through depth interviews.

Depth interviews are an effective way of gaining rich data. Sue Jones (1985a&b) gives a comprehensive definition of depth interviews:

In order to understand why persons act as they do we need to understand the meaning and significance they give to their actions. The depth interview is one way of doing so. For to understand other persons' constructions of reality we would do well to ask them (rather than assume we can know merely by observing their overt behaviour) and to ask them in such a way that they can tell us in their terms (rather than those imposed rigidly and a priori by ourselves) and in a depth which addresses the rich

4 Crutching is the process by which wool is removed from a sheep's backside to keep it clean and to avoid fly strike during lambing.
5 I adopt here the terminology of the major theoretician consulted rather than use the, perhaps, more obvious terminology of 'in-depth interviewing'.
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context that is the substance of their meanings (rather than through isolated fragments squeezed onto a few lines of paper) (Jones 1985b P46 emphasis in original).

The interviews all followed a similar format. After initial pleasantries I would sit down with the respondent(s), explain again what I was doing and ask them to sign a consent form. With the consent form I would give them a face sheet requesting some base demographic data which I would ask them to complete for me. While they were completing the forms, I would get out my tape recorder and set it up, inserting a new tape in full view of the respondents.

The tape recording of interviews only caused problems in one instance where the respondent did not realise he was being taped. When he did realise, he expressed embarrassment at some of the material he had disclosed and said he would not have said these things had he realised it was being recorded. As a consequence, I expunged the material he was concerned about from the transcript and sent him a copy to reassure him that I would not include the material in the research corpus.

There are some particular constraints on the effectiveness of depth interviews. Firstly, the dynamics of the relationship between the interviewer and interviewee can impact on the quality of the interview. As the interviews were almost always conducted at the first meeting between myself and the interviewee, a balancing act was necessary between making myself and the contact feel relaxed and comfortable - getting to know one another - and gaining the necessary information. This may have resulted in me tending to avoid topics which might have been interpreted as contentious, or challenging ideas in a way which might have been interpreted as being confrontational. I might want to be a good researcher, but I want people to like me! As time wore on and experience was gained, increasing confidence reduced the degree to which this seemed to be a possible problem.

A second and related limitation to the effectiveness of this method is that the skill of the interviewer is paramount. Having been a professional counsellor I pride myself on the quality of my listening skills. However, in the counselling situation one uses minimal encouragers; ‘mm’, ‘yes’, ‘I see, and, in particular in my case, ‘right’, to

---

6 See Appendix II.
encourage the flow of talk from the client. When this is done in an interview situation it has a similar effect on the conversation, but has a diabolical impact on the flow of the transcribed interview.

Further, other normal social dynamics apply to an interview situation and may impact on the quality of the interaction. One interview I undertook with a man I took to be a blue-collar worker. I thought the interview went well until I listened to the tape recording and realised that I interrupted him constantly. In another instance, when I listened to the tape of an interview with a professional man, which I also thought went well, I found he interrupted me constantly. In both instances I was unaware of these interruptions until I listened to the completed interview. My assessment is that both gender and social class issues were clearly evidenced in these examples. However, the reality is that these issues are always present, even when unidentified. I can change neither my gender nor my social class, nor can I be held responsible for how others respond to these characteristics. What I can be held responsible for, however, is for maintaining as consistent an approach as possible and remaining as reflective as possible about the relationship dynamics between the interviewee and myself. In addition, while gender and class may have a bearing on land management, it is not the purpose of this study to attempt to analyse their impacts.

Another issue which impacts on the effectiveness of an interview is that the interviewee often has expectations which do not necessarily coincide with a depth interview approach. In one interview the respondent kept pausing, in what I thought was a good flow of information and talk, to tell me to get on and ask my questions! Infact I was working to a template, rather than a fixed list of questions. The areas I wanted to cover in the interviews were:-

(i) length and type of association with the Otago Peninsula;
(ii) nature of changes to the Peninsula during their association with it;
(iii) land management practices used on their own properties;
(iv) the Dunedin District Plan;

Some would debate that both these characteristics can, indeed, be changed and that what I should be saying is that I am unwilling to change either. In a sense I agree, but changing either would only raise new issues and not solve this situation at all. No matter what, I would always have a gender and a social class which would impact on my relationships with others.
(v) issues / problems with land management on a Peninsula wide scale; and  
(vi) future vision for / of the Peninsula.

Open-ended questions were used to encourage the respondents to talk freely and in their own language about these topics. As a consequence, these areas were not always dealt with in the same order or same depth, depending on the concerns and interests of the interviewee. As time passed, and empirical data accumulated, specific questions developed in importance, some relating to features in the landscape, some to personal relationships with family farms and some relating to more esoteric questions such as 'What is a farmer?' In addition, as my knowledge of common practices and events increased my confidence increased and later interviews are more relaxed and possibly richer than some of the earlier ones.

Some authors express a particular concern about using interviews to gain data for discourse analysis (Potter & Wetherell 1987). Their argument is that the interviewer inevitably participates in the production of the discourse and that this effectively contaminates the material. They consider that it is necessary to use 'natural language' for discourse analysis, that is, language which has been generated by a motivation other than to satisfy a researcher. While I accept the inevitability of the participation of the researcher in the construction of the discourse, I do not agree with the idea that this necessarily contaminates the material. In this project the triangulation enabled by the existence of written materials – submissions and management plans – minimise the impact of researcher-constructed frames.

3.4.4 Participant observation

In addition to interviews some participant observation was undertaken. Bastin defines participant observation as a means by which a researcher can:

...obtain an intimate knowledge of their research community...through combining data obtained using the more formalised techniques of social surveys, structured interviews and genealogical reconstructions with information obtained through participating in everyday affairs and observing behaviour as it occurs (Bastin in Walker (ed) 1985 P 92).
My goal in undertaking participant observation was indeed to observe behaviour as it occurred, but behaviour specifically relating to the management of land. In some instances this behaviour was explanatory or demonstrative in nature. These cases were either instances where interviewees showed me around their properties or where I participated in field trips associated with other events. In both these types of situations I was able to see examples of practices I had had explained to me and to ask questions about how and why certain things were being done. In some instances, I carried a tape recorder and a camera during the excursion, but in all cases extensive field notes were made as soon as practicable.

In other instances, I was able to participate in work days actually undertaking land management activities myself. These included revegetation planting and weed control. In addition, I spent a lot of time driving and walking around the Peninsula to familiarise myself with as much of it as possible. Part of this entailed observing the practices which were undertaken on the land - ploughing, tree felling, drilling, gorse clearance and so on. Again, extensive field notes were taken including tape recorded notes made whilst driving.

3.4.5 Documentary sources

In addition to the interviews, and to the observations I made myself, a large body of documents was collected. These were selected on the basis of their being part of the process of land management on the Peninsula. I was not only interested in what happened on the ground, but also in the policy and planning aspects of management. Thus, management plans and policy documents are directly implicated in the land management process.

Documents relating to both public and private land were collected. The private management documentation comprises management plans for privately owned covenants and reserves. DCC management plans for their reserves and road corridors were collected as were their street tree planting policies. Parts of the DCC Draft District Plan, the final District Plan and associated pamphlets and maps were
collected as they form the background to many of the substantive issues which were raised by respondents as well as being part of the management of the Peninsula themselves. In addition, art works; Otago Regional Council plans; reports and even a high school student’s project about the history of her family farm were collected.

3.4.6 So, how long is a piece of string?

Qualitative research differs most dramatically from quantitative in terms of the decision as to what constitutes enough data. I have heard of PhD theses that have been based on twelve interviews. This piece of research entailed sixty-one interviews plus the participant observation and document collection outlined above. The decision as to how much data is enough to answer the research question is an extraordinarily difficult one to answer. In terms of interviews, my decision to stop approaching further respondents was based on my feeling of confidence that I had a good idea of what was going on, on the Otago Peninsula. This saturation style is a commonly used way of deciding when enough data has been accumulated.

However, in addition to the interviews, I also have large amounts of written materials to contribute to the corpus. Consequently, only the most relevant material from the written documents is being included in the corpus, and parts of the interview material of tenuous relevance were not analysed either.

3.5 The process of analysis

One of the key features of qualitative research is its reflexivity. Consequently, while this section focuses on particular methodological tools which have been used to analyse data, their application was not necessarily a discrete event, or a step in a prescribed process. Analysis has, in fact, been happening from the very beginning of the project. Categories and explanatory frames which now seem commonsensical and pre-determined, were actually developed by the application of mental energy along the way.
For example, early in the research project I noted in my Research Diary that I had spent some considerable time and effort over two days trying to analyse the interrelationships of different land management agencies on the Otago Peninsula (Field Notes 26/8/99, 27/8/99). My notes do not record a ‘eureka’ moment, or even a conclusion. However, some time later I was able to draw a diagram of the interrelationships with little effort. What happened in the interim was analysis – I found / abstracted / demonstrated the structure of relationships between land management organisations on the Peninsula. This analysis was not undertaken systematically, except in the early attempts which entailed trying to organise index cards on a desktop. It was not undertaken by applying any particular formula or method or using any particular tool. Familiarity with the organisations and their roles, isolated moments of reflection and some time simply ignoring the problem combined through time to produce an answer.

The point is that while certain analytic tools are indispensable, the process of analysis overall is, just like other parts of the research process, reflexive. As described by Tolich and Davidson (1998 P8):

Unlike conventional quantitative research, where data collection and data analysis are clearly distinct steps, in fieldwork the analysis of data occurs simultaneously with their collection. Indeed, that ongoing analysis shapes what data are to be collected.

However, it is important not to overstate the case. This study does have a theoretical framework which requires certain methodological tools to be applied to the data, unlike works using grounded theory. Thus while analysis does occur on an ongoing basis there are, none-the-less, analytic processes which must be explained, and an analytic phase to the project. The rest of this section details these processes, explaining and justifying them.

3.6 Data analysis

As noted at length in the previous chapter, I am working with a fundamentally Foucaultian concept of discourse. This concept can be characterised by an understanding that discourse is constitutive of human knowledge. While Foucault offers many useful insights into the implications of this conception, the
methodological means to identify such discourses are not key among them. Consequently, other sources have been utilised to provide the tools to undertake this analytic process.

Norman Fairclough, a major proponent of discourse analysis, makes a key observation when he states ‘...there is no set procedure for doing discourse analysis’ (Fairclough 2003 P225). He observes that variations occur according to the specific nature of the project and the conception of discourse in use. In this case study, I was concerned to identify the discourses which construct the landscape of the Otago Peninsula. Thus, I needed to be looking for different constructions of its spaces, its features and people’s relationships with them. These features include the social characteristics of the Peninsula environment and the constructions of the proponents of conflicting discourses. (For example, the subject position ‘farmer’ can have entirely different connotations depending on the discourse in which it is constructed.) In addition, as I was concerned with power, I needed to be alert for evidence of resistance, conflict, and of new ways of seeing. Who says what is important from the point of view of the subject position that they occupy, and from the position they hold as a proponent of a particular discourse.

In addition to the discourses, however, I was interested in the empirical information about land management practices which exists within the corpus. Thus the threads of discourse analysis and empirical analysis interweave throughout the analytic process. Together, these concerns support Fairclough’s assertion that text, interaction and social context are three critical elements of a discourse resulting in three parallel levels of analysis: the micro-level description of text; the meso-level interpretation of relationship between text and interaction; and the macro-level explanation of relationship between interaction and social context (Fairclough 1989).

The analysis of the data corpus for empirical and discursive information is, therefore, a dialectical process. A naïve listening to an interview tape may result in gaining an understanding of some land management practice used by the interviewee. A comparison of like and conflicting talk about certain practices may enable the identification of discrete discourses. The extraction of both these types of information
from the interview material occurs as part of an ongoing process of ‘depth listening’, in the first instance, and ‘depth reading’ once interviews are rendered as text.

### 3.6.1 Transcription

Transcription is the process of translating spoken (tape recorded) language, in this instance depth interviews, into written text. This is done, in a formal, planned sense, to facilitate the analysis of the material. However, the process of listening to the tape in order to transcribe it is an analytic process in own right. I referred, in an earlier section, to two interviews in which I discerned social class and gender issues impinging on the process of the interviews. Other aspects of interviewer behaviour also came to light at this point, for example, my overuse of minimal encouragers also mentioned earlier. This level of analysis is part of the process of self critique, and it enabled me to modify (or attempt to modify!) my behaviour in further interview situations.

A second level of analysis occurs at this point also. The actual empirical material, that is the content of the interview, may stimulate further questions to be broached at future interviews. In addition the ‘depth listening’ required to transcribe a tape reveals nuances of attitude that may have been overlooked when immersed in the interview situation. Thus, just by listening to the tapes of interviews analysis occurs.

The actual process of translating spoken language into written language also implies analysis. On one level this may be as simple as trying to decide upon a word which is not clearly enunciated. On a much more significant level, however, it entails making decisions about how to represent the spoken features of the language used, and the non-verbal aspects of the interview as conversation. Transcription systems exist which enable the recording of changes of intonation, volume, tempo and other non-verbal aspects of speech (see Potter, 1996 p 233 for an example of transcription conventions and Fairclough, 1992 P229 for a discussion of options).
While this project utilised an essentially linguistic process (discourse analysis), it is not a piece of linguistic research. Thus, much of this detail is unnecessary. Further, while a high level of detail would be very informative when transcribing the interchanges at a public meeting, say, or other examples of natural language, the interaction between interviewer and interviewee can be assessed by other means. For example, verbal content, interruptions, and leading questions can readily be identified from the simple content of an interview. Other aspects of the interviewer/interviewee relationship will have been recorded in field notes subsequent to the interviews. Consequently, I adopted minimal transcription conventions.\(^8\)

Interviews were coded with a number which became the primary means of identification, and the interviewee was identified in the transcript by that code. Any overlapping speech is indicated with square brackets around the words. Parentheses are used to indicate any words which could not be identified, and dots within the parentheses to indicate approximately how many words were unclear. Non-verbal aspects of the conversation — laughter, yawning, coughing etc — are indicated in ordinary brackets. All 'ums', 'ahs' and other interjections and all repetitions were included, so that the transcripts are verbatim. No punctuation of any sort was used in the original transcripts.

Sixty-one interviews were undertaken. Of those, fifty-eight were transcribed following this convention. Of the three that were not transcribed the first was a very relaxed interview with a couple undertaken while being shown around their garden. As a consequence of the setting, and problems with the tape recorder, the recording was of insufficient sound quality to make verbatim transcription a practical or useful possibility. The second interview not transcribed was the one mentioned previously which was done while sitting on upturned buckets in the corner of a shearing shed while sheep were being crutched. The background noise of the shearing machine made the deep listening required for a verbatim transcription a hazard to my hearing! The third, similarly, was recorded during a torrential rain storm and the background noise of the rain made transcription impossible. In all instances comprehensive field

\(^8\) Another consideration was time. A one hour tape can take more than twenty hours to transcribe if high levels of detail are required (Fairclough, 1992 P229).
notes were made, and in the latter cases, comprehensive notes made from listening to the tapes.

Effort was made to transcribe the interviews as soon as possible after completion. However, I found myself unable to transcribe for more than four hours a day, and as most interviews took around ten hours to transcribe the tapes soon piled up. As a result, I began listening to the tapes within days of the interview and making comprehensive notes, taking advantage of that initial and informal level of analysis mentioned previously. Transcription carried on for an extended period after the fieldwork was completed, resulting in a veritable mountain of paper, some interviews being more than a hundred pages in length.

A further level of transcription was undertaken when quotations were selected for inclusion in secondary text. The appropriateness of reproducing a respondent’s language ‘as it were spoke’ or of tidying it up to correct grammatical errors and erase repetitions and stumbling speech has been debated elsewhere. In this instance, repetitions and interjections have been removed, and punctuation included in selections to mimic the pattern of speech as it was made. This has been done to enhance the readability of the material and great pains have been taken to ensure that the meaning of the material has not been affected.

The material taken from the transcripts has been used in two ways in the text. The majority of the material has been used as data illustrating various discursive constructions. This material is cited with the interview number, the status of the interviewee (see page 87 for an explanation of this), and the date on which the interview was conducted. On occasion, particularly in regard to the history of certain voluntary organisations, the material has been used as substantive information. This information is cited in the text in a similar manner but with the interviewee’s pseudonym included. While common practice in the citation of interview data is to

---

9 See Valerie Raleigh Yow (1994 P237) who argues that transcripts should be kept as close to verbatim as possible saying, ‘When [you change the language] to make the sentence read smoothly, you change the personality of the speaker and obscure his or her reality.’ This is to be compared with the statement from Sarah Nelson that ‘it is patronising and discriminatory for academics to print people’s inarticulacies (Times Higher Education Supplement, 28 March 2003).
include the site of the interview, any more refined definition of location other than
'Dunedin' would threaten respondents' confidentiality and I consider protecting this
more important than fulfilling stylistic conventions. All interview transcripts will be
kept on CD-ROM until 2009 when they will be destroyed.

However, intervening between the production of a mountain of interview transcripts
and secondary text was a process of formal analysis which was undertaken using a
qualitative research software package known as NUD*IST.

3.6.2 Using NUD*IST for analysis

While most texts on qualitative research methods advise strongly against putting off
the moment of analysis until all the data is in, I felt I had strong reasons for doing so.
While being aware of the informal analysis I was conducting on an ongoing basis, I
still felt that I needed to deal with the corpus, at least the interview data, as a whole.
As a consequence I was confronted with what seemed like a mammoth task – reading,
analysing and coding many hundreds of pages of transcripts. I did begin manual
coding using highlighter pens. I rapidly came to the conclusion that this would not
work. Firstly, there was no way I could keep track of the millions of bits of paper this
process would inevitably generate. Secondly, the limitations imposed on my analysis
by the number of different colours of highlighter pen I was able to purchase did not
seem to have a very sound theoretical basis! Consequently I looked for a computer
based system that would enable me to undertake the necessary analytic processes and
settled on N5, at the time the most up to date and appropriate version of the NUD*IST
qualitative research software available.\textsuperscript{10}

Infact N5 is a much more sophisticated system than I really required. Its primary
value has been in that it allows me to store all my transcript data, and any other data
that can be converted into a text file, in its databases. I was able to code and recode
data without any impact on the original material. In a sense, what I did with the
program is exactly what qualitative researchers have done in the past with pen and scissors – selecting pieces of text and collecting them together. However, its ability to search text for particular terms, and to compare groups of data with one another was very useful. Fundamentally, it enabled the management of the project in a way that working with hard copies would have made extremely difficult.

- Coding I Base data

Once all the interview transcripts had been loaded into the N5 databases they were coded for base data. This information came from the face sheets which interviewees completed at the start of the interview and included age grouping, gender, occupation and ethnic identification. Most interviewees had provided each of these pieces of information, but some, council employees for example, interviewed in their professional role, had not provided their age. Some other people did not provide their ethnic identity, and when people did not know what to say or did not want to put anything down I did not press them.\(^\text{11}\)

Ethnic identity was recorded as the interviewees provided it. This resulted in eight categories including ‘None given’. Age also was recorded as given within five-year age groupings. The age range of respondents was twenty-six years to, in excess of, seventy-six years. Gender was recorded, also as given. Rather than record occupation as given by the respondents, I decided to record what I have termed ‘status’ and I developed seven categories: landowner, crib\(^\text{12}\) owner, professional, tangata whenua, community group, small holder and gardener. This reflects my reason for interviewing the individual, rather than what they may have told me was their occupation. Thus, a fisheries officer is recorded as a crib owner, a farmer as a landowner, a doctor as a gardener and so on. In addition, I recorded if an interviewee was a Peninsula resident, a past Peninsula resident or not a Peninsula resident. This base data is presented in Appendix III.

---

\(^\text{10}\) Another QSR product was available, Nvivo, but N5, although less sophisticated, copes better with the sorts of volumes of data that I was working with.

\(^\text{11}\) Infact some fascinating information was gained from the explanations people gave for their selection of, or refusal to use, certain identifying words, and this was recorded in field notes when not part of the interview transcript.
The coding of such base information enables fundamentally sociological questions to be asked of the data within N5. Using the programme’s features, it becomes possible to check for correspondence, between practices or discourses, and age group, gender or ethnic identity. The similar application of the categories I developed is more problematic and these have generally only been used as identifying notes when working with the data.

- **Coding II**  Free nodes

In the N5 manual nodes are defined as, ‘...the containers for ideas, ways of abstracting from data. They represent categories for thinking, which may be concepts, topics, tentative interpretations or information...’ (Richards 2000 P35 emphasis in original). In a sense, a free node is equivalent to a discrete pile of like texts. The first systematic cut of the data was undertaken in an inductive way, starting with Interview I and working through to Interview 61. Each interview, or my notes where no transcript existed, was read in its entirety within N5 and coded according to the themes which were evident in the text. Each time material was reached that evidenced a new theme a new free node was created. This resulted in twenty-two free nodes.

Fairclough (2003 P129) says, 'We can think of a discourse as: (a) representing some particular part of the world, and (b) representing it from a particular perspective'. Thus this first analytic cut identifying the themes within the corpus is identifying the 'parts of the world (including areas of social life) which are represented' there. This, then, is the first step of discourse analysis.

While the free nodes are not connected to one another, this does not mean that the data in them is discrete. In fact, the same piece of text can, and often is, coded for many different nodes if this seems appropriate. This is consistent with the intention that what is being sought is evidence of discourses, as well as information about

---

12 A ‘crib’ in southern South Island parlance is a small, rustic holiday home, the owner of which is often referred to as a ‘cribbie’.
particular things. A piece of text may be about farming, express an opinion about the Dunedin City Council's policies and be about land management practices as well. As a consequence, while the interview texts comprise 63,019 units of text in N5, the sum of units of text in the free nodes is 161,679 units. My theoretical assumptions told me that the material that I identify as a theme, and place in a free node, most probably includes material from different discourses which, at sites of resistance, will be identifiable as contrasting and conflicting constructions. By being open and flexible in this process, I allowed for the richest possible interpretation.

**Coding III Analysing the free nodes**

Once all the transcripts had been 'crunched' and all the data incorporated into free nodes the next phase was to analyse the material within them. As this continued it became clear that not all the free nodes would be analysed in their entirety and a selection of the most relevant and promising nodes were selected. The first step was to reproduce the contents of a free node as a tree node. Tree nodes can be coded into progressively more refined categories (nodes) and the entire tree with its interrelationships can be described.

Again this process was undertaken inductively, the content of the parent node being read, the themes identified and child nodes created as the material suggested them. While these themes were related, they could not necessarily be identified as different discourses at this stage being still more subtle or smaller parts of the world.

As the sole coder, it is easy to feel confident about the coding process. However, larger studies (Baxter and Eyles 1997) using more than one person to code data have raised issues of inter-rater reliability particularly in regard to the use of NUD*IST software, and this does have potential implications for the lone coder, regarding the reliability of the analysis.

Baxter and Eyles (1999b) conducted a review of the methodological processes utilised in a study undertaken by Baxter in 1997 with particular regard to applying the criteria

---

13 A 'unit of text' in this instance is equivalent to a line of text.
for promoting qualitative research rigor discussed earlier in this chapter. They assert the ideal proposition that:

...the themes which emerge from a set of interview data would be connected to the same discrete units of text by any interpreter informed of the objectives of the research (Baxter & Eyles 1999b P316).

Clearly underlying this statement is a positivist frame of reference which assumes that there is one reality or truth evidenced in the data. They argue that researcher triangulation should illustrate this. In order to test this proposition, they examined the coding, done by two researchers, of the same piece of interview transcript, using a form of NUD*IST. One of these researchers had developed the coding scheme; the other was merely sorting the data into the predetermined categories. Baxter and Eyles found that at a coarser level the coding coincided, but at the refined level of child nodes the coding became strongly disparate.

My position is that as the researcher is intimately implicated in the construction of the research object, this result is not surprising. However, nor should it be alarming as this does not mean that the coding is arbitrary or meaningless. Janice Morse (1997) argues that:

Inter-rater reliability is appropriate with semistructured interviews, wherein all participants are asked the same questions, in the same order, and the data coded all at once at the end of the data collection period. But this does not hold for unstructured, interactive interviews...[where] the researcher first assumes a listening stance and learns about the topic as she or he goes along (Morse 1997 P445)

While I have characterised the interview approach used in this study as 'depth interviews' this type coincides with Morse's 'unstructured interactive form'. She stresses the reflexive nature of this approach which extends, in her opinion, to the coding process which she describes as 'fluid'. She says:

Initially, coding decisions may be quite superficial – by topic, for instance, but later coding decisions are made with the knowledge of, and in consideration of, information gained from all the previously analysed interviews. Such coding schemes are not superficial and, in light of all the knowledge gained, small pieces of data may have monumental significance. The process is not necessarily superficially objective: It is conducted in light of comprehensive understanding of the significance of each piece of text. The coding process is highly interpretative (ibid P 446).

This description coincides with the process I undertook and so I take heart from Morse's concluding comment which is that, 'Researchers must learn to trust
themselves and their judgments and be prepared to defend their interpretations and analyses' (ibid P 447)

• Coding IV Identifying discourses

Coding at this point has separated the data into thematic groupings with quite a high level of refinement. This follows Fairclough’s schema mentioned above where he describes discourses as representing particular parts of the world from particular perspectives. Thus the content of the child nodes both represent parts of the world and perspectives on those parts.

Fig 3.3 below illustrates, in a very pragmatic way, the theoretical assertion that discourses can be most clearly identified at points of resistance and conflict.

At this point the identification of discourses has still been undertaken in a somewhat inductive manner. For someone with a critical ear, picking up these differing perspectives is reasonably easy to do in a naive way. However, Fairclough also offers a number of more specific linguistic structures which can be used to identify discourses. These are summarised below in Table 3.4.

![Fig 3.3: A schematic diagram of part of the 'Weeds and Pests' node tree. Constructions of gorse as good, bad and neutral were a key to identifying the agricultural and environmental discourses. The other weed species divided into two groups. If people constructed gorse as bad, weeds such as thistles were mentioned. If people constructed gorse as good, other species represented here by Baumaria, were mentioned.](image-url)
Clearly it is these linguistic features which give a discourse its own ‘sound’; which provide the basis on which the naïve classification is made, effectively supporting the validity of that naïve classification.

While different discourses are relatively easily identified when there are two or more conflicting constructions of the same ‘part of the world’, it is not necessarily the case that those conflicting discourses will conveniently construct all the same parts. For example, when analysing the material about plant pests I created child nodes for each different species identified by respondents. When it came to gorse (*Ulex europea*) two utterly different constructions were in evidence, some respondents constructing gorse as a pest, and others seeing it as useful. This conflict was in evidence for only a few other species. However, there was a consistency of approach to these other species and a commonality in the respondents who presented these views. Once the species as a whole were grouped by respondent a sort of venn diagram arrangement was clear. Thus two discourses were effectively identified by extrapolation from the site of resistance.

The identification of the larger discourses relies upon the identification of commonalities identified between different chunks of text/discourse. For example, the discourse I have identified as ‘agricultural’ consistently focuses within the individual’s geographic and legal boundaries. That is, it focuses on the farm as an
island within the larger world, and those occupying subject positions within this discourse could not comment on others' responses to events or policies, only their own. The discourse I have identified as 'environmental', on the other hand, constructs the world on a broader scale and those occupying subject positions within it have a responsibility to comment on events and policies at a wider scale.

![Diagram of discourses](image)

**Fig 3.4: The identification of discourses by extrapolation from the site of resistance**

- **Coding V**  
  **Triangulation**

In order to test the veracity of the discourses I identified, I entered the text of submissions made on the Dunedin Draft District Plan into N5 and coded them, firstly according to the section of the plan they referred to, and then according to the status of the submitter, copying the framework I developed for interviewees. The results of this exercise were very encouraging and details will be discussed in future chapters.

### 3.7 Conclusion

This chapter fulfils two primary requirements of this research project. Firstly, it presents a rigorous argument for a particular methodological approach. A case study was selected as the appropriate form of research, and a qualitative methodology was selected to execute it. A qualitative methodology was chosen because it is most
consistent with the social constructionist position which I have taken and which is
detailed in Chapter Two.

The second requirement this chapter fulfils is the detailing of the actual methods used
(tools applied) in the execution of the research. This has been done by describing the
tool, and explicating its use within this project, more or less simultaneously. This
approach has enabled me to supplement theoretical discussions about the strengths
and weaknesses of various techniques and strategies with my actual experiences of
problems incurred and advantages gained.

I have also argued in this chapter, that qualitative research, in order to be amenable to
evaluation must evidence transparency of practice and honesty in reportage. I have
endeavoured to fulfil my own requirements to the best of my ability. I have not
indulged in pages of autobiographical detail, in order to ‘show where I’m coming
from’, as I do not consider that approach to be effective in clarifying the researcher's
involvement in the creation of the object of the research. Rather I have begun, and
will continue, to make reflexive asides about my process throughout the substantive
chapters when and where it is appropriate.

Having now identified the terrain of study, and unpacked the tool box, it is now time
to get on with the job at hand: learning how the Otago Peninsula landscape is made.
To this end the next five chapters examine different discursive constructions of the
Otago Peninsula, its landscape and the consequent actions these discourses require,
preclude or permit, and the networks of power which are implicated in and dispersed
through these discursive systems.
Chapter Four: Landscapes of Mana Whenua

4.1 Introduction

This chapter begins the presentation of the substantive results of this research and focuses upon the landscapes of the Mana Whenua, Kai Tahu of Otakou. The next five chapters are ordered in such a way as to build up a comprehensive picture of the complexities of the landscape of the Otago Peninsula, piece by piece. The next chapter focuses on the agricultural development of the Otago Peninsula and the current agricultural discourse expressed there. Environmental issues have become important on the Peninsula over the past twenty or so years and the environmental discourse expressed there is the topic of Chapter Six. These chapters focus on examining ways in which discursive frameworks determine actions upon the land, effectively manufacturing landscape. Chapter Seven examines three further discourses which are important in terms of their interactions with the other discourses discussed. Chapter Eight examines the management of the landscape of the Otago Peninsula as it has been undertaken by the Dunedin City Council to fulfil the requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991.

However, it is not a simple matter of my describing or reporting on these landscapes. I am a Pākehā and operate within a European cultural archive. The process of undertaking this research has been, for me, among many other things, a process of learning to understand some aspects of the Māori cultural archive. However, my approach to the project and my respondents is inevitably framed in Pākehā terms, and places my respondents into particular subject positions through the discourses within which I framed the questions and the manner in which I asked them. As Russell puts

---

1 Māori was a wholly oral language until Europeans arrived and started writing it down. To this day Māori orthography is far from consistent. Some use the macron to indicate a long vowel, whereas others double the vowel, and yet others do neither. Hence the word 'maori' will be seen written as Māori, Maaori, or Maori. I have adopted the use of the macron and refer to Williams Dictionary of the Māori Language as my authority. In addition, different vowels are used by some writers, depending on the interpretation of the sounds. I do not alter the spelling or style used by the authors I quote but use the most common spellings where alternatives exist. Thus the orthography used in this chapter is far from consistent. See section 4.3.3 for a discussion of the colonisation of the Māori language.

2 For comparison, see Russell (2000) Chapter Three for a discussion of her methodology which includes the intriguing description of her being '...required to present myself in a new way and present my researcher credentials...' to people she had known all her life.
it, ‘Outsiders may fit our epistemological understandings into a theoretical parameter of their understanding that is not necessarily ours...’ (Russell 2000 P4). What makes such framing problematic is when the insiders are unable to express their own understandings, or when the outsiders’ understandings are given, or demand, more weight. Either or both of these situations are likely to arise in Aotearoa / New Zealand where the process of European colonisation has seen Pākehā discourses gain hegemonic power.

In a sense, then, any discussion of the landscape of Aotearoa / New Zealand is inevitably a discussion of colonisation. These islands were the last landmass on earth to be colonised by humans, having remained unsettled until about a thousand years ago. The descendents of the first Polynesian colonists, the Māori people, are among the latest human groups to be colonised in the nineteenth century expansion of the British Empire. Thus the colonisation of this land has taken two forms; the first impacting on the indigenous biophysical systems which had evolved in isolation from the days of Gondwanaland; the second impacting on both the biophysical systems and the cultural systems which had developed here since initial Polynesian settlement.

In-depth discussions of either of these forms of colonisation are outside the scope of this thesis. However, it is clearly not possible to broach the question, ‘How is this landscape made?’ without some discussion of both the biophysical impacts of the first wave of human colonisation, and the cultural and biophysical impacts of the second. Thus, while colonisation per se is not the direct focus of this work, this discussion will still illuminate some of the ongoing issues regarding the colonisation of the land, the landscape and, inescapably, of the Māori people. I make no apologies for this as a key part of my intention in undertaking this research is to unpack the taken-as-natural assumptions of Pākehā culture towards the landscape we live in.

This chapter begins with a history of the pre-European settlement of the South Island of Aotearoa / New Zealand and where possible, of the Otago Peninsula itself. I discuss aspects of the relationship Kai Tahu, the local tribe, Mana Whenua, have with the land and with the landscape. The impact of European colonisation on Kai Tahu is examined, both using a conventional historical approach and an ethnographic perspective. The late twentieth century ‘Māori Renaissance’ is examined along with
its more local impacts. Finally I examine some of the contemporary issues facing Mana Whenua in land management within their region, and examine the attendant and changing power dynamics they entail.

This chapter relies on somewhat different sources than the rest of the thesis. In addition to invaluable informants, who I was referred to by Te Runanga O Otakou, I also draw on significant secondary sources. This is particularly the case in examining the history of Kai Tahu. Also I draw extensively on the recent work of Khyla Russell, herself Mana Whenua of Otakou. Her PhD thesis, *Landscape Perceptions of Kai Tahu: I Mua Āianei, Ā Muri Ake* (2000) is described by the author as an ‘insider ethnography’ aiming to provide ‘...an epistemological presentation of the ways in which we [Kai Tahu] understand the term ‘landscape’’ (P4). Thus, while it is a thesis it can be considered to have similar standing to primary sources, and provides a highly relevant and robust source of data.

4.2 A brief history of Māori in Aotearoa

4.2.1 Pre-European settlement of Te Waipounamu

According to Kai Tahu tradition, the first people to inhabit the South Island of Aotearoa / New Zealand, Te Waipounamu, were Te Rapuwai. Te Rapuwai were:

...very numerous, even on the mountains. Heaps of shell left by them show the extent of their occupation. They made the land open (i wakapakihi). They filled the whole island (Matiaha Tiramorehu quoted in Anderson 1998 P 18).

Waitaha followed Te Rapuwai, the eponymous ancestors probably living around the fifteenth century AD, and the people taking the name some time later. Contemporary claims that Waitaha inhabited Aotearoa / New Zealand for a thousand years before the arrival of Māori is described by Anderson (1998) as a ‘modern fable’. Kiore bones

---

3 Te Waipounamu is a Māori name for the South Island of Aotearoa / New Zealand. Roughly translated it means 'greenstone waters', an allusion to the nephrite jade which is a prized resource found in the southern mountains. Another Māori name for the South Island, but one less well known amongst Pakeha, is Te Waka o Āoraki, Āoraki's canoe.

4 Maori tribal groups get their names from an ancestor from whom they are descended. Te Rapuwai is the eponymous ancestor of those people; Waitaha Nui and Waitaha Ariki of the Waitaha peoples; Whatua Māmoe (a woman) of the Kati Māmoe; and Tahu Potiki of Kai Tahu.

5 Kiore is the Polynesian rat, *Rattus exulans*, and could only have arrived in Aotearoa / New Zealand via human transportation.
have been radiocarbon dated at two thousand years old possibly indicating human contact with these islands at a much earlier time than either most genealogical or other archaeological evidence would suggest. However, there is some debate as to the accuracy of the radiocarbon dating of rat bones. What is more certain is that in about the sixteenth century Kati Māmoe, who originated on the east coast of the North Island, began to migrate south. Initially settling in the northern areas of the South Island, pressure from further waves of migration led to them moving progressively further south and settling amongst the Waitaha.

Kai Tahu also originated on the east coast of the North Island and as such share many common ancestors with Kati Māmoe. In the late seventeenth century they began to migrate south in a way characterised by Anderson (1998 P57) as having ‘mostly occurred in a piecemeal fashion, with small groups drifting south over a fairly long period and those generally able to pick up kinship connections which legitimised their residency.’ Whilst periods of warfare between the new migrants and the pre-existing residents occurred, Anderson is clear that representations of Kai Tahu winning the land through conquest is misleading. The acquisition and legitimation of territory by intermarriage was key to the spread of Kai Tahu through the South Island. However, some contemporary Māori still contest their absorption into Kai Tahu, asserting their separate identity as Waitaha or Kati Māmoe. Conflicts certainly did exist at times. For example, a famous battle between Kati Māmoe and Kai Tahu, in which Kai Tahu prevailed, occurred at Pukekura on the Otago Peninsula, and involved a local Kai Tahu hero, Tarewai, probably in the late eighteenth century (Entwistle 1976).

4.2.2 Lifeways

While northern Māori continued and adapted the horticultural practices which had been brought from tropical Polynesia, southern Māori were unable to do so because of

---


7 This has important implications for the settlement of Treaty of Waitangi grievances, some groups insisting that Kai Tahu has no authority to negotiate on their behalf and that the Crown’s recognition of Kai Tahu in their areas is simply a further act of colonisation. Sandra Lee, then Minister of Conservation and leader of Mana Motuhake, said of the Ngai Tahu Settlement Bill, 'It ignores numerous hapu claims...you've got a fight on your hands if you think this is over yet' (The Evening Post 1 April 1998 P9).
colder climatic conditions. Kūmara were grown in the northern south island, Banks Peninsula representing the southern most limit of their cultivation. In addition taro was grown on the West Coast and bottle gourds were probably grown in northern areas (ibid P 111). However, for most of the South Island the gathering and hunting of foodstuffs formed the basis of the economy with subsequent limitations on the potential population that could be supported on this subsistence. Davidson (1992 P3) notes that, ‘...contemporary communities in the northern North Island and southern South Island were probably less alike than were communities living in one area 500 years apart’.

Access to specific resources or areas from which resources can be extracted, mahika kai, are determined by heredity, and the use of these areas determined seasonally. Unlike the stereotypical view of 'hunter-gatherer' societies, Kai Tahu maintained permanent settlements as well as networks of temporary camps for access to resources. Settlements on the northern reaches of the Otago Peninsula were part of a group of permanent settlements centred between there and Waikouaiti to the north. Anderson claims non-seasonal mobility between major settlements, such as this grouping, and other permanent settlements. The members of these settlements also moved between temporary inhabitation sites on a seasonal basis as the community moved about its region in order to harvest produce (op cit Pp 116-117)

Russell (2000 P240) argues that the dynamic relationship with the landscape entailed in the seasonal mobility required by mahika kai forms a key aspect of Kai Tahu identity. The mahika kai are not simply the sites of sources of food and other items, but are areas which are actively managed in order to maintain and improve their productivity. Rāhui are used to protect resources from over exploitation; tī kouka was cultivated to ensure its ongoing availability for harvest; selected shell fish were farmed; and habitat improvement undertaken (ibid Pp 230-231). In addition, the dispersed nature of these mahika kai meant that movement through the landscape was

---

8 Rāhui are prohibitions of use preventing the exploitation of a site or resource.
9 Tī kouka is the cabbage tree, *Cordyline australis*. Anderson (1998 P 145) notes that the Otago Peninsula was an important source for this and that it was almost a domesticated plant by the time of European contact.
necessary to utilise the resources. Marsden characterises the relationship between Māori and the land thus:

Like the human mother who nourishes her child in the womb and then upon her breasts, so does Mother Earth. Natural resources are the means by which our primeval mother nourishes her human children with water and food, and provides clothing and shelter etc for all their biological needs (Marsden 1998 P21).

![Fig 4.1: The pits and hollows visible in this photograph are umu-tl and pits where cabbage trees have been dug out, near Otakou on the Otago Peninsula. (Photograph – Kevin Jones in Hamel 2001 P94)](image_url)

That the Otago Peninsula was an important habitation site can be clearly seen from the distribution of Māori archaeological sites illustrated in Fig 4:2. The Peninsula
environment was rich in resources which included, in the early periods, moa\textsuperscript{10}. In addition, other birds; marine mammals; fish; shellfish, including the local specialty, tuaki\textsuperscript{11}; and tī kouka were all abundant (Hamel 2000) as was bracken fern, the root of which was a staple source of carbohydrate (Wilson 2004).

Fig 4.2: Map of the Otago Conservancy showing the distribution and location of Māori archaeological sites. (Hamel 2001 P10).

\textsuperscript{10} Moa were a group of species of flightless birds including the giant moa, \textit{Dinornus gigantea}, which stood two metres high. The moa became extinct, probably within a hundred years of the first human colonisation of Aotearoa / New Zealand.

\textsuperscript{11} Tuaki, \textit{Austrovenus stutchburyii}, are known in Aotearoa / New Zealand English as cockles and in American English as clams.
4.2.3 1800 to 1840 – period of initial European contact

Captain James Cook made the earliest recorded European observations of Otago Peninsula in 1770 when he applied the name ‘Cape Saunders’ to the eastern most point on the Peninsula. Between 1791 and 1809 a number of groups of sealers were stationed around the southern coastline and extensive contact occurred between them and the local Kai Tahu. One of the adoptions by Māori from this contact was the potato. Entwistle (1998) considers it likely that Peninsula Māori probably had potatoes by 1810, and they were recorded as seen in cultivation in the harbour area in 1813.

The cultivation of potatoes rapidly became of great importance to Kai Tahu, replacing the fern root as a staple and providing a commodity readily tradable with the tagata bola.12 Their possession did not immediately cause major changes in lifestyle, however, as they were planted adjacent to traditional foraging areas (Russell P245). While the presence of sealers provided Kai Tahu with the ability to trade for useful goods it was not tolerated peaceably for long, particularly when the commercial value of the seal pelts they were collecting was realised. Local Māori saw the sealers as undertaking an ‘unauthorised assault on their resources’ (Anderson 1998 P 65) and lethal skirmishes occurred between them. Trading in flax, used to manufacture ropes, became important after 1813, and pigs and fowls were adopted as part of the local economy. However, the influence of Europeans was limited and while their material goods, plants and livestock were welcomed, Māori ‘...did not want to live as Pakeha: the white people are too selfish, said Te Wakataupuka’ (ibid P76).

Two major political events occurred within the South Island during the first decades of the nineteenth century, which both had major impact on Kai Tahu. The first is characterised by Anderson (ibid P78) as a testing of the relationships between an emerging generation of chiefs. Occurring around 1825 it is known as the Kai Huānga (eat relations) feud. A series of virulent altercations, aggravated by the (limited) use

---

12 Takata pora and tagata bola are alternative forms of the early appellation given to Europeans by southern Māori and means ‘boat people’. The second form, tagata bola, was recorded at Puketeraki by the missionary Watkins. The close proximity of Puketeraki to the Otago Peninsula leads me to choose this form as an appropriate dialect form. (See Anderson 1997 P63)
of newly acquired muskets, disrupted intra tribal relationships down the east coast of the South Island.

Of even more dramatic impact were the series of raids made by the northern chief, Te Rauparaha (or Robulla in the southern Kai Tahu dialect) and his Ngati Toa warriors between 1828 and 1839. Facilitated by muskets and, in one instance, the active collusion of a Captain Stewart who sailed Te Rauparaha and a hundred warriors to Akaroa and assisted in staging an ambush there, these raids devastated Kai Tahu. Te Rauparaha invaded and gained control of much of the northern reaches of the South Island and drove as far south as Banks Peninsula displacing many survivors south. Anderson (ibid P 90) estimates that the Kai Tahu population was reduced from an estimated 4 000 to 5 000 by about a quarter by Te Rauparaha’s raids. Thus by the late1830s, despite eventually succeeding in driving Te Rauparaha from the South Island, Kai Tahu were significantly weakened.

In November 1831 the Weller brothers, Joseph and Edward, arrived at Te Umu Kurī on the Otago Peninsula seeking to buy land on which to found a whaling station. In addition they purchased a ‘whaling right’ from Kai Tahu for the sum of one hundred pounds (Palmer and Goodall 1988 P3). The whaling station was duly established and operated until the early 1840s employing many local Māori. Trade in potatoes, flax and dried fish was facilitated by its presence providing economic support for the local people. However whaling stations also provided ports of entry for infectious diseases. In 1835 a measles epidemic at Otakou ‘...left the population ‘stricken with disease and broken in spirit” (McLintock 1949 cited in Anderson op cit P193). Tuberculosis, influenza and venereal diseases also impacted on the local population. Anderson (P194) argues, ‘It is difficult to be sure how devastating the major epidemics had been’. It is clear from contemporary sources that local Māori saw themselves in a diminished state by 184013.

---

13 In a famous speech made during negotiations for the sale of the Otago block Tuhawaiki, a major chief, is recorded as saying that the northern reaches of the Otago Peninsula were not for sale as, following the arrival of a ship from Sydney bearing measles, ‘...most of the inhabitants sickened and died. Whole families on this spot disappeared and left no one to represent them. My people lie all around us...’ (cited in Dacker 1994 P20).
The increasing interest shown by the British Crown in regulating affairs within Aotearoa / New Zealand raised alarm amongst the few Pakeha in the southern South Island who had bought land before 1840. Attempts were made by two of these Pakeha to convince Kai Tahu chiefs to sign over to them the entire South Island and Rakiura (Stewart Island) before the Crown could step in to manage land sales! This prompted the British Agent, Hobson, to proclaim sovereignty over Te Waipounamu by right of discovery (Dacker 1994 P18). The Treaty of Waitangi was still signed by seven Kai Tahu chiefs, including local chiefs Korako and Kareta at the Otago heads on June 13th of that year.

The signing of the Treaty of Waitangi facilitated the opening up of Aotearoa / New Zealand to British colonisation. Meanwhile, in Scotland, the Presbyterian Church was undergoing internal conflict and division. Plans arose to establish a Scots Free Kirk settlement in Aotearoa / New Zealand and the area from the Otago harbour south to the Nuggets was identified as suitable. (See Fig 4:3)

Under pressure from the New Zealand Company, the Crown waived its right of pre-emption allowing the New Zealand Company to negotiate with the local chiefs for the purchase. Four hundred thousand acres in total was purchased in 1844, of which all but one hundred and fifty thousand acres was to revert to the Crown. The northern most part of the Otago Peninsula, ‘...four miles along the coast from Taiaroa Heads’ (Sale agreement cited in Dacker 1994 P20), was retained in Māori ownership along with two other blocks on the coast further south. In addition to this land, verbal agreements were made to reserve ten percent of all the land sold (known henceforth as ‘the tenths’) in trust for the benefit of Kai Tahu. The failure of this agreement, plus the later, disputed, ‘Kemp’s Purchase’¹⁴ of Canterbury led to the disillusionment of Kai Tahu and eventually to Te Kereeme or ‘The Claim’ which was not resolved until 1997.

¹⁴ ‘Kemp’s Purchase’ was made in 1848 to secure land for the Canterbury settlers who were already on their journey to the new land. The area actually sold has always been disputed, and Kemp disobeyed his instructions to ensure that ample land was retained for present and future needs of the local inhabitants (Dacker op cit P 25).
4.2.4 The 'European'\textsuperscript{15} Period

Initially the relationship between Kai Tahu and the Scots settlers of Otago, who arrived in 1848, was mutually positive. Māori were able to provide potatoes, fish and other foodstuffs for trade and these supported the new colonists to the degree that Dacker (1994 P31) suggests that without it the Scots might have starved. Local Māori also worked for the colonists building houses and providing other services, including the transportation of both people and goods (ibid P31-32).

\textsuperscript{15} I use inverted commas here to indicate that it was during this period, 1840 to 1970, that European discourses gained hegemony in Aotearoa / New Zealand. Thus, while in many areas Maori remained the majority of the population, and other cultural and ethnic groups immigrated (particularly Chinese) this period is characterised by the increasing dominance of Pakeha social and political systems.
The economic boom did not last long. European labourers supplanted Māori workers and as European agriculture became established the necessity to purchase goods diminished. Lacking the capital to buy bigger boats Māori ascendency in coastal trading also lapsed. The loss of economic clout in relation to the newcomers pushed local Iwi back into reliance on their traditional mahika kai for survival. However, land sales and the surveying and fencing of land prevented access to many areas. Dacker (ibid P36) notes that without the rich kai moana resources available off the coasts around Dunedin many Kai Tahu would have starved.

The 1860s heralded a number of events which were to have major consequences, both nationally and locally. In 1861 gold was discovered in Central Otago, an event which precipitated a significant gold rush. As a result of the influx of miners, money and the consequent commerce, Dunedin grew rapidly to become Aotearoa / New Zealand’s largest city and commercial capital (King 2003 P207). In the North Island, meanwhile, Māori resistance to colonisation had become violent and land wars raged between Iwi and British soldiers.

In 1869, at the conclusion of the Taranaki land war, seventy-four Ngati Ruanui warriors, convicted of high treason, were transported to Dunedin jail to serve out their sentences of hard labour. At least eighteen of these men died and are buried in the city’s Southern Cemetery (Harold 2000). These prisoners constructed the Anderson’s Bay causeway on the Otago Peninsula, among other projects in the city. Māori from Puketeraki and Otakou cared for these unwilling guests as best they could and in gratitude some called themselves Ngati Otakou on their release (Dacker op cit P66).

In 1879 a further group of Taranaki prisoners were transported to Dunedin jail. These prisoners were neither tried nor convicted of any offences. The men were known as the ‘Taranaki ploughmen’ and were followers of the prophet, Te Whiti O Rongomai and his campaign of passive resistance to the confiscation of land which had occurred in response to the earlier fighting. Eventually numbering one hundred and thirty-
seven this group were also used as convict labour and probably worked on the construction of the 'low road', which follows the harbour’s edge along the Peninsula,

Fig 4.4: ‘Rongo’, a memorial to the Taranaki prisoners who died in Dunedin, was unveiled beside the Andersons Bay causeway in March 1987. The stone from a Taranaki beach is etched with an ancient carving of a koru which is just visible on the lower right hand side of the stone. The symbols on the plaque include Taranaki, the mountain, and the three white feathers of Parihaka.

and on the early construction of Fort Taiaroa (Griffiths and Goodall 1980 P 32). Otakou elders had a strong relationship with Parihaka, Te Whiti’s model kāinga in Taranaki, visiting frequently (Griffiths & Goodall P29) and financial support was provided from profits won on the gold fields (Dacker P80). In 1881 the settler government physically broke up Parihaka and Te Whiti and his co-leader Tohu Kakahi were transported to Dunedin where they stayed at Otakou16.

In 1866 the Māori people of Otakou had consented to their land being surveyed and placed under individual family ownership under the Aotearoa / New Zealand Native Reserves Act of 1856. Dacker notes that the Commissioners of Native Reserves for Otago strongly encouraged this as, ‘They held that individualisation would break down the ‘communalism’ that was seen as the greatest hindrance to the civilising of

Fig 4.5: Map showing the subdivision of the Native Reserve land at Otakou in 1866. (Hocken Library reproduced in Dacker 1994 P44)
Māori’ (P46). The land was surveyed in strips with each strip having a sea boundary at the low water mark. This ensured that each family had access to the full range of resources of their land and reflected recognition of the importance of kai moana (Dacker op cit P 46). These strips are still visible in the landscape today, evidence of the varying practices employed upon the strips by their various owners. This visibility underscores the discourse-action-object relationship, showing clearly that the act of surveying and mapping has real consequences on the land via the actions of the land owners.

By 1900 much of the Native Reserve Lands on the Peninsula had been leased, some to Māori, some to Pākehā farmers. Many of the wakawaka were too small for the families to subsist on, and others incurred debts in attempts to have grievances heard in the Native Land Courts. Dairying became the major economic activity over the entire Peninsula and continued as such until the 1960s. While, as Dacker (op cit) makes clear, Te Keereme continued to be a central issue to all of Kai Tahu, life continued quietly to all intents and purposes. As a Pākeha who grew up in Dunedin in the 1960s and 1970s I was oblivious to any Māori presence in the locale. I knew there was a Marae at Otakou, but somehow I saw it as an un-peopled relic. Dacker sums up the situation precisely:

By the 1970s Kai Tahu Whānui had become invisible in many ways to the wider community. Their history was unknown, and the assumption was that they had become so Europeanised or Pākehāfied that they could no longer claim to be Māori. When Kai Tahu Whānui reappeared on centre stage in the latest attempt, in over 150 years, at trying to get justice – the recent Waitangi Tribunal hearings on the Ngai Tahu Claim – many were shocked and incredulous (op cit P1).

Fig 4.6: The strip farms of the Native Reserve lands are visible in the landscape today. (Photo – Author 2000)

17 Wakawaka is the name given to the piece of land owned, or in earlier times occupied, by a single family unit. Anderson considers it a traditional unit land use allocation (see Anderson pp 111 – 115), whereas Russell treats it as a colonial imposition (see Russell pp249 – 250).
Fig 4.7: Tamatea, the wharenui at the Otakou Marae was built to celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi at Otakou (Dacker 1994). Interestingly the panels on the front of the meeting house are not carved wood, as is more usual, but moulded concrete.

4.2.5 The late twentieth century and the Māori Renaissance

The apparent invisibility of Kai Tahu, and of Māori issues within the wider Pākehā community, was a matter of separation. As one respondent said to me in interview, ‘Māori kept their own little pot boiling’. Later his wife added:

I think that’s where Pākehā are so shocked now. Because for years Māori did things their own way. They kept away. They didn’t make a fuss. They were nice to their neighbours etc etc etc etc. They’re starting to get tired – over the last twenty years they’ve got tired and they’re starting to back the young ones that are impatient and want to do things, not the old way, ‘Lets get on and do it! We’ve waited long enough.’ And they’re starting to back them, starting to say, ‘Well, I know where you’re coming from lad.’ (Int 6, Tangata Whenua, 29/5/00)

In 1975 the pot boiled over resulting in what is known as the Māori Land March. Spearheaded by Te Roopu O Te Matakite it was led by a kuia¹ from Ngati Hine of Northland, Whina Cooper. A large group of Māori walked from Kaitaia to

¹ A ‘kuia’ is a revered older woman.
Wellington to present Parliament with a list of grievances based around a request for a moratorium on all sales of Māori land, but including petitions about specific issues including one from Kai Tahu. Taking the form of a hikoi, or pilgrimage, the Land March passed through many Māori communities providing opportunities for many face-to-face discussions of the issues at hand, and acted as a consciousness-raising vehicle within both Māoridom and the Pākehā community. Consequently it has been said that:

> Despite the failure to maintain unity [afterwards], however, the March was important to radical ideology as a crucible and as a catalyst. It was an omen of the Bastion Point occupation to follow two years later (Greenland 1991 P 96).

Bastion Point, or Takaparawhau, is a prominent headland in central Auckland, a piece of land which had been taken by the Crown from its Māori owners, Ngati Whatua, for defence purposes. By 1977 it was almost the only undeveloped land left in the central Auckland area, and the Government of the day decided to sell it to the highest bidder for prestige housing. By this time Ngati Whatua, once the owners of the entire Auckland isthmus, had, by various means, been dispossessed of all of their lands save a small church and urupā\(^\text{19}\). In January 1977 a group organised by the Orakei Māori Action Committee moved onto Takaparawhau and began an occupation which lasted five hundred and six days. The occupation was ended by the invasion of the site by seven hundred police and military personnel, and the arrest of more than two hundred people on charges of wilful trespass. In 1998 Terry Dibble wrote:

> In 1978 Joe Hawke said to Maori gathered at the Point, ‘We have lit our fire here on Bastion Point. There are plenty of issues where you people come from. Go away and light your fires on your land.’ And the Maori people did. Twenty years later, those fires are the symbol of Maori Renaissance and sign of hope to Pakeha as well as Maori (in Hawke (ed) 1998 P56).

The 1980s saw a number of key events occur which radicalised many Maori and Pakeha alike. The first occurred in 1981 when the Aotearoa / New Zealand Rugby Union hosted a tour of the country by the South African national rugby team, the Springboks. A huge protest movement mobilised against this tour as it was widely felt that playing rugby with South Africa was tantamount to supporting the racist

\(^{19}\text{An urupā is a burial ground, or graveyard.}\)
apartheid regime there. The same government that evicted the Bastion Point protesters mobilised the Army along with hundreds of police to enable the tour to continue despite what seemed, at times, to be a virtual civil war. However, for many, myself included, the inevitable connection was made between support for (or at the very least tolerance of) apartheid in South Africa, and racism at home. Māori women, who were particularly prominent in the protest movement, were particularly important in drawing these connections, both for their own people and Pākehā Aotearoa / New Zealanders. How much impact the Springbok Tour had on Māori is beyond my capacity to speculate. However, it was a central event in the development of radical Pākehā support for the resolution of Māori grievances.

In 1984 Te Māori, an exhibition of traditional Māori art, opened at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City. The exhibition was accompanied by kaumātua from all over Aotearoa / New Zealand on its two-year long tour of the United States of America. I can remember being incredibly moved, and, I confess, mildly astonished, by the great respect which was shown the exhibition and its retinue as it moved around the United States. Indeed for, possibly even most, Pākehā Aotearoa / New Zealanders, the frequent television news items measuring the progress of Te Māori in America, were probably their first ever exposure to Māori ritual, particularly the powhiri. The immense respect accorded to Te Māori in America led to it being toured around Aotearoa / New Zealand on its return in 1986. All visitors to the exhibition were welcomed with a powhiri put on by the local iwi. This had an enormous impact on the iwi around Dunedin, both stretching their resources and energies but also providing a source of learning and community (Dacker op cit P128-130). Dacker quotes Edward Ellison of Otakou stressing the local impact of Te Māori:

Prior to Te Māori we mixed kaupapa up a bit...It sharpened your awareness of what tikanga is about...Certainly I think the idea that your marae is the heart of the people and that is where you should always carry out your main discussions...on your marae where all those traditions are, where the old people are buried. If you really

---

20 The 1974 Commonwealth Games held in Christchurch had been boycotted by the Black African states in protest at Aotearoa / New Zealand’s ongoing sporting relationship with South Africa.
21 It was something of a joke during the tour, but one based on clear evidence, that in many instances the majority of protesters were women, their sons, husbands, fathers etc being inside the grounds as spectators.
22 ‘Kaumatua’ are elders of both genders.
23 The powhiri is the ritualised welcome which was given to Te Māori at each new venue, and parts of these were televised.
want to resolve fundamental difficulties on your path, that's where you should go and that’s what actually happened after Te Māori...we started planning for our development into Runanga...that’s what flowed out of that awareness, that the Maori Committee system is not a Maori system (op cit Pp129-130).

On a broader scale Te Māori represented the first time traditional Māori art had been taken out of the ethnographic museum and placed in an art museum (Jonathon Mane-Wheoki pers comm Sept 2003), a turning point in the development of contemporary Māori art and for contemporary Māori culture.

In 1975 the Government had passed the Treaty of Waitangi Act. This act was to enable Māori to pursue limited grievances under the auspices of the Treaty of Waitangi, and established the Waitangi Tribunal to hear these grievances. This tribunal could only hear grievances as they arose, and had the role of advising the government as to solutions. For the first eight years or so of its existence the Tribunal maintained what has been described as a ‘life of obscurity’ (Sharp 1991 P133). He continued:

At first, the Tribunal and its Treaty jurisprudence were not supported by many Maori and were little heeded by the rest of the population. Of diverse tribal origins and traditions, and of greatly varying contemporary political persuasions, Maori were not at one on the Treaty. Neither were they satisfied with the Tribunal’s capacity to attain reparatory justice for them.

In 1985 the Treaty of Waitangi Act was amended, a key political event which Sharp has described as ‘a constitutional revolution’ (ibid P 135). Events of the early eighties moved Māoridom towards a more united view of the Treaty as a symbol of their mana as tāngata whenua, and of the Waitangi Tribunal as a potential site of the resolution of grievances. The amendment of the Act in 1985 confirmed this by allowing for the hearing of disputes dating from the signing of the Treaty in 1840, and by the expansion of the Tribunal and its ability to hear cases. In addition this amendment marked the beginning of a process which saw the requirement of adherence to the ‘principles’ of the Treaty of Waitangi specified in legislation.

Following the amendment of the Treaty of Waitangi Act the Ngai Tahu Trust Board took Te Kereeme to the reformed Waitangi Tribunal at the earliest possible opportunity (Dacker op cit P 133). Hearings ran from late 1987 to late 1989 and Ngai Tahu had to sell most of its assets to pay for the case. In 1991 the Tribunal presented
its report which found that the Crown had repeatedly wrongly deprived Ngai Tahu of lands they wished to retain. In 1997 Te Kereemewas finally settled, Ngai Tahu receiving among other things, a personal apology from the Queen and $170 million dollars (Office of the Minister in Charge of Treaty Negotiations 1996).

One of the pieces of legislation passed since the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1985 which has particular relevance to this thesis is the Resource Management Act (RMA91) which was passed into law in 1991. The RMA91 aims ‘to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources’ (S5(1)), and included among those resources are the country’s ‘outstanding natural features and landscapes’ (S6(b)). Thus, the RMA91 will feature in many aspects of this thesis. However, at this point it is important to note that the Act formalises a relationship between Māori and the Crown with relation to management of these natural and physical resources. Part II of the Act establishes its Purpose and Principles. Section 6 of Part II requires that all persons exercising functions under the Act must, as a matter of national importance, provide for ‘(e) The relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga’. In addition, Section 7 requires these persons to have particular regard to kaitiakitanga. This is defined in the Act as ‘the exercise of guardianship; and, in relation to a resource, includes the ethic of stewardship based on the nature of the resource itself’ (RMA91 S2). Further Section 8 of the Act states:

_Treaty of Waitangi_ – In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi).

(A comprehensive analysis of the provisions of the RMA that recognise Māori interests is reproduced in Appendix IV) Thus, the Resource Management Act ensures that Iwi have some say in the management of the environment in their traditional region. However, to understand the significance of this it is necessary to look at the relationships which Māori have with their landscapes and how the process of colonisation has disrupted them.
4.3 The colonisation of the landscape

In the discussion thus far, I have constructed my narrative using the discourses of history, and to a lesser degree, archaeology. These discourses construct identifiable events and quantifiable resources, and are essentially Pākehā in terms of the cultural archive from which they are derived\(^{24}\). I now want to change to a more emic approach in order to discuss the ways in which the landscape (as opposed to the land) was colonised.

I have already discussed, in Chapter Two, the conception of landscape as the dynamic interrelationship between discourse, the discursive object and action, and between differing discourse-object-action triads. Thus in talking about the colonisation of the landscape I am talking about the imposition of discourses and the consequent actions taken to make the physical world coincide with the discursive. In Russell's words:

> Depending on how landscape and land ownership are conceptualised, the behaviour employed to recreate a particular landscape will be influenced by its present or intended future economic use and the consequent expected added value that such action, or lack of action, will place upon it (2000 P175).

The earliest Polynesian settlers of Te Waipounamu interpreted the landscape and its resources through their existing discursive frames and acted accordingly. The extinction of the moa was one consequence of this but as Russell observes:

> ...our histories tell us that these early colonisers soon became aware that changes would be necessary if they and their mahika kai sources were to survive. Thus they adopted a form of conservation and sustainable landscape management which would ensure this for themselves and the unborn for generations (ibid P140).

In part, this process was completed by the planting of whakapapa over the landscape which Tau says:

> ...had a two fold effect where it: a) acted as an external cultural marker upon the mind and at the same time, b) made sure the land became the Tupuna. This was the first act of the colonising of nature by culture (Tau 1999 P 29 cited in Russell ibid P163).

The process of European colonisation can be analysed in a similar way. Pākehā interpreted the landscape and its resources through their discursive frames and also acted accordingly. This time, however, the landscape was occupied but, as Russell

\(^{24}\) However, it is also the case that Atholl Anderson and Khyla Russell, on whose research the first half of this chapter is largely based, identify as Kai Tahu themselves.
points out, ‘...the dominant beliefs of the incoming colonisers paid scant attention to the belief systems of the already resident Mana Whenua Kai Tahu…’ (ibid P187). This section examines some of the aspects and impacts of these processes. It does so from three perspectives; by examining conceptions of ownership of land; the processes of naming land; and the function and use of land. In doing so I take the view that these actions and perceptions are the stuff of which landscape is made.

4.3.1 In the beginning

It is necessary for an understanding of the relation between Kai Tahu and the landscape of Te Waipounamu to detail, at some length, their creation mythology, and I paraphrase from the work of Khyla Russell to this end (see Russell 2000 Pp152 – 155 for a more detailed version).

Papatuānuku (the earth mother) was not first wife of Rakinui (the sky father). The first wife was Te Pōkohārua o te Pō and she had several sons including Āoraki, Rakirua, Rakiroa, and Rarakiroa. Āoraki and his brothers decided to undertake a journey to view Rakinui’s new wife, Papatuānuku. While travelling in the dark southern ocean they became hungry and, failing to catch any fish to eat, decided to return to Rakinui. A powerful karakia was required to separate the great waka from Papatuānuku and the fearful cries of the crew led to Āoraki’s strength failing him at a crucial moment. The bow, which had been successfully raised from the water, crashed onto the earth and shattered forming the islands of the Marlborough Sounds. The waka tilted and the brothers were forced to climb onto its side to save themselves from drowning. The waka and all aboard were turned to stone forming Te Tiritiri o te Moana (the Southern Alps) Āoraki being the highest peak. The South Island itself became known as Te Waka o Āoraki, Āoraki’s canoe. At the time of this catastrophe the landscape of the island was stark, rocky and totally devoid of life. Here the mythology connects with other Maori creation myths and sees Papatuānuku and Rakinui filling the world with life: the trees, the birds, the fish, the people. Thus, for Kai Tahu, not only are all the living creatures of this land related by descent, but the very land itself is also part of this great web of kinship.
The understanding of this relationship with the land and its resources is critical to understanding the differences between Māori and Pākehā epistemologies of landscape and to understanding the process and impact of colonisation on Kai Tahu and other Iwi. In Russell’s words:

> Whakapapa is the backbone that permits humankind to interact with their lands and landscapes. In this way, the earth and sky were understood as our original parents, while the sea, flora and fauna and all the elements of the natural world were also connected to us as people through a web of common kinship (Russell ibid P 218).

This kinship connection combined with the specific environmental conditions in the South Island to produce a specific relationship with the land.

### 4.3.2 Ownership

As the previous sections make clear, pre-European Kai Tahu lived in a cooperative relationship with the land. While heredity provided rights of use and access to resources, individuals could not be said to ‘own’ the land in the European sense of the term. Russell quotes one of her respondents as saying ‘...the land is something that you look after for future generations, not something that you can own’. Pākehā imposed new values on the land meaning ‘...it was only valuable for improvement and ownership, where our ideas were, it was of value all the time and cannot be diminished’ (J Waaka quoted in Russell P 187). The idea that land could not be ‘owned’ by Māori had an unfortunate parallel in European views of land ownership. Byrnes describes as a ‘commonly held view’ among early settlers:

> ...that Maori, due to their ‘unsettled inhabitation’ could not be the true and legal owners of the land, whereas ‘the people of Europe, too closely pent up at home’, were ‘lawfully entitled to take possession of the waste [land] and settle it with colonies’. (Byrnes 2001 P17)

Thus European settlement was justified and even a moral imperative.

One of the primary means in which these new values were imposed on Māori was through surveying and the institution of individual and family titles. Byrnes argues that:

> The surveying of land, with its delineation of boundaries, partitioning of land and confirmation of property rights, was considered a necessary philosophical struggle between humanity and nature, civilisation and the wilderness (ibid P18).
As has been alluded to already, this ‘civilising’ process of surveying had a number of important impacts on Kai Tahu, not the least their near starvation. However, variations in response to the imposition of the European system of land ownership are still evident today.

Perhaps the most obvious result of and response to the individualisation of title on the Otago Peninsula has been the sale of land. Original blocks were small. After World War I some lands were leased or sold to Pākehā as families moved to more lucrative employment after the men returned from overseas. Post World War II saw the sale of further blocks as dairying was replaced by sheep farming. One respondent stood with me on top of a hill and pointed out, within one viewshed, the sites of five homesteads that had disappeared in the past fifty years (Field Diary 29/5/00). He described haymaking as a community activity where the women and girls cooked, the boys gathered the coils of cut hay and the men built the haystacks. The sale of the land represents a diminution of community, as well as a changing economy.

According to Francis, a local Kaumatua, by 1987 only about 40% of the original Māori land on the Peninsula remained in Māori ownership. This is an issue for those who are left as he explained:

Of course, if the people haven’t got the land, or the land to come back to, then they’re less likely to come back and frequent the area, they haven’t got the ties. So land’s quite important really, in terms of keeping our people. I think, for example, we’d struggle to have the sort of cohesiveness or strength that the Rūnanga has enjoyed; more than other areas where they’ve lost their land. Where the people move away, where there’s nothing to hold them there you get skeleton forces looking after the place, or none at all (Int 15, Tangata whenua, 13/6/00).

While acknowledging that the sale of land impacts on the ability of the community to maintain itself Francis was very clear that the Runanga had little direct influence on

---

25 It must be acknowledged, however, that there are many places on the Peninsula that this would be the case. A major difference here is that the respondent named the owners and outlined their interrelationships.
the situation. This he stressed was because:

...what land is left is held individually, as individual title. It’s not Rūnanga land, or Otakou land. It belongs to individuals within families descended from the original owner and there’s little we can do to assist (Int 15, Tangata Whenua, 13/6/00).

Instead, the Rūnanga is seeking ways of developing the local economy in a way that would enable people to stay, or return, to the kaik.

Seeing the land as held in individual ownership is something of an oversimplification, however. One legal structure being used on at least one block of land is a Whanau Trust. Rather than ‘individual ownership’ with its connotations of a single person controlling the title to the land, a Whanau Trust means the land is owned by the Trust for the members of the whanau and their descendents in perpetuity. Thus, there may be an individual title, in the Pākehā, legalistic sense, but there is a substantial and growing group which has a relationship with that piece of land.

On being shown around this property by the respondent, I was struck by the fact that he identified blocks of land, not just his own but other pieces of land in the area, by their lot numbers. Once each piece of land would have been known by whakapapa as the wakawaka of particular families. Later during interview he said to me:

...as I’ve said about the place, I have very deep feelings about this place and since it’s all that’s left, virtually, in this place, I feel that I cannot sell it. So that’s why I’ve made this a Whanau Trust. Because a Whanau Trust goes on forever, it doesn’t stop like a normal general trust. (Int 6, Tangata Whenua, 29/5/00)

He continued:

...the old fella, waiting up there (laughs and makes punching gesture), he’d be waiting up there for me alright if I sold it off just for personal gain or boredom or whatever. The way I feel about it is, as I said to [Name removed], at one stage there he said, ‘I’ll pay you twice what it’s worth’. I says, ‘You can’t pay what it’s worth, not to me anyway’. I said, ‘Look at it this way. My ancestors came here. They lived on the land. They lived off the land. They fought over it; they bled into it; they were buried under it. You can’t buy my ancestors.’ So that’s the way I feel about it and I don’t sell. (Int 6, Tangata Whenua, 29/5/00)

26 A ‘kaik’ is a village or settlement known as a kaika in northern Kai Tahu dialect and a kainga in North Island dialects.
This determination to maintain the ownership of the whanau’s land is not without personal cost. The land area is small and uneconomic and the respondent’s wife commented that if they were not retired they would not be able to cope.

A Māori Incorporation owns another large block of land at Otakou. This Incorporation was established by a group of siblings in the 1960s for tax purposes, and to enable the purchase of adjoining properties. The Incorporation is now broken into forty indivisible shares which are held by the descendents of the original owner of the original block. A manager (Morgan), himself a shareholder, is employed to run the farm by a committee which is, itself, answerable to the shareholders.

Morgan described the pressure to continually expand under which farmers have found themselves in past years. To remain economic the Incorporation has, in recent years, begun buying land further south on the Peninsula and now it owns most of the iconic hill, Harbour Cone (Hereweka). The total area which they now own, is both economic and about the maximum one person could manage. By maintaining both blocks the Incorporation manages to satisfy both the need for an economic return and the retention of the family’s land. Morgan expressed his attachment to the place thus:

I was brought up here, so this is just home to me. I know the history behind the place so I wouldn’t really like to lose it. There’s a sense of wanting to keep it. I wouldn’t like to see it sold just for the money or anything like that. I couldn’t see the sense behind that and I think that probably if it’s managed properly there’ll never be a reason to sell it (Int 31, Tangata Whenua, 22/9/00).

His comment about not selling ‘just for the money’ echoes the comments of the previous respondent.

Some of the land does remain in individual or family titles however. One means of dealing with this seems to be to keep ownership but to leave the land alone. The few
pieces of land I know of for which this approach is taken are small and subsumed by
the surroundings. Thus, one is a small piece of bush-clad land which is contiguous
with bush on land owned by the Yellow-eyed Penguin Trust. Another is a road
corridor which actually belongs to this Māori Incorporation but which crosses Okia
Flat. Of this land Morgan said, ‘We’ve got no intentions of ever using that, unless we
got forced into it somewhere down the line. We should never, ever, have to use that’.
He continued:

> It gets back to what you were saying before about them [the shareholders]. They
don’t like selling land unless they really, really have to, so they have it; it’s there;
it’ll always be there. We have no intentions of stepping on their [the adjoining
landowner’s] toes or anything like that, and they’re looking after it. That’s why it
wasn’t sold or given away to them but it’s there, and like you say, one day it might
come in handy (mutual laughter) (Int 31, Tangata Whenua, 22/9/00).

This echoes, perhaps paradoxically, the claim by Russell that:

> ...Kai Tahu as recognised Mana Whenua have felt no need to own or permanently
inhabit all of their landscapes, in order to stay connected with them spiritually. Nor
have they considered this essential to the retention of their status of kaitiakitaka over
these landscapes of Te Waipounamu.

In this instance, however, the land is clearly owned by Mana Whenua, though not
inhabited, but they see no need to exercise control over it.

In conclusion, the comments of Barbara and Wiremu sum up well the conception of
land as tupuna, and of the connection which is felt with that tupuna:

B: Maybe I’ve lived with Maori long enough to have much the same attitude.
The land is a living thing. It’s like a person isn’t it? Well you call it your
bones? don’t you?

W: Yeah

B: Your ancestors, I suppose that is more or less their attitude.

W: Right

B: Part of the family.

W: Yeah

B: You’d no sooner sell it than your daughter or your son or your grandmother.
(Int 6, Tangata Whenua, 29/5/00)

---

27 The word for tribe, iwi, also means bones.
4.3.3 Naming and claiming

Part of the process of colonising the land undertaken by both Māori and later Pākehā settlers was the application of names to the landscape. In Byrnes’ (2001) words:

As each colonising group imposed place names on the land, they did so over those of the colonised. The historical landscape of Aotearoa / New Zealand may, therefore, be read as a cultural palimpsest where the layers of systems of nomenclature provide an index to its history of occupancy and colonisation (P 80).

What we have then, at this point in time, is an incredibly complex layering of different languages, dialects and discourses, woven into knots and webs interlaced with power dynamics. Much of the unpicking of these complexities is beyond the scope of this study and probably belongs in the realm of sociolinguistics. However, it is my aim to discuss some of the aspects of these processes which directly impact on discourses of land and landscape and to suggest other areas of interest for further study.

In discussing the naming of landscape it is very easy to fall into the trap of assuming that the names which are so familiar to us now have some sort of permanence. However, an examination of almost any old map will illustrate clearly that current names are not necessarily long standing, and that many of the early European names have already fallen from use. That the same fluidity exists with Māori placenames is clearly the case, although the process of European colonisation has clearly had a major impact on the process of place name change, which I will discuss further shortly.

Stevens’ (1976) study of Māori placenames around Dunedin points out a number of factors which have made them unstable. Placenames may have alternate forms and both these forms and varying names may not all be in use at the same time. More
names may be remembered than were in use at any given time and the origins of names may be lost. Further, alterations to the landscape may result in named features no longer existing. In addition, Kai Tahu were only just establishing themselves around Dunedin at the time of first European contact.

Byrnes characterises the process of naming by Europeans as an act of power. She says:

Names inscribed on the land by the early surveyors were deliberate and provocative statements of power; they were assertions of presence and signifiers of occupation. Place names are not simply words imposed on a blank space, but are evidence of historical events which expressed the intentions – as well as the actions – of the namer (op cit p 80).

It could be argued that this is always the case. That is, that all names are assertions of presence and that names which ‘stick’ and gain popular usage are those which have currency within the dominant discourses. A comparison between Stevens’ map of Māori placenames on the northern reaches of the Peninsula and a current map, reproduced below (Figs 4.8 and 4.9), is informative in this regard. Clearly the names which have ‘stuck’ are overwhelmingly European.

To assume that the Māori names given by Stevens have long term veracity would also be mistaken. While being shown over one respondent’s property he made, what seemed at the time to be, a quite cryptic comment. Waving at the beach in the distance he said, ‘I always thought that was called Bibigaru until I saw it written down.’ Later in the journey I noted that he referred to the ‘goai’ trees growing on his property (Field notes 30/5/00). The beach he was referring to is known more widely as Pipikaretu, and the trees he was talking about are more usually known as kōwhai. What I realised later was that I was hearing examples of the old southern dialect which is now, reputedly, almost extinct. The replacement of ‘k’ for ‘ng’ in Māori words is just one of the features of this dialect and the only one which has been retained in common usage.
Fig 4.8: Stevens' map of Maori Placenames around the northern reaches of the Otago Peninsula
Other features which have been largely lost, particularly from the ‘official Maori’ which I, as a Pākehā, have access to are detailed by Griffiths (2002 Pp76-83). (Also see Entwistle 1998). Several of these have, however, been alluded to already in the text of this Chapter (Robulla for Rauparaha, tagata bola, kaik for kaika). One placename on the Otago Peninsula which has (probably) retained its original essence is Tomahawk. This is described by Griffiths (2002 P 72) as:

\[\ldots\text{the kind of name which later led the European community into all kinds of absurd etymological ramblings and apologetic acknowledgements of ‘corruption’. But it was simply the southern Maori pronunciation of ‘tomahaka’}.\]

Māori placenames on the Peninsula and throughout Otago and Southland have undergone a process of standardisation through the imposition, to a large extent by Pākehā, of northern dialect forms.

---

28One of the deep ironies of this is that Pakeha like myself who want to avoid further colonisation of the Maori language often go to great pains to apply what we believe to be the ‘rules’ and thus eschew pronunciations such as ‘Tautuk’ for ‘Tautuku’ thinking we are being ‘more correct’. Infact we are probably contributing to the demise of the Southern dialect.
It is also the case that placenames which may at first sight (sound?) appear to be Māori, may, in fact, be Pākehā appellations. An example of this is Taiaroa Head, at the northern tip of the Peninsula, which is known to local Māori as Pukekura. Pukekura is a site of ‘national and local importance’ to Māori (Kai Tahu ki Otago Natural Resource Management Plan (NRMP) P51). Local mythology refers to Maui taking shelter under its lee to repair a torn sail (NRMP P49). It is subject to an ancillary claim to the Waitangi Tribunal, which is still unsettled, and is a site which raises concerns for local Māori in terms of the inadequate protection afforded the cultural sites on the headland, and the failure to restore kaitiakitanga to Mana Whenua (NRMP P52).\footnote{The headland is occupied by an Albatross colony. As a result of its presence the site is designated a nature reserve managed by the Department of Conservation and access to nature reserves is by permit only. Further, the Albatross colony, along with Pakeha historical relics, is the focus of a substantial tourist venture managed by the Otago Peninsula Trust. See Sims (2000).} The headland was known as Taiaroa’s Head in the early European period but later became Taiaroa Head (Knight 1979). The possessive form of the first form alludes to the presence in the area of Chief Taiaroa, who was a famous character in the area during the early years of European settlement.

Fig 4.10: Pukekura, otherwise known as Taiaroa Head. (Photo, author 1999)
Further, in 1894 the Aotearoa / New Zealand Government passed into legislation the Designation of Districts Act. This Act was designed to stop the proliferation of duplicated placenames and had two key clauses. The first of these stated that when a placename needed to be altered to remove a duplication, ‘...in all such alterations and future naming, preference shall be given to the original Maori names’. The second stated that whenever a place

...is generally known or named by a name professing to be a Maori name, but is not the true spelling of the said Maori name, or is a corruption thereof, the Governor may...alter the name of such locality or natural feature as aforesaid in consonance with the correct Maori orthography (cited in Griffiths 2002 P 20).

Some of the consequences of this second provision have already been illustrated. The consequence of the first of these provisions, however, has been the use of apparently Māori placenames which were often Pākehā impositions, sometimes translations of European names for places, and always filtered through the Native Department in Wellington which imposed North Island orthographic conventions. (See Griffiths for a fascinating exposition of this process and its consequences.)

That this complex process of the colonisation of both the land and the language has been resisted can be seen from the above discussion. The Māori Renaissance of the 1970s and 1980s may have increased interest in acting to protect and promote the language and to reinstate placenames and their correct pronunciation. It may simply have made the concerns of Māori more audible to Pākehā. In any event resistance took more institutional forms. In 1989, for example, a petitioner made a submission to the New Zealand Geographic Board (NZGB), the body established in 1947 to rule on the naming of places in Aotearoa / New Zealand, to restore the traditional place names of three beaches just to the north of the Otago Harbour. The NZGB decided that the arguments in favour of this restitution were sound and that the names should be changed accordingly. The loud and virulent response to this proposal, the study of which is the focus of a paper by Berg and Kerns (1996), was so concerted in its resistance that the NZGB was forced to back down. Key amongst the issues for local Dunedinites, were resistance to changing English names to Māori, and that the petitioner, despite being Mana Whenua of the area by whakapapa, lived in the North Island and therefore was not considered by local Pākehā to have standing in the community. As Berg and Kerns state:
The politics of naming places in this instance is both a *politics of space* (deciding who names and controls space) and a *spatialized politics* (whereby the spatial defines who has legitimacy to speak) (op cit P 111 Emphasis in original).

In this instance and at this time, local Pākehā maintained their control over both the space and the naming of it.

This was not to be the case for very much longer. The Ngai Tahu Settlement Act reinvests some seventy-eight traditional names to sites of importance to Kai Tahu, including those promoted for restitution in 1989. Thus in a relatively short period, 1989 to 1997, the tides of power turned (albeit that the names are now duplicated and, other than the corrected spelling of Purukaunui, the English imposed names remain). However, this process was not necessarily one with which all Kai Tahu felt satisfied. Russell recounts that for some Kai Tahu the inclusion of the seventy-eight names elevated those names above others and lead to much dissatisfaction. This was paralleled by a sense that the opinions of the university educated who ran the negotiation process were given more weight than those of others (Russell op cit P55). Thus some Kai Tahu continue to feel aggrieved at the loss of certain traditional names, against the background of others being given mainstream support.

Thus it is clear that the colonisation of the landscape through naming has gone hand-in-hand with linguistic colonisation and that both of these processes have been continually resisted. Given that our knowledge of the world is discursively constructed, this is unsurprising. The combination of linguistic colonisation, colonisation of the landscape, and the actions of resistance has had specific and particular impacts in the southern South Island. Together these processes of colonisation have produced a very complex situation. Thus Byrnes' comment quoted earlier about 'layers of systems of nomenclature', whilst apt, oversimplifies the situation. Far from neat layers of impositions, 'statements of power...and signifiers of occupation', they are more a tangle of knotted and interwoven strands, requiring patient untangling, much like woollen yarn after a cat has played with it, rather than the neat archaeological excavation suggested by the metaphor of layers. I consider that this untangling is a process which needs to be undertaken, but which is, apart from this superficial attempt, beyond the scope of this project.
4.3.4 Function

As outlined above, in pre-European times, Kai Tahu Whanui maintained relatively permanent home places, but spent a significant amount of time travelling their region visiting and attending to the widely dispersed mahika kai. These were visited on a seasonal basis to gather foodstuffs and other resources, such as pounamu. As Russell (op cit P140) points out, the activities of the first human tūpuna had been, in many ways, environmentally destructive, the extinction of the moa being an extreme example of this. However, she argues that a form of sustainable management developed quite rapidly. Of this she says:

Kai Tahu environmental protection was essential for two reasons: the caring of tūpuna who are the landscape since all things derived from it including ourselves came from the same set of primeval parents was the first. The second was essential to ensure the survival and continuation of us as an Iwi (op cit P 141)

Russell characterises the resulting Kai Tahu approach to land use as being working with the landscape, as opposed her characterisation of the Pākehā view of working on the land.

All the Otakou respondents I interviewed were involved in farming their land. For Wiremu and his wife farming was essential to pay the rates and insurance, and to prevent fire hazards from developing either through rank grass or weed growth. Without their superannuation they could not make ends meet. In order to increase the economic viability of the land for the Whanau Trust they are examining possible diversification, either into tourism, or into nut production. Wiremu and Barbara commented that their daughter would like to see the place all in native trees, and recognised that retiring the land and revegetating it was a definite possibility. However, some sort of income is necessary in the mean time to finance the transition.

This produces a tension between feeling for the land and pragmatic considerations. Wiremu and Barbara discussed it thus:

W: The land does need looking after because it’s starting to get aged and the wrinkles are falling off.

B: It’s cold, yes it’s cold. It needs its clothes back on.

While much of this thesis will demonstrate that this Pakeha characterisation is an oversimplification, at this point I will let it stand as a part of Russell’s exposition of the Kai Tahu view.
One of Russell’s respondents described feeling an inner tension between his Māori feelings for his land and what it was necessary for him to do to earn a living from it (op cit P195). Another (Otakou) respondent is described as:

...not act[ing] aggressively upon his farming landscape by ploughing it, because there was so much history in that land that could be irrevocably disturbed by turning it over to serve our needs (Russell op cit P194).

Interestingly, this same man said to me of his farm:

It’s not being pushed as it might have been. When I first went back to run the place you grazed every blade of grass and that’s how it was, you know. Farming was pushed and you tried to squeeze everything out of it (Int 15, Tangata Whenua, 13/6/00)

He continued to say that the rural downturn of the 1980s made the effort required of farming of questionable value, and that as this coincided with an increase in work for the Rūnanga he ‘let things coast along a bit’ but ended saying ‘I always was conservative anyhow, the way I grazed it’.

It would seem that this somewhat contradictory narrative exemplifies the tension between Māori feeling for the land and agricultural production. I would speculate that this tension is underlain with conflicting discourses, which are characterised in Fig 4.11 below. While the next chapter will cast much more light on the agricultural discourse it can be seen that the idea of the land as a mother caring for, and being cared for in turn, by her offspring is in direct conflict with the idea of the land as a resource for economic exploitation. What is particularly interesting here is that the conflict between these discourses is being expressed intrapersonally. The economic imperative of the hegemonic Pākehā system is internalised in these respondents, along with the Māori imperative to foster a mutual relationship, demonstrating clearly an impact of colonisation. The respondents have access to both cultural archives but the subject positions created by conflicting discourses, when internalised, lead to personal feelings of inner conflict.
On the broader scale, of course, the conflict leads to Māori land owners being assessed as poor farmers because their actions are not as ‘efficient’ in an agricultural sense as is required by the agricultural discourse alone. Russell notes that her examination of Kai Tahu farmers shows that:

...their farming practices are almost always different from those of their Tauiwi counterparts and this relates to the differing cultural conceptualisation of landscape and the need to minimalise the type of assault farming might afflict on Papatuanuku (op cit P 207-208 Emphasis in original).

She also states that this approach resulted in, ‘Yet another opinion...that the Tahu farmers of the area [Otakou] were lazy, as they underutilised their blocks of land’ (ibid P127).

An example of this difference can be seen in attitudes expressed towards topdressing. While I discuss this further in the next chapter, the advent of topdressing is widely considered to be a major breakthrough for Peninsula agriculture in the twentieth century, increasing both stocking rates and the quality of stock. Wiremu, however, expressed concern about the impact of topdressing on the water quality of the harbour, Barbara also claiming that topdressing on the hills around them leads to seagrass spreading ‘like crazy’. While conceding that the use of superphosphate is also simply uneconomic for them, and questioning its efficacy anyway, Wiremu would prefer to use a liquid seaweed foliar feed which he described as ‘organic, virtually’.

---

Fig 4.11: The conflict between the discourses of ‘landscape as tupuna’ and ‘agriculture’.
Part of caring for the land for Wiremu, putting its ‘clothes back on’, would, ideally be, restoring forest cover. Wiremu was clear that land instability on the Peninsula (which threatens his home) is due to the clearance of forest for farming. To this end he was annoyed that the Dunedin Draft District Plan was not more supportive of tree planting and forestry. While their daughter may have favoured indigenous species, Wiremu and Barbara did not, having planted pines and eucalyptus for land stability, shelter and investment. Wiremu would like to plant more trees to both control gorse and as an investment. ‘I would be quite interested if we had the money and the enthusiasm,’ he said.

Thus part of the process of the colonisation of the landscape has been a dramatic alteration in the function of the land and attendant changes in the practices imposed upon it. In pre-European times a symbiotic relationship developed, as a matter of necessity, between Māori and the land and its resources. This relationship was disrupted by both the imposition of European conceptions of ownership and European economic processes and imperatives. Contemporary Māori on the Otago Peninsula (and probably elsewhere) are still attempting to reconcile the contradictions inherent in these different cultural systems.

4.4 Conclusion

In the introduction to this chapter I stated that the theoretical framework being applied to this study leads me to expect that different cultures will construct different landscapes through the application of different discourses from within their cultural archives. I have examined the construction of the landscapes of the Mana Whenua from this perspective, and, inescapably, from a Pākehā perspective also. Thus the features which I have noted are the ones which seem most different to my own constructions, but also the ones which explain phenomena most clearly.

The key aspect of the Mana Whenua understanding of landscape is the conception of land as tupuna. It is critical to understand that this is not a metaphorical construction. The Mana Whenua connection to the land is a literal blood tie. The land is kin. Talk of ‘putting clothes back on the land’ is, on the other hand, metaphorical, referring as it
does to the planting of trees on the landscape. While it is built upon the kin relationship with the landscape it is an adaptation of English language forms and is a metaphor of caring for the kin that is landscape.

The relationship with the land as tupuna underlies the activities which are appropriate on the land. Holding the land in trust for the whanau, at personal cost, is a consequence of this relationship, as is mitigating farming practices because they are not good for the landscape. However, the practices which are now feasible are constrained and dictated by European discourses – of economics, of ownership, of lifestyle, of agriculture. Many of these discourses have been and are actively embraced. However, the effects of the colonisation by Pākehā of the land, the landscape and the language have been to diminish the strength of the Māori discourses, and the ability of Māori to act appropriately according to traditional ways.

In the past the conception of caring for the land which cares for its people in turn led to some notable impacts on the landscape of the Otago Peninsula. It is probable that some burning of land cover occurred, both accidental and purposeful, with the intent of stimulating the regrowth of bracken fern. Cabbage trees were cultivated and areas for habitation cleared of vegetation and the land itself reshaped. The relationships between people and their landscape were codified in the system of names of sites and landscape features.

Aotearoa / New Zealand was, then, far from *terra nullius* when Europeans arrived on its shores. It was an inhabited landscape with a people (or peoples) with rich and long histories and attachments to places. The colonisers’ discourses, however, rapidly gained ascendancy and with them came land clearance, private ownership, agriculture, urbanisation, and the suppression (sometimes active, sometimes simply by the act of ignoring) of Māori actions in the landscape. Māori constructions of landscape have been consistently ignored and constantly overridden. As such Māori have been forced to adopt and adapt Pākehā ways of doing things. In the past few decades the Māori Renaissance, particularly the idea of partnership based on the Treaty of Waitangi, has dramatically increased the power of Māori and their ability to have a voice in the management of the landscape. This has led to the co-management of a number of sites on the Otago Peninsula, in particular Okia Flat, Te Rauone.
reserve, and Pilots Beach. However, as the example of Pukekura illustrates, when the issues are complex and when money is involved, settlement becomes much more difficult to obtain.

The next four chapters detail Pākehā discourses of land management evident on the Otago Peninsula. Together with the material discussed in this chapter, these discourses interact to produce the landscape of that place. This chapter should, if nothing else, ensure that the reader is clear that the Pākehā way is not the only way, and that what is described and analysed in these further chapters are cultural constructions also.
Chapter Five: The agricultural discourse

5.1 Introduction

European style agriculture\(^1\), it could be argued, has done more to form the landscape of Aotearoa/New Zealand, and much of our national character, than any other human driven force. In order to pursue their agrarian goals European settlers cleared vast tracts of indigenous forest. Grasses and cereals were sown, sheep and cattle grazed. McLauchlan (1981 P11) argues that:

> The history of New Zealand farming is in a real sense the history of New Zealand. Until the Second World War all life here was powerfully conditioned by what happened in the country.

This chapter outlines the history of European style agriculture on the Otago Peninsula and discusses the agricultural discourse of land management as it is exemplified in the research corpus.

Fairclough (2003 P129) states that there are basically two steps to identifying a discourse. The first is identifying the main parts of the world which it constructs, and the second is to identify the perspective from which these parts of the world are constructed\(^2\). In the case of this description of the agricultural discourse, the 'parts of the world' begin with the farmers' own land, and the 'perspectives' with their personal relationships to that land. Further aspects of the discourse have been identified at points of resistance. At these points of resistance clearly related 'parts of the world' were portrayed, and similarities in the 'perspectives' expressed enabled these parts to be connected into a larger whole.

This discourse of land management constructs the land as an economic resource and promotes actions which maintain and promote economic returns from that land. It is in common usage within the farming community on the Otago Peninsula and within

---

1 Māori made extensive modifications to the landscape in some parts of Aotearoa/New Zealand in order to facilitate horticulture. However, these were limited to relatively small areas in comparison to the modifications made to facilitate European style agriculture, and were limited to the North Island and the northern half of the South Island, the climate being too harsh further south for the subtropical crops.

2 Fairclough actually uses the word 'represents' rather than 'constructs' as I do here. For a discussion of the epistemological differences between his approach and mine see Chapter Two.
associated organisations such as Federated Farmers\(^3\) and the Ministry of Forestry. Thus, its use is not exclusive to any one group, nor is its use entirely consistent within any one person’s expression. The agricultural discourse, which I present in the rest of this chapter, is a patchwork of pieces stitched together. While there may be pieces missing from the patchwork, I believe there are sufficient pieces to support my argument that this is an identifiable discourse.

5.2 A brief history of farming on the Otago Peninsula

The earliest European style farm on the Otago Peninsula was Kelvin Grove established at what is now known as Harrington Point in the early 1840s. The farm produced dairy products and vegetables for the first organised European settlers who arrived in 1848 (Eccles 1944). It was still in production in 1863, the land being leased from its Māori owners. However it was soon to be buried under a sand blow\(^4\), which also buried a Māori village, and stopped production. Another European family settled at the southern end of the Peninsula in 1844 anticipating the imminent arrival of the New Zealand Company settlers. Giving their name to the area, Anderson’s Bay, they lived what has been described as ‘...a Robinson Crusoe type of existence’ (Huggett 1966) until the settlers finally arrived in 1848.

The financial organisation of the settlement of Otago was based upon the sale of land shares. These shares, two thousand in total, consisted of a quarter acre town section, a ten acre suburban section and a fifty acre rural lot. The original survey was carried out on this basis as can still be seen on a modern cadastral (Fig 5:1). It would seem that this share system was intended primarily as an investment scheme as its instigators themselves suggested to potential buyers the possibility of group purchases and the profitable sale of ten acre blocks (Hocken 1995 133).

---

\(^3\) Federated Farmers is the national industry organisation and lobby group which represents farmers interests in a wide range of areas. Membership of Federated Farmers was, until the 1980s, compulsory, levies being charged on the sale of agricultural produce.

\(^4\) Erosion of the sand dunes around the Otago coastline occurred early in European settlement, due to the burning of the indigenous dune species, and to stock browsing. In a number of places this resulted in windborne sand burying substantial areas of land (Eccles 1944).
Organised settlement of the suburban and rural zones of the Peninsula began in 1848 and focused on Anderson’s Bay and Portobello. In the first instance, Anderson’s Bay was readily accessible by boat from Dunedin, the intervening land, now South Dunedin, being swamp. In the second instance, Portobello was readily accessible by boat from Port Chalmers. The use of the harbour for transport continued into the twentieth century, but the construction of land routes followed settlement, firstly the ‘high road’ to Portobello followed by the ‘low road’ built in the 1860s and 1870s (see Chapter Four).

The first task facing the settlers was to clear the dense broadleaf-podocarp forest which covered the Peninsula to the water’s edge. The main method of land clearance
was to fell the trees, leave them to dry over summer, and then burn them in February or March (Huggett 1966). In some areas the stumps were dragged into windrows to act as temporary fences and at least one is still in existence today (Fig 5:2). The Gold Rushes of the early 1860s contributed to the settlement of the Peninsula as miners returned with money to buy land and to employ less financially well off neighbours to clear their land. Thus Walter Riddell recorded in his diary that in 1865 he charged £75 to clear ten acres of land for a neighbour (cited in Knight 1979 P 37).

Fig 5.2: A windrow remaining from the original clearance of the land, Braidwood Rd, Otago Peninsula. The trees in the background are *Cupressus macrocarpa*, a highly characteristic, exotic, species planted extensively in the area as windbreaks and recently for timber. (Photo – author 1999).

Clearing the forest from the land on the Peninsula’s southern reaches exposed extremely stony ground. It was necessary to clear the stones to facilitate ploughing. Stone scoops, something like huge galvanised iron sugar scoops, were dragged across the ground by teams of horses, and the accumulated stones often used to build dry stone walls, houses, dairies and other buildings (Fig 5:3). In some places stones were placed rather unskilfully and combined with post and rail or post and wire fences. By 1896 only scattered remnants of bush remained, approximately 11% of the land area (Huggett 1966), but bush clearance continued until the 1960s.
Initially the newly cleared land was sown in oats, but fertility declined rapidly and pasture soon replaced them. Dairying became the predominant land use on the Peninsula, sheep being grazed on the more inaccessible and rougher areas. In 1871 Aotearoa / New Zealand’s first co-operative dairy company was established at Springfield on the Otago Peninsula and in 1877 a second cheese factory was opened at Harbour Cone. In addition to the cheese factories, creameries operated at Sandymount, Wickliffe Bay, Lower Portobello, and Otakou. However, Knight (1979) notes that while the dairy industry on the Peninsula built to a peak in the 1890s, this was also the beginning of its demise. The small, fifty and one hundred acre, farms were becoming uneconomical and their consolidation into larger blocks began around the turn of the twentieth century. In addition, the development of refrigerated shipping in 1882 meant that sheep farming for meat as well as wool became an attractive proposition.

The first half of the twentieth century continued in a similar vein. Infact Heenan (1979) shows that relative depopulation occurred in rural areas nationally right through the twentieth century up to the 1970s, and by 1991 only 12% of New Zealand’s population was rural (Tong & Cox 2000 P27). More recent increases in
rural populations tend to be in areas around urban centres as a result of the development of lifestyle blocks. A mix of sheep and dairy farming continued on the Otago Peninsula, the dairy farms being either 'town supply' providing milk for domestic consumption or 'Cadburys', selling their milk directly to the chocolate manufacturer in Dunedin city. The 1960s and 1970s saw another wave of land consolidation occur. The current generation of farmers, in taking over the land, found it necessary to expand their holdings resulting in farms made up of five or six of the original farm blocks. Dairying continued to decrease in importance, and today only one dairy farm is left on the Peninsula. Diversification into deer and goats has been attempted, but only one deer farm continues and goats are no longer farmed. Tourism has become the diversification of the late twentieth, early twenty-first century, rural economy and this is a growing activity on the Otago Peninsula.

5.3 The agricultural discourse of land management

In beginning this discussion of 'the agricultural discourse', it is important to stress that I am not claiming any national status to this discourse. In keeping with the model of a case study, discussed in Chapter Two, the findings of this study are not generalisable to the country as a whole. This is particularly the case as agricultural production varies from area to area around Aotearoa / New Zealand, both in terms of produce and methods. The discourse which I am describing here is a localised one which has sprung from a particular area with a specific cultural and political heritage, and specific and localised environmental conditions. That having been said, it may indeed be the case that features of the discourse are to be found more widely than just on the Otago Peninsula. However, it is beyond the scope of this study to examine or test this speculation.

Thus, having discussed the history of farming on the Otago Peninsula in the manner of conventional historiography, I am beginning this section with a more personalised account of farming as a way of life as related to me by my respondents. This is intended to ground the more discursive material in the specific place and culture of the Otago Peninsula.

---

5 'Lifestyle blocks' in this instance refer to smallholdings which are occupied by people who gain most of their income from off-the-land pursuits.
5.3.1 Farming as a way of life

‘Farming,’ said Terry, ‘Is a way of life, but it’s not an extremely financial way of life.’ Thus, with little chance of getting rich, other motivations must exist to keep people doing it. In Morgan’s words, ‘I don’t think the whole purpose is just to make money. I think they like it, the land, and they like the lifestyle.’ There are several aspects to this lifestyle.

David D and his mother, Betty, talked evocatively about their family life on the farm. Clearly farm tasks, such as tailing⁶, were undertaken as family activities where their togetherness and shared activity were as important as getting the job done. But proximity to the city was the most important lifestyle plus that the farm offers at this life stage. As David D said:

If I’m picking up slinks⁷ all day and it’s cold and wet I can go to town in twenty minutes and forget about it...so I think that it it’s a wonderful place to farm and I’m very privileged to farm here (Int 30, Land Owner, 22/9/00).

Other farmers concurred saying that they ‘get the best of both worlds’ (Don) and that they ‘wouldn’t want to live anywhere else.’ (Gavin)

Another aspect of the lifestyle that farming affords is the independence it offers. While as George said of his own farming venture, ‘I reckon we bought ourselves a job and I think a lot of farmers have bought themselves a job,’ that job tends to be a solitary operation. Morgan manages a farm of twelve hundred acres, on two sites, alone. He said that if the farm was to be expanded further it would really have to be doubled in size as any increase would require another fulltime worker, and another twelve hundred acres would be needed to pay them. Similarly, David D was able to manage his farm alone, and felt that any expansion would require employing help. While he could see that this might give him some more free time, it would not increase profitability enough to warrant the wages. Tom cast the situation in the most positive light. He said:

---

⁶ ‘Tailing’ refers to the amputation of lambs’ tails done when they are a few weeks old at a time when they are robust enough to cope with the trauma, but light enough to easily be lifted by the helpers who are often older children and young teenagers.

⁷ Slinks are the carcasses of newborn lambs which are collected and sold for their fine quality skins.
I think one of the big things is the fact that you're your own master to a degree...there's that driving force to become probably the master of your own destiny (Int 46, Land Owner, 23/10/00).

He went on to say of farming:

There's certainly a lot of challenges in it and it's interesting, so many interesting things. Just seeing the seasons come and go, the stock growing and things like that. It's amazing really (Int 46, Land Owner, 23/10/00).

Tom farms a low-lying area on the ocean side of the Peninsula. The close proximity of the sea has the pragmatic advantage to him in that it means his farm is almost frost free. It does also make it windy however. But for Tom, his proximity to the sea clearly has much more meaning to him than simply good grass growth. He said,

There's something nice with having your farm near the sea. Like if you're inland there's either a neighbour's boundary there beside you, well we've still got them round here, but you haven't got that smell of the sea or the fact that you can go and catch something out of it to eat you know. Magic things really. Inestimable really, you know, what they mean to you (Int 46, Land Owner, 23/10/00).

For David D, his surroundings provide his working life with a quality he could not find elsewhere.

I can sit down for a cup of tea when I'm fencing or something a watch the ships come and go. I can watch numerous things whereas if I'm looking at the side of a hill I think that your inspiration is not quite the same, you know. I can stop in the wool shed and look out onto the harbour and things and, you know, the view is always different (Int 30, Land Owner, 22/9/00).

The importance of the attachment to the place that is the family farm, has been noted elsewhere. Johnsen (2003), for example, studied the impact of rural restructuring on farms in north Otago. She found that the relationships that people had with their farm, and the senses of place invested in the farm property, were very important in explaining responses to the external pressures for change. She concludes that:

Ultimately, the coincidence of enterprise, household, and property suggests that the family farm is not just an economic and social entity, but also a physical space invested with socio-cultural meaning, much of which is embodied in material and symbolic phenomena such as land and stock (Johnsen 2003 P132).

As this discussion underscores, the farmers of the Otago Peninsula have strong vested interests in their properties and their lifestyles. This forms an essential backdrop to the following discussion of the agricultural discourse.
Early on in the fieldwork I became aware of the imminent demise of the family farm on the Peninsula. I was repeatedly told there were only three (or five or seven, depending on the version) full time farmers left on the Peninsula. This phenomenon is to do with economics, the relatively small Peninsula farms and relatively harsh environment necessitating the earning of off farm income. The other aspect of this imminent demise that I rapidly became aware of was the fact that the farmers I met were clearly a mature cohort. Frank N, a farmer in his sixties, commented that, ‘Farmers are all getting older. You just need to go round to a sheep sale and see how many grey heads there are there.’

Because Peninsula farms are small, and only marginally economic, young people are unable to sustain mortgages on the land and are consequently moving away from farming as the focus of earning their living. All but one of the farmers that I met had grown up on the Peninsula and most had two or more generations preceding them on the land. Hence I was interested in finding out if it was important to people that their own forebears had worked their land. It should be noted from the outset, however, that due to the process of consolidation the original family holding is often a mere fraction of the whole farm.

For a number of the Peninsula farmers, farming this family land was not their first choice. Frank N and his family moved from the Peninsula to Central Otago when he was a boy. They retained ownership of a block of land on the Peninsula, which later became part of Frank N’s farm. However, he returned to the Peninsula when he married, with great reluctance because of memories of the, ‘...northeast wind and fog and rain...it could come in and stay there for days and weeks.’ He notes, however, that it is very seldom foggy anymore. He and his wife moved, ‘to that place round there, just as a stepping stone to sort of say, well look, we’ve got somewhere to live just meantime. Thirty seven years later we were still there.’ Over time Frank N bought up neighbouring blocks until he had a farm of approximately 800 acres, which he is now beginning to dismantle.

---

8 However, in some instances, consolidation combined the land holdings of ancestors.
Jill and her husband also did not intend to make his family farm their home. She said:

We came here with the intention of buying this property as a stepping stone to a big place but you get entrenched in the history and you feel you don't want to be the part of the family that sells it out of the family so here we are and that's it really (Int 39, Land Owner, 11/10/00).

She noted that the farm, originally a dairy farm but more recently a sheep farm specialising in coloured wools, has never been their sole source of income, one or both of them always having worked off the land to sustain their family. Both Jill and her husband are past retirement age now and for her, the likelihood that the farm will be sold out of the family is a matter of great sadness. She is hopeful that a relative will take over the core of the farm and said:

It's the sentimentality of the fact that the ancestors came here and worked hard. Everybody who's come here has had to really work hard to make enough to live and I think that we'd hope someone would, one of the family, would take it on (Int 39, Land Owner, 11/10/00).

Theresa and Don took over Don's family farm because of its proximity to the city. They did consider buying land elsewhere but thought the advantages to their, then future, family of being close to schools and to Otago University were too great to ignore. Conflict over public access across their land has caused Theresa and Don great stress over past years. In answer to my asking if it was important to them that the farm had been in Don's family for over one hundred and twenty years he said:

Yeah it is actually, yes I suppose it is. That's probably one reason we haven't shifted away. We, well primarily, we were waiting to see what our son was going to do, if he wanted to go farming (Int 22, Land Owner, 6/7/00).

In the meantime, the constant and ongoing improvement of the property is their primary goal.

Chas, a retired school teacher, and Catherine have lived on and farmed a small block of land that had been in Catherine’s family since 1863. In their seventies when I met them, their son was about to take over all but the small block their house is located on. Chas described himself as a newcomer to the Peninsula, of fifty-three years. Catherine commented that this meant ‘...I've got a stake in it (laughs)...more than he has.’ Chas described Catherine’s forebears as having cleared the land and ‘found the stone’, a local landmark now topped with a World War One memorial. Chas went on to say:
There's a lot of talk about the Maori and their feelings for the land. My submission [to the Waitangi Tribunal] was that we have an equal stake in the land. It's part of us, particularly with an old family farm like that {.} You'd hate to see it going through degrade (Int 8, Land Owner, 31/5/00).

Gavin runs a family farm, the core of which has been in his family four generations. Of this he said, 'Yeah it's important. It's sort of, yeah, you know I've never lived anywhere else so you feel that the rest of the country is a strange place.' Gavin has three daughters, the youngest of whom is adamant that she wants to take the farm over from her father. Gavin clearly expressed a multigenerational view of his farm when he said:

I look at it this way, that my Dad put the property together into the size that it is and it's up to me to develop into something that, because I'm mechanically minded and have an ability to build things like this kitchen, that's what I feel my part in the role is (Int 47, Land Owner, 25/10/00).

He will use his skills to prepare the farm for his daughter's turn at the helm.

David D on the other side of the hill from Gavin expresses a similar ethic of work, development and continuity. Of his property he said:

I mean, it's a family farm, there's big ties here. There'd be a lot of pride to take over a farm like this. My grandfather developed the place and probably thought that he'd developed it to a good standard and I know my father developed the place and could always see more development and I think there's still more and more development and I think that's good, you know. The day that I sit down and think that the place is running and ticking over quite nicely is the day that I probably shouldn't be here (Int 30, Land Owner, 22/9/00).

A strong theme emerges from these accounts which indicates that the attachment that these people feel to their family farms is not simply to do with knowing that past generations walked the same land. It is the work, effort and the constant improvement or development which has been and will be undertaken that is the main tie. In order to retain the right to hold the land one must be willing to work. Not only does the application of ancestral effort ensure ongoing ties to the place, but the place demands continuing work from current and future owners to validate their ongoing attachment. This is notably different to the attachment evinced by Mana Whenua, discussed in Chapter Four, where the attachment is a kinship relationship and, as it is one of blood, does not necessarily require any active intervention on the land.
A key, perhaps to this difference is to be found in Chas's statement that the family farm 'is part of us' whereas, to Māori, the people are part of the landscape (Russell 2003)9.

5.3.3 The bush

As noted above, the first task confronting the new would-be-farmers who settled the Otago Peninsula was the clearance of the indigenous forest. This activity, while driven by an economic imperative, was also a moral exercise:

To leave the land idle and resources unused was to deny the very essence of humanity, which consisted in establishing independence from nature, and to sink to the level of the brute (Lockhead 1994 P30).

Underlying this belief was the understanding, probably based on the Judeo-Christian creation mythology, that animals and plants exist for human use, and that 'subduing the wilderness contained the possibility of moral redemption' (Short 1991 P13)10.

---

9 This is not intended to belittle the, sometimes intense, feelings of attachment to their land that some landowners of European descent, such as Chas, express. Arguments about who feels more strongly about certain pieces of land are pointless when the actual issue is that those feelings are underlain by different discursive constructions. Understanding and acceptance of this difference could allow both Māori and Pākehā to accept each others' feelings and negotiate practical actions which could respect the views of both parties.

10 Short does, however, go on to make the point that 'We cannot make too simple a connection between Christian theology and social action' (P14) and argues that in the late twentieth century an alternate reading of the Bible, which sees wilderness as a place of spiritual regeneration, has gained currency.
Allied with this belief system, and associated with Darwin’s theory of evolution, was the theory of displacement which was at its most influential in the 1870s (Star 1997). Crudely put, displacement theory argued that the displacement and demise of the indigenous (flora, fauna and peoples) was inevitable in the face of colonisation by superior species and cultures\(^{11}\). Or, in the words of a contemporary:

> A faint image of the certain doom of a species less fitted to struggle with some new condition in a region which it previously inhabited, and where it has to contend with a more vigorous species, is presented by the extirpation of savage tribes of men by the advancing colony of some civilized nation (Charles Lyell cited in Galbreath 1989 P56).

Given these driving forces it is perhaps unsurprising that land clearance was so rapid and so thorough. In 1982 the Department of Industrial and Scientific Research (DSIR) published the report of a botanical survey of the Otago Peninsula (Johnson 1982) which concluded that only 5% of the land area remained in indigenous forest and scrub. Most of this continues in small scattered remnants that owe their survival, until recently, to their presence on steep or bouldery ground, often relatively inaccessible to stock and to humans.

For many landowners the presence of these patches of bush on their property is really neither here nor there. For example, when I interviewed Ron he assured me that his land was completely cleared of bush by 1962. Some time later, when I visited a reserve that is landlocked by his property, I observed that, in fact, a substantial area of bush still existed high on a steep, south-facing slope on his land. The bush is not displacing a more productive use, but nor is it necessarily contributing anything of value, thus it’s presence is not really of any note. It is an area of ‘non-farm’, something of a hole in the scheme of things.

That this ‘non-farm’ has an underlying economic aspect can be seen in the words of another respondent. Ted was approached by Department of Conservation (DoC) staff who were interested in seeing an area of indigenous vegetation on his land protected. He described his response to DoC as follows:

> We hadn’t really thought about it when they mentioned it. I went and I looked into it and I thought, ‘Well, the way of the soil structure…well if you plant trees on there they’re only going to go down, turn on round and they’ll fall over, so that would be useless, putting all that scrub off and putting trees there because it wouldn’t end up

\(^{11}\) See Chapter One for further discussion of displacement theory.
being a cash crop anyway. It would just end up being a mess...so there was no point in doing anything else with it.’ I wasn’t going to gain a thing by doing anything else with it (Int 52, Land Owner, 1/11/00).

This land is now fenced to protect it from stock and is protected by a Conservation Covenant. Ted’s interest in what happens within the covenanted area has increased over time and he admitted that his attitude to the bush has changed:

The native bush, it’s very interesting when you actually study it. I didn’t look at it that way when I put the covenant on the hill. I only looked at the fact that I can’t do anything else with this piece of ground (Int 52, Land Owner, 1/11/00).

Bush is only ‘non-farm’ when it has a neutral impact in economic terms. If it impinges on the economic viability of the farm, either by occupying potential pasture or by complicating stock management, then it enters the agricultural discourse. In the former instance the encroaching bush is constructed as a threat. Don and Theresa have a significant area of kanuka¹² on their property and are concerned that it is spreading. Don is concerned that he might be prevented from managing the extent of this kanuka by DCC regulations. He said:

As you’re aware, probably, we’re stuck in this landscape zone which could be detrimental. We’ve got a bit of native bush, well mostly manuka which I call scrub (laughs), and you know, they’re trying to restrict us even cutting down one bush that’s over about a metre high or something like that. It’s just if we weren’t allowed to cut it and trim it, it would just take over the whole farm and it’s a problem we could have in the future (Int 22, Land Owner, 6/7/00).

Thus the extension of the range of kanuka is problematic as it displaces the economically productive pasture and threatens to ‘take over the whole farm’.¹³

It is interesting and significant to note the movement between the terms ‘scrub’ and ‘bush’ as exemplified in the narratives of Ted and Don. When Ted is discussing the economic potential of the piece of land now covenanted the indigenous vegetation on it is ‘scrub’. When he is discussing his growing personal interest in that vegetation it becomes ‘bush’. Similarly Don notes that he calls the manuka (sic) ‘scrub’ where as the DCC considers it to be ‘bush’. ‘Bush’ is a noun which refers to areas of (at least predominantly) indigenous forest vegetation. The only exception to this is stands of

---

¹² Kanuka, or Kunzea ericoides, is an indigenous species which colonises open ground and develops large, single species, stands. It is common on the Otago Peninsula where it is known colloquially as manuka, although manuka (Leptospermum scoparium) is actually a different plant altogether.

¹³ Don’s assessment of the spread of kanuka on his property is based on a comparison with the area visible in aerial photographs taken in the late nineteen fifties which, he said, ‘showed only a small patch’. He attributed the spread to aerial topdressing.
Kauri, *Agathis australis*, which are consistently referred to growing in forests. ‘Scrub’, on the other hand is used to refer to naturalised exotic species such as gorse (*Ulex europea*), broom (*Cytisus scoparium* and other exotic species) and lupins (particularly *Lupinus arboreus*) as well as indigenous species including kanuka and mixed stands of smaller forest species. This distinction in vocabulary suggests different discourses are present in these narratives.

Don also considers the kanuka a hazard to the stock themselves and thus a stock management issue. He said, ‘The young scrubby stuff, you can’t see sheep in it and it’s a hazard at lambing time. You can’t find your sheep and things in amongst them...’ Gavin doesn’t even like the tall kanuka as shelter for his stock, although he acknowledges that his animals use it for this purpose. He said of the kanuka:

> ...it’s a real nuisance that if anything like a cow calving gets into it you can’t see her and it’s damned hard to find her because the level of visibility is about that high and with the contours of the ground you can’t see much further than from here to the door (Int 47, Land Owner, 25/10/00).

Patches of bush also create stock management problems in certain areas. For example, David D has a block of bush at the northern end of his property which he intends to fence as it causes him problems when he moves mobs of sheep around the area. Of this decision he said:

> ...there’s no grazing lost, there’s no real benefit for shelter. If that piece of bush was fenced out it would leave me with a reasonably good laneway so it would make things a lot quicker to muster as I wouldn’t have sheep in the bush (Int 30, Land Owner, 22/9/00).

Ted found that remnant bush caused problems of a different sort for his stock. When talking about having cut ‘miles of bush’ off his paddocks with his father, he explained that they had done so in order to make the land productive both directly, in freeing up ground for pasture, but also indirectly as in some cases:

> ...they were paddocks where the bush was basically only a bit of a nuisance. When the native bush is thinned out too much you can’t make it into a hedge for instance. It has to be a reasonable sized block before it is really effective because if it isn’t it opens up underneath and it is actually more draughty than if it wasn’t there (Int 52, Land Owner, 1/11/00).

At times it is not so much the presence of bush remnants that is constructed as a problem, but their constitution. Ben owns a smallholding on which he runs sheep. A
small block of bush exists along one boundary and it is densely overrun with
*Muehlenbeckia australis*¹⁴. Ben intends to:

...clean a lot of that out underneath, a lot of the vines up there...It just gets in round the trees and hangs right through them. I want to clean that out...get the vines cleaned out from underneath (Int 28, Small Holder, 20/9/00).

He intends to do this:

...but leave the rest of the bush up in there. It’s good because it’s good shelter for the ewes and for the young lambs. They can get up in there, get up in amongst the trees and they’re out of the weather and they’re protected from the southerlies coming up through there. With the vines up there it becomes a bit dangerous for the lambs. They get caught up in the vines and things like that (Int 28, Small Holder, 20/9/00).

Bush with a clear under story is useful as good shelter but the *Muehlenbeckia sp* renders it hazardous.

The use of the metaphorical construction ‘cleaning’ is common, and characteristic, in relation to weeds within the agricultural discourse. Gorse, in particular, is ‘cleaned off’ areas, and areas where there is no gorse are described as being ‘clean’. This is a good example of a lexical metaphor which Fairclough (2003 P 131) describes as a differential characteristic of discourses. Egoz *et al* (2001) comment that, ‘A neat looking farm landscape signals not only success, but also that the farmer is industrious and cares about his or her farm.’ This indicates the connection between the discursive construction of the ‘clean’ farm environment and the social importance to the individual.

Bush-as-stock-shelter is one of the most common and positive constructions of bush within the agricultural discourse. Like the case of Ted, discussed above, Fred had also been approached by DoC staff who hoped they might convince him to fence off some remnant bush on his land. In this instance the remnant on Fred’s property is the edge of a larger block, most of which is already situated on conservation land. Fred described to me, with what I interpreted to be some pride, the large totara (*Podocarpus totara*) and miro (*Podocarpus ferrugineus*) trees that are to be found in the remnant, the protection of which, he understood, to be the motivation behind this approach. When I asked what had happened to the idea of fencing it Fred replied, with some indignation:

¹⁴*Muehlenbeckia sp* are a genus of indigenous climbers which tend to form dense canopies especially in degraded stands of indigenous forest.
I wasn't agreeable and I'm still not. I said to the fella, I said, 'I'm not going up there with a chainsaw to cut the trees down. They're quite safe as far as I'm concerned, but that paddock is worth its weight in gold. When I shear the hoggets I put them over there and they have got all that shelter in there and they use it, they go in there, and as I say, I'm not going to cut the trees down,' so I just left it at that (Int 33, Land Owner, 28/9/00).

Fred's suggestion that the bush on his property was not under threat because he wasn't going to cut the trees down was echoed by other landowners. Morgan commented of Taiaroa Bush, the majority of which is located on the property he manages that, 'We really don't do anything to it. I suppose we run cattle in there but we have no intention of ever burning it or clearing it.' The cattle are not put into the bush in the winter as 'they make too big a mess, they'll do too much damage' but in September when the interview was undertaken they were in there to calve. Sheep 'go through there too' he said.

Ian also told me about having about thirty acres of bush on his property. Of this he said, 'There's still some nice areas actually, broadleaf bush, real thick stuff'. In response to my asking him if he had any plans for it he said, 'Well, I don't intend knocking it down or anything, just leave it natural and that's all.' I responded by asking if he'd thought about protecting it in any way. He responded immediately with, 'Why? By kicking people out of it.' He continued:

No, look, its actual location is as much a protection as anything. I don't want it to spread, and I don't want it to get any smaller. Its boundaries aren't changing at the moment so I don't see there's too much problem. The stock don't do any harm. We don't let the cattle go into it in the winter time so they don't go in there and destroy the bottom of it. Sheep don't actually go into the bush that much. Actually, very little I'd say (Int 25, Land Owner, 17/8/00).

This discussion warrants a closer examination for a number of reasons. Firstly, the context of these discussions has some relevance. I felt some discomfort talking to farmers about indigenous forest remnants on their properties. I knew it to be a point of conflict with local environmentalists, and I also had realised that farmers didn't talk about bush on their properties, except in passing, unless I asked about it. In the three interchanges examined above I had a certain level of discomfort. When I did ask about the management of bush on their properties, I sensed defensiveness on the part of Morgan and of Ian. I was completely taken aback by the level of indignation that
Fred expressed about not fencing off his bush, particularly as he had just described the miro and totara trees on his property with obvious pride, and this had put me at my ease. This interchange in particular really confused me. I have come to the conclusion that his confused and confusing narrative, at once expressing pride that someone valued his bush, and then immediately expressing indignation at the suggestion that it be fenced off, is confusing because it incorporates two conflicting discourses.

Within the agricultural discourse, as I have discussed above, bush is ‘non-farm’ unless it is a nuisance (financial cost) or it provides stock shelter (financial gain). Therefore, to talk about ‘protecting’ it by excluding stock is nonsensical within the agricultural discourse as this means, crudely put, spending money to lose money. Thus, when Fred expressed pride in the fact that DoC staff clearly thought his bush, particularly the miro and totara, valuable, he was accepting and reflecting one discursive construction of bush. When he expressed his indignation at the idea of fencing his stock out of his valuable shelter, he was utilising the agricultural discourse which is, for him, dominant.

Further, for me to ask about protecting the bush (and this was the term which I used in discussion with Ian but not with Morgan or Fred) required me to frame my questions from a discourse which most of these farmers would probably interpret as ‘greenie’. Thus, I and my interviewee were immediately placed in potentially conflicting subject positions, him as a ‘farmer’, me as a possible environmentalist\(^\text{15}\). Put in more conventional terms, it is impossible to ask about ‘protecting’ bush from a neutral position as the term is already loaded with power and significance. Thus to discuss ‘protecting’ bush with me required constructing a threat which made sense within the agricultural discourse and was therefore not directly confrontational with my subject position, as the logical retort, ‘Why does it need protection?’, which may be what Ian began to say, would have been. Hence, all three of these respondents argued that their bush was not under threat because they were not going to take to it with a chainsaw, burn it off, or ‘knock it over’.

\(^{15}\) I had been warned by a landscape architect, who was my first interviewee, that if I disclosed that my field was landscape architecture it was likely that the farmers of the Peninsula would decide I was a ‘greenie’ and not co-operate with my research.
As people are not harming the bush in any way, and its fundamental construction is in terms of economics, it then makes some sense that within this discourse the health of the bush is measured in terms of the land area it occupies. If it increases in area (as with the kanuka on Don and Theresa’s property discussed above) then it becomes an economic threat by taking over pasture. If it shrinks in area it becomes an economic threat in terms of a loss of stock shelter, or it is an economic advantage because more ground is available for grazing. However, some acknowledgement of the influence of the environmental discourse (see Chapter Six) is made in the assertion that cattle are kept out of the bush in winter because they’d make ‘too big a mess’ (Morgan) or ‘destroy the bottom of it’ (Ian). This concession is interesting given that a number of sources (Knight 1979, Hugget 1966) state that bush blocks were, in the past, favoured for over-wintering cattle. Nevertheless, the more generalised assertion that sheep and cattle don’t damage the bush is still strongly made.

5.3.4 Farming practice

When I asked an elderly landowner, who had lived on the Peninsula since his early twenties, what had changed there in the time he’d known it he said:
Well, my impression's from brown to green. With the advent of aerial topdressing and trucks and things being able to top dress, the productivity of the land has increased quite markedly I'd say. I reckon when I came you could run about three ewes to the acre. Now it's about five or six (Int 8, Land Owner, 31/5/00).

The use of the number of sheep (or more recently 'stock units')\(^{16}\) that can be grazed per acre of land as a measure of productivity and land quality is ubiquitous in rural Aotearoa/New Zealand. Within the agricultural discourse it underlines the interconnectedness of animal and land husbandry. Indeed, often when I asked farmers about land management they would answer by discussing their stock. Land is managed for stock production and all decisions are made with this ultimate goal in mind. Top dressing is one of the major means of increasing land, and thereby stock, productivity.

Aerial topdressing began in Aotearoa / New Zealand in 1949 (Waswo 1996 P 138). World War Two pilots flying Tiger Moths began dropping superphosphate from the air onto areas too hilly, too large or too remote to fertilise by other means. The Otago Peninsula was an area in which aerial topdressing, in particular, continues to be an important aspect of farming practice. This practice diminished from the mid 1980s when the new Labour Government withdrew agricultural subsidies\(^{17}\). On David D's farm topdressing ceased completely for about eight years. Of this he said:

> We learnt some hard lessons in the early 80s... For a number of years there we were selling store lambs\(^{18}\) and our lambing percentages, things like that, wool production – admittedly there were some dry years in amongst them which hurt but I think the flow on effects come down to fertiliser (Int 30, Land Owner, 22/9.00).

Again the impact of the inability to fertilise the soil is measured in the impact on the productivity of the animals living on it. David now fertilises every year, but varies the quantity of fertiliser applied depending on the availability of money to pay for it.

---

\(^{16}\) The sheep forms the basis of this measurement and a cattle beast is equivalent to five stock units.  
\(^{17}\) In 1984 a Labour Government was elected to govern Aotearoa/New Zealand. While this party was traditionally the more socialist of the local political parties, it immediately set about a raft of extreme neo-liberal economic reforms which included the complete removal of all subsidies to the agricultural sector. These had included such things as tax free petrol and assistance to construct new houses as well as production based subsidies. See Leipens & Bradshaw (1999) for a discussion of the impact of the neo-liberal economic discourse on agriculture in Aotearoa/New Zealand, in particular the new emphasis on 'efficiency'. I also discuss the neo-liberal discourse further in Chapter Seven.  
\(^{18}\) Store lambs are the lesser quality lambs which are sold for local consumption. This is as opposed to fat lambs which are sent to the freezing works for slaughter and eventual export.
Morgan, similarly, was unable to fertilise for a number of years. He noticed the impacts more when he began topdressing again, seeing the paddocks recover more quickly when stock were removed. Morgan uses soil testing to determine the best sort of fertiliser mix to use. Bruce also uses soil testing but said, ‘We still haven’t achieved great results with it.’ He uses his own skill and experience to determine what a pasture needs and uses different mixes on different paddocks, applying it by tractor. Bruce said:

We’ve got fellows, they go round and they measure dry matter content. That’s when you get really fanatic. We’ll use our own vision and say, ‘The pasture’s looking poor so it will have to be lifted up with a slightly heavier coat, or another special mixture’ (Int 37, Land Owner, 9/10/00).

In addition, Bruce, who runs a dairy farm, has recently begun to spread the cow effluent from the milking shed onto his paddocks. Of this he said, ‘It’s been the greatest fertiliser ever created’. However, the other fertilisers are still necessary. In Bruce’s words, ‘We’ve got to topdress otherwise you might as well not be on the place.’

Stock management practices are also changing. Don detailed regimes of vaccinations and drenchings\(^\text{19}\) that are now considered necessary to produce quality sheep, but which were not done in his father’s day. These, like the application of fertiliser discussed above, are practices intended to make farming more effective in the sense of producing better, heavier, healthier animals. Another relatively new practice considered important by Don and others is the ultrasonic scanning of ewes to determine whether they are pregnant with twins, a single lamb or have failed to conceive. Ewes carrying twins are put onto better pasture than those that are carrying only one. Those that are ‘empty’, that is, have failed to conceive, are sent ‘straight to the sale yard’ and on to slaughter. This is intended to improve the efficiency of the farm, minimising the resources utilised while maximising production.\(^\text{20}\)

\(^{19}\) ‘Drenching’ refers to the oral administration of anti-parasitic compounds.

\(^{20}\) Leipens and Bradshaw (1999) discuss ‘efficiency’ as being a prime construct of the neo-liberal economic discourse and one enthusiastically adopted by Federated Farmers, the farmers lobby group.
A further move to increase efficiency undertaken by some is a change in sheep breed aimed at reducing the farm workload, particularly at lambing time. For some the lambing beat, where a farmer usually walked twice daily through paddocks of lambing ewes ready to help any ewes or lambs in trouble, has now become a thing of the past. Ian said of this tradition, ‘If you’re out there helping them all you’re doing is creating problems for the future, so that’s natural attrition.’ He now runs perendale cross ewes which he characterised as being ‘less work’. Fred has also changed to perendales\(^{21}\) of which he said, ‘I’ve never liked perendales. I’m still not terribly keen on perendales, but they can look after themselves and you’re better to keep away from them because they’re so touchy.’ After relating that just by walking past some he had separated some ewes from their lambs\(^{22}\), he said, ‘So, no I don’t shepherd the sheep now, but, perhaps the two teeth\(^{23}\), the first lambers.’ These examples of changing breed to reduce farm workload underline the truth of the statement that ‘farm animals have, quite literally, been constructed by people to fit into particular rural spaces’ (Yarwood and Evans 2000 P99).

---

\(^{21}\) Perendale is a New Zealand developed breed characterised thus: ‘As a purebred, its hardiness makes it ideally suited to colder, high rainfall areas. The Perendale is easy to care for; the ewes have little trouble lambing and are good mothers’ (http://www.ansi.okstate.edu/breeds/sheep/ downloaded 1/4/04).

\(^{22}\) A ewe temporarily separated from a single lamb will work hard to find it. However, apparently sheep can’t count as a ewe separated from twins will give up searching once she has recovered only one, leaving the other lamb to die.

\(^{23}\) Sheep are categorised by the numbers of adult teeth which they have. A ‘two tooth’ is anywhere from between fourteen months and two years old. Sheep gain two more teeth (pairs of teeth in fact) each year until they have eight pairs of molars, at which point they are known as a ‘full mouth’.
5.3.5 Erosion

Respondents from all backgrounds saw erosion, specifically land slipping, as a major issue on the Otago Peninsula. Some very large slips have occurred including several which have threatened the harbourside settlement of Macandrew Bay (Arthur 1980). Constructions of land instability range across a continuum from ‘slips as inevitable and natural’ to ‘slips as directly caused by deforestation’. In the middle ground varying combinations of these two constructions existed together. For example, Bess pointed out that:

> Even if you go down to the likes of Stewart Island and some of these places where there’s [no clearance] you see slips and all too. I suppose the vegetation must help, but you still see it in those areas don’t you (Int 20, Land Owner, 5/7/00).

However, farmers evinced a strong tendency to see slipping as inevitable, where as environmentalists tended to blame deforestation.

Erosion on a small scale has always been a part of farming on the Peninsula. In Bruce’s words:

> They ploughed up and down but they had to develop where they had to cultivate the ground sideways. Every time the harrows went around you’d see a row of soil going down (laughs) but, alright, that’s the way they worked it (Int 37, Land Owner, 9/10/00).

Bruce now estimates there is about eight feet of extra topsoil at the bottom of his paddocks which he wants to excavate and return to the top of the hill.

The transference of soil back to the tops of the hills, such as Bruce wants to do, was routine until fifty or sixty years ago, according to Jill, and undertaken with teams of horses dragging sleds. While visiting her property I noted that some of her stone walls were now acting as retaining walls, the uphill soil being level with their tops. She was indignant at my suggestion that this was the result of erosion saying, ‘No, it’s not erosion. It’s where those paddocks were cultivated in the earlier days and, of course, as you cultivate the soil comes down, so it’s built up.’
Both of these respondents see the movement of soil as a result of cultivation as the inevitable consequence of the technology and methods available, rather than, say, of the inappropriate use of the steep hillsides themselves. Ploughing is certainly still undertaken on these steep Peninsula hillsides, but some, including Bruce and his son, use direct drilling. This practice entails spraying the area for cropping or pasture renewal and, several weeks later, using equipment which cuts slits in the soil and deposits seed within them at the same time. The soil is not cultivated in the traditional manner at all minimising the risk of it tumbling down the hillside.

Much larger scale earth movements are problematic all over the Peninsula. Within the agricultural discourse this is constructed as a consequence of the nature of the soil and its interaction with water as rain and as underground water courses, both natural and constructed. For Shirley, ‘The problem has mostly to do with erosion and the type of soil that we’ve got here, but erosion is something that is totally inherent in this particular area.’
For Tom the association with rain is quite specific. He said:

The land is quite plastic and fluid in some places and some say that taking the native bush off may have increased slipping. It might have a bit but I sort of think that even with native bush on it, it still slipped because the country has got a greasy back underneath that the clay slides on. You'll have seen those sort of slips around. So I just feel it's something we have to live with. You can build a fence as straight as a die – five years later it may be wiggling like that because the land has subtly moved with the wet. If you get, say, over 140 millimetres within three days you can start to think about having some earth flows (Int 46, Land Owner, 23/10/00).

For John inappropriate management has exacerbated the association between water and slipping. He said:

There's areas on this Peninsula that periodically will slip because it becomes soggy and it builds up there and eventually slips out. It might be many years before it does it again there but it's just the nature of the country. But there was a lot of places that they went and put a bulldozer in to doze a track around a hill. There's a lot of under-runners where water runs underground and the weight of the machine would collapse the underground tunnel. Then it dams up – it's got to burst and you very often would see slips below where those dozed tracks had been. Those were the sort of things that had to be pointed out. When you come to think of it you've gotta, you start altering nature, you can get into a lot of bother (Int 29, Land Owner, 21/9/00).

He noted that the move in recent years to four wheeled bikes (All Terrain Vehicles or ATVs) means that farmers no longer need as extensive networks of tracks as they did when they used land rovers and as a result there doesn't seem to be the same problems anymore.
David D lives on a property that has been troubled by some extremely severe slips. He noted that his father built most of the tracks that have been built on the farm more than twenty years ago. Of the slipping he said, 'It’s been slipping for years, since dot and you know, even places which have been in bush have slipped.’ His mother, Betty, noted that the 1970s was the worst period for slips, something she blamed on the very wet winters which they had had then. One of the responses to the risk of slips on the property has been to manage drainage so that run off is directed into natural watercourses. The other main response to the risk of further slips has been to plant trees. David D said that by watching for slumping he could predict areas that were likely to slip and he would go in and plant them with poplar poles. He said:

I know which bits are going to slip and I think that the planting of trees is the only way to slow things down. It’s by no means a fix (Int 30, Land Owner, 22/9/00).

David cuts approximately three metre lengths from poplars growing on the property, sharpens the bottom end with an axe and then uses the tractor to drive them into the ground. Of this he says:

Because you’re planting a heavier pole you’re not going to get good form, you get very poor form because you’ve only got leaders coming away. Depending on the type of poplar you’re going to get a sort of birds nest type tree, which doesn’t bother me (Int 30, Land Owner, 22/9/00).

Within the agricultural discourse, poor form in the trees is irrelevant if they do the job of holding the land stable.

One of the major Peninsula slips, which threatened the settlement of Macandrew Bay, was, reputedly, a consequence of a small slip breaking a water main. The consequent leaking water resulted in a substantial movement of earth. Both the size of the slip and the threat it posed to the residences of Macandrew Bay were key motivations in the establishment of the Peninsula Landcare Group, part of the New Zealand Landcare Trust, which has seen land stabilisation as one of the key issues for it to address on the Peninsula. However, the Peninsula Landcare Group has failed to gain acceptance within the farming community. In part this may be connected to its genesis at a public meeting held by the local environmental group, Save The Otago Peninsula (STOP). A major factor in its unpopularity seems to be that non-farmers who are seen to have little sympathy for the farmer’s position are seen to dominate it. David D’s mother, Betty said of landowners:
I think everybody's trying to do a little bit. Okay, there might be some landowners who've only planted a hundred trees in their lifetime on a property, but aren't they better to be complimented for those ones they have done than be told they haven't planted any? (Int 30, Land Owner, 22/9/00)

David D continued:

But also you're dealing with livelihoods and in the last few years, the last fifteen years, the farmers down here, their livelihoods have been threatened enough. They've never been big farms down here, they've never been great earners and so for someone to turn around and give you stick about how you farm your land – that's actually affecting your financial viability. You know, if you were to do everything the way you'd like to do just wouldn't have any money, basically (Int 30, Land Owner, 22/9/00).
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Fig 5.9: The conflict between different constructions of land instability

David D's comments here return us to the underlying economic imperative of the agricultural discourse. The construction of erosion, within this discourse, as inevitable and a farm management problem, suggest an underlying construction of the biophysical world as a resource for human use. There is no question of the appropriateness of the agricultural use of the land, merely of the use of methods which might exacerbate or minimise the problem. The subject position 'farmer' is one of a manager, entitled by dint of ownership and activity, to extract a livelihood from the land.
5.3.6 Private property rights

One of the most characteristic features of the agricultural discourse as evinced on the Otago Peninsula is its construction of the relationship between the individual farmer and the larger community. While certain community rights are conceded, a strong focus is placed on the rights of the individual as a landowner and manager. This can be seen most clearly be examining narratives focusing on two themes, public access to Peninsula lands for recreation, and the development of the Dunedin City Council’s (DCC) Draft District Plan (DDP).

• Public access and the Peninsula Walkers

In 1990 a group calling themselves the Otago Peninsula Walkers (OPW) began a campaign to open up, so called, ‘paper roads’ on the Peninsula as recreational walking tracks. The term ‘paper road’ is used commonly to refer to a road corridor which has been surveyed or dedicated but never constructed. Much mythology exists about these roads and the surveying of Dunedin in general, the popular story being that the survey plans were drawn up in Edinburgh and then laid over the landscape, often inappropriately, once the settlement was established. This is not the case as Mason (1994 P13) states, and he points out that all the official survey records of the twenty or so roads affected on the Peninsula were prepared locally and are deposited locally. Several of the ‘paper roads’ on the Peninsula, had actually been constructed, but had fallen in to disuse as a result of a reduced rural population and the development of motorised transport. As they had fallen into disuse a number of these roadways had been incorporated into neighbouring farms as grazing.

Described by an OPW member, in 2000, as ‘still probably a bit controversial’ the OPW campaign succeeded in opening a number of these roadways to public access. In 1994 the Public Access New Zealand (PANZ) newsletter proclaimed:

Much has been achieved on the Otago Peninsula during the last four years in opening up unformed legal roads for public use. Considerable heat and friction was generated in the process, by application of the ‘law of the highways’ by a determined group of walkers...hundreds of people are now using a network of approximately 20 well marked walking tracks that were either the direct result of the labours of the Otago Peninsula Walkers, or the result of political pressure by them on the Dunedin City Council...Dunedin City now has a major recreational
facility on its doorstep...The events on the Otago Peninsula are worthy of much fuller treatment, being a significant part of New Zealand's recreation history...(PA No 4 May 1994)

Landowners that I interviewed in 2000 could still scarcely contain their fury, disgust and hurt at the impact of this 'heat and friction' upon them. All those I interviewed with road corridors crossing their land acknowledged that these road corridors were not their land but publicly owned land. What concerned them was the manner in which the OPW approached the issue, 'by application of the 'law of the highways'". This included fences and trees being cut down and rubbish being dumped over fences. A brief examination of two land owners experiences as recounted to me highlights some of the issues and provides a context for some of the landowners responses to the Dunedin Draft District Plan.

Euan and Sheryll own a property entirely bisected by one of the road corridors in question. Describing the process of dealing with the OPW as 'pretty horrendous' and something 'we had to grind our way through', Euan complained that their 'bulldozer approach I didn't particularly find too good for a start'. Euan and Sheryl had friends within the OPW and through one offered an alternative route which followed their boundary rather than cutting across their property. This alternative was accepted and now extends through a piece of covenanted regenerating bush. However, for some time afterwards Euan had to, regularly, redirect people claiming a non-existent right of access to the lagoons partially enclosed by their property.

Don and Theresa have a number of road corridors within their farm. Theresa recounted:

When the walking tracks proposal came out we thought, 'OK. That's fair enough, the roads are there,' and we went to a consultant in town who said, 'Well, look. The Council, they'd be quite willing to negotiate with you,' so we said, 'Right. Well, there's certain parts of our farm that are real viewpoints and real good places to go,' so this guy, on our behalf, drew up a plan which we put to the Council. We would say, 'Right. That road goes right through our hay paddock,' for instance, 'But if you don't take that road, if you go up round the side of the hill there, you get a beautiful view looking to the harbour.' So we offered alternatives for every track (Int 22, Land Owner, 6/7/00).

Initially the Council looked quite favourably on their proposal but in the end declined to negotiate. Theresa concluded:
It was a political thing; it wasn’t anything to do with walking tracks at all. It was to do with that group that said, ‘Those farmers have got public land, we want it back’ (Int 22, Land Owner, 6/7/00).

The Dunedin City Council, as the owner of the land in question, the ‘paper’ roads, was inevitably involved in the process of settling the access issue. It is clear in the perceptions of some landowners that they did not acquit themselves well. Don described the feeling of disenfranchisement that he experienced saying:

There is the weight of half a dozen farmers as against fifty walking groups of the Federation of Mountain Clubs and all those people, they’ve got all the weight of them on the other side and six farmers could do nothing about it (Int 22, Land Owner, 6/7/00).

Fig 5.10: The erosion and lack of maintenance on Braidwood Road makes it impassable to vehicles and a challenge even to those on foot! (Photo – Author, 2000)
The situation in 2000 when the field work for this research was conducted was that the walking tracks are promoted by the Council’s recreation staff. However, as they are technically roads, their management falls under the jurisdiction of the roading engineers. As they are not open to vehicular traffic there is no budget for their maintenance. Thus volunteer efforts are relied upon to clear gorse and other obstructions.

In addition, while PANZ and OPW might feel very proud of the results of their efforts, the anecdotal evidence presented to me indicates that far from improving and expanding recreational activities on the Peninsula, they have diminished. This is because landowners who once used to allow walking groups, scouts and other recreationists access to their land no longer do so. As was said to me by Jill:

Before all this people would come down and say, 'Could they walk through to Macandrew Bay?' and we would say, 'Oh yeah, that's OK. Just mind out, we've got such and such somewhere'. But now nobody goes. They've got their tracks, they can stick to them, and that's the way we feel about it (Int 39, Land Owner, 11/10/00).

The essence of the conflict is characterised in the following diagram, Fig 5.11
Landowners on the Otago Peninsula are asserting their ability and right to control access onto land where they can control it, in response to being forced to allow access they could not control.

- The city and the country

Dunedin city residents have long seen the Otago Peninsula as a recreational resource, many of the older dwellings in the harbourside communities having been originally cribs. With the growth in the use of private motorised transport over the last twenty-five years or so these communities have tended to become commuter suburbs. At the same time the roads and beaches of the Peninsula have become more accessible to motorised city dwellers looking for rest and recreation. In addition, the growth of tourism has lead to increasing numbers of visitors to the Peninsula. As one respondent put it, 'That's one thing that's changing the face of the Peninsula is the tourism traffic.'

This increasing amount of tourist traffic being experienced on the Peninsula roads is a source of irritation and concern to local landowners. Don and Theresa, for example, live at the end of a road which gives walking access to a beach where tourists can watch a variety of local wildlife at close quarters. Don said:

'It's getting a bit congested with tourism and that now. That's another gripe we have with the City Council if you like. They turn all the tourists out here - they don't mind sending tourists by the bus load out here - but the roading infrastructure isn't really set up for tourism (Int 22, Land Owner, 6/7/00).

Theresa continued:

'The worst thing is they don't want to know about it. People get stuck down here, I mean, we get people at the door every other day of the week wanting to be pulled out, and all sorts of things, and you ring the Council and say, 'Look, can you put some gravel down there?' but they don't want to know, they don't care (Int 22, Land Owner, 6/7/00).

Further, four or five tour buses a day may call at this site and, in the absence of any facility, use their drive entrance to turn around and cause significant corrugation to the steep and unsealed road causing further irritation to Don and Theresa. This perceived failure to follow through on their own actions on the part of the DCC (they promote
the Peninsula as a tourist destination but do not provide dedicated facilities) is a cause of resentment in the local community.  

Farming in close proximity to the city has a number of other challenges. Morgan recounted having stock stolen from the property he manages. However, it is not necessarily only active interference with stock that is problematic for the rural dwellers on the Peninsula. Maurice and Bess described an incident where a car towing a trailer containing newly purchased garden plants pulled up in the road outside their property. When Maurice passed the spot where they had been park, some time later, he found they had removed stones from their stone wall and taken them. As Bess said, ‘There’s plenty of them in the paddocks, if they only asked you could let them have them’.  

City people and visitors wanting access over private land continues to be an issue on the Peninsula years after the conclusion of the OPW campaign. At a workshop run by the Peninsula Landcare Group in October 1999 a summary was made of the landowners and (potential) land users’ perspectives. 

Primarily, the landowners’ perspective can be summarised in the statement that their land is no different to a person’s urban property, and their rights to restrict access to that property the same also. In addition to this the farm is a business which can be compromised by uninvited visitors. Problems feared, if not actually experienced, included loss of productive working time and costs incurred in putting right things done, undone or damaged; injury to stock and damage to crops; and the time and cost incurred in securing property, for example, with electric fences. On a personal level the loss of privacy and the undermining of their chosen lifestyle were important as was the negative light they believed they were held in because of their stand. A further thread of concern was of people indulging in illegal activities, such as cultivating cannabis, on their property (Discussion Report 1999).  

The land users perspective extended from some who considered ‘that a fundamental right of access over privately owned land does exist Others considered that traditional
agreements could be relied upon and others that the effort involved in locating the
owner of land is not warranted for one-off access. Difficulty in identifying the owner
of land is also problematic in many parts of the Peninsula, leading to only those with a
personal relationship gaining access’ (Discussion Report 1999).

These statements of perspective outline clearly the differing perspectives of those who
own the rural land and those who seek access over it. The outcome of this meeting
was the publication of a ‘Country Code’ as part of a Directory of Otago Peninsula
Resource Information by the Otago Peninsula Landcare Group.

• The Draft Dunedin District Plan

The Dunedin City Council’s Draft District Plan was released for public submissions
in July of 1995. I discuss the Draft and subsequent District Plan in detail in Chapter
Eight. At this point I intend to discuss the response to the Draft Plan from within the
farming community on the Otago Peninsula in order to illustrate further aspects of the
agricultural discourse.

The DDP proposed that all but the southern urban fringe of the Otago Peninsula be
classified as an Outstanding Landscape Area (to the east of the main ridgeline) or as a
Landscape Conservation Area (to the west of the main ridgeline). This classification
was to overlay other zoning, predominantly rural, which had its own policies and
rules for land management. The Landscape section of the plan aimed to manage ‘the
City’s landscape quality in terms of its aesthetic coherence and scenic values’ (DDP
1995 P10:1). Therefore rules were proposed to control new forestry planting and the
construction of new buildings, plus a series of guidelines were to be prepared making
suggestions regarding the placement and design of forestry blocks, buildings, quarries
and tracks, and discouraging bush clearance.

Response to the landscape rules of the DP was fairly strong from within the Peninsula
Farming community. Coming as it did on the heels of the OPW controversy, some
farmers felt somewhat under siege. In 2000 Theresa recounted making submissions
to the Council and said:
They hardly even listen to you, I mean the last time I went there I vowed it would be the last time because it got to just before their tea time and all they wanted to do was have their tea. We thought, 'What the hell's the use of coming? They're just wasting our time.' It's like banging your head on the wall (Int 22, Land Owner, 6/7/00).

Infact the submission process led to a significant relaxation in the eventual rules, but retained the primarily visual criteria by which Resource Consent applications are assessed (DP 1999 P14:32).

A number of clear threads run through the written submissions that were made on the Landscape section of the Draft Plan by Peninsula farmers, Federated Farmers Otago (the farmers’ professional association and lobby group) and the Ministry of Forestry. The first of these threads has to do with the way in which ‘landscape’ is defined within the Plan. In the words of a submission from Federated Farmers Otago:

Federated Farmers Otago has major concerns about the whole approach this plan takes to landscape values. Such values are very subjective, and every individual has a different perception. Most perceptions lack vision and tend to assume the status quo looks best. Such perceptions come from those who view the landscape from the road while passing through. This plan currently sets up a process where those who own the land can potentially have their normal activities and opportunities over-ridden by the whims of those who have no stake in that land or the wellbeing of that rural district.

This attitude was echoed by Maurice who said in interview:

This is an outstanding landscape area, they say, on this side. Well, it’s just like when you go into the art gallery, it’s my view of art compared with someone else’s view of art. That’s the way I look at it (Int 20, Land Owner, 5/7/00).

Chas expressed similar sentiments:

A green productive paddock is just as scenically valuable as a patch of cut over scrub (Int 8, Land Owner, 31/5/00).

A second thread had to do with resisting the idea that farmers should have to have Resource Consent for activities which they see as normal farming activities. This particularly applied to the proposal that forestry under two hectares in area should be a controlled activity, and fell into two subgroups. The first type of complaint was that farmers in the Landscape zones were being treated differently from farmers whose land was only zoned rural. The second type was that the term ‘forestry’, when applied to areas under two hectares, could be construed to include shelter planting, amenity planting and erosion control planting, and that these should be specifically excluded from its definition.
The common and most notable theme that runs through the submissions to the Landscape Section of the draft plan, however, is their scope. Some submissions could be seen as 'outliers' and probably belonging to discourses not identified or examined here. However, those made by Otago Peninsula farmers, Federated Farmers and the Ministry of Forestry all have the feature that their focus is to support the free actions of individual farmers on their own properties. As stated in a Federated Farmers Otago submission:

It should be remembered that the primary land use for most of these areas is farming. Landholders carrying out normal activities and exercising normal land use opportunities should not have costs and restrictions applied to their productive land, just to please others, yet receive no benefits. Costly consents are unacceptable. If the zones and the rules were to remain, then it is essential that landholders on production land should not be charged any resource consent fees, because the benefit is (sic) for those people (or the wider community) off the land.

As it has been pointed out repeatedly, it is resistance between discourses that make them come into focus. This quotation should be contrasted with the following submission from Save the Otago Peninsula (STOP), a local environmental group:

We are also concerned that controls exercised by the Council on block tree planting will deter landowners on the Otago Peninsula from planting for erosion control reasons in areas of landslip activity. We know that many landowners are reluctant to and/or do not have the resources to do extremely important land stability planting. In our view the Council is placing yet another barrier in the way of this happening. There is very little in the plan to encourage landowners to comply with and undertake soil protection measures on the Otago Peninsula.

Clearly STOP feels it at least has the right, possibly an obligation, to make submissions about how the plan may impinge on the behaviour and practices of others, something that does not occur within the agricultural discourse.

One of the responses to the feeling of disempowerment amongst the farming community to the District Plan process was a strong campaign, largely instigated by rural landowners, to have a Community Board established. Community Boards are the bottom tier of local government in New Zealand, and do not exist automatically. Of the prospect of the establishment of a Community Board for the Peninsula David D said:

Well I can't see the farmers having a voice in it anyway. If I disappeared tomorrow it wouldn't concern the Dunedin City. You know, this farm is of no concern to the mayor, no concern to anybody. The few thousand sheep we run here. It's not a big employer; you're maybe only talking about one person out of work, so they're not worried about it. They're more worried about the tourism side of things (Int 30, Land Owner, 22/9/00).
The campaign to establish a Community Board for the Otago Peninsula was eventually successful, and the first Board elected in 2001.

5.4 Conclusion

In this Chapter I examined what I call the agricultural discourse of land management. This is the first of the European discourses which I will discuss, and that is because it has the longest history and has had the most extensive impacts on the landscape of Aotearoa/New Zealand. This agricultural discourse is characterised by a number of features, but key amongst them is the construction of land as an economic resource. As such, attachment to the land, while strongly felt, is something which is earned by continuing hard work and ongoing improvement in order to protect and increase future economic returns.

The first form of land ‘improvement’ which was undertaken on the Otago Peninsula, as elsewhere, was forest clearance. Echoes of the moral imperative which, in part, drove this process of clearance can still be heard in the agricultural discourse’s reference to ‘scrub’. That bush-free land is improved land is reflected in the resistance shown to the environmental discourse (see Chapter Six) which constructs the bush as a valuable indigenous ecosystem. The ongoing control of weeds, referred to, often, as ‘cleaning’, similarly reflects the moral imperative to work hard to maintain the economic productivity of the cleared land.

The instability of the land is constructed as a natural and acceptable part of farming on the Otago Peninsula by the agricultural discourse. As simply a characteristic of the place, it is simply something to be managed. The paradox that one of the means of managing land instability is tree planting, whilst the clearance of the bush as a cause of the instability of the land is denied, goes unnoticed. However, the trees which are planted are species which not only minimise pasture loss, but that can themselves be used as fodder in emergency situations, again emphasising the underlying economic base of the discourse.
Farming practice continues to change on the Otago Peninsula. Over the past twenty years, changes in Government policies and the wide scale (but far from universal) acceptance of the neoliberal economic discourse have coloured these changes. Emphasis on increasing efficiency in terms of minimising effort and expense while maximising production have become a strong theme.

The neoliberal economic discourse also supports the construction of the property owner as an independent land manager found in the agricultural discourse. However, the rise of the Otago Peninsula Walkers and the related organisation, Public Access New Zealand, can be seen as acts of resistance against the force of the neoliberal discourse and the sale and privatisation of public assets which its ascendancy produced.

The Resource Management Act 1991 is, in its essence, a neoliberal tool for environmental management. However, the development of the Dunedin District Plan as it pertains to the Otago Peninsula is, perhaps, the strongest indicator to date of the waning power of the agricultural discourse there. The dominance of the Otago Peninsula as a scenic and recreational resource for the people of Dunedin and for tourists, rather than as an economic resource, has been institutionalised in the Plan.

As my theoretical model predicted, aspects of the agricultural discourse only came to light at points of resistance with other discourses – Māori, environmental, neoliberal, planning and public access. While the previous chapter examined the Mana Whenua and their constructions of and relationships with the land of the Otago Peninsula, the next chapters will continue the examination of the main Pākehā discourses in evidence within the corpus, beginning with the environmental discourse.
Chapter Six: The environmental discourse

6.1 Introduction

The concept of discourse has been widely used in writing about environmentalism. This extends from discussing changes in broad scale human-environment relationships through time, as with Benton and Short's (1999) *Environmental Discourse and Practice*, or to analysing conflicts over specific issues or proposals, such as Harrison and Burgess' (1993) 'Social Constructions of Nature: a case study of conflicts over the development of Rainment Marshes'. Clearly a discourse can be defined at vastly differing scales and, indeed, Benton and Short (1999 P2) use the term 'metadiscourse' to refer to the more encompassing concept that they use.

In this Chapter I refer to the discourse I am discussing as 'the' environmental discourse. I am not, however, claiming that it is a national phenomenon, or that there is only one discourse expressing environmental concerns. What I am claiming is simply that this discourse is expressed within the case study area. Within that area it has a notable impact, both spatially in terms of the increasing amounts of land specifically managed in terms of its precepts, but also politically in terms of its influence on broader scale land (and landscape) management. Thus, it is far from a metadiscourse, although it may belong under the auspices of one, but it exists at a more generalised level than that at which Harrison and Burgess undertake their analysis.

The fundamental characteristics of the environmental discourse on the Otago Peninsula are, firstly, that it constructs a very broad view of the environment. While the agricultural discourse focuses on the farm, the environmental discourse focuses on the entire area, in this case the whole Otago Peninsula and its immediate environs. Thus areas of concern extend well beyond any one person's property onto the properties of others. In this regard there is strong resistance between this discourse and the agricultural discourse. Further, while acknowledging the need to make an economic return off farmland, the environmental discourse eschews the construction of land as an economic resource, constructing it in more romantic terms as wounded
biological potential. As it is people who have harmed the land they are placed into quite specific subject roles, and are constructed as objects of the discourse also.

This chapter discusses the environmental discourse which is evinced on the Otago Peninsula. The Peninsula is home to a vigorous, and local environmental movement which has developed in response to some quite specific issues. I examine the background to this development, and investigate some of the characteristics of the discourse. In addition, I examine its relationship with other discourses, in particular the agricultural discourse discussed in the previous chapter.

### 6.2 The context

#### 6.2.1 The national and international contexts

The rapid transformation of the land of Aotearoa / New Zealand into a landscape of agricultural production has not been without its casualties. Our iconic bird, the kiwi, is threatened with extinction, and it was recently reported that we are losing eleven kiwi a day, mostly to introduced mammalian predators (Hayman, K. *The Press* 6 Dec 2003). Land clearance has reduced the amount of habitat available to indigenous birds and plant species have also become extinct as a result of the felling of forest and the subsequent grazing of the land. Erosion, both in terms of land slippage and topsoil loss, has been associated with deforestation and the subsequent siltation of wetlands, lakes and streambeds. Top dressing has been blamed for the nitrification of freshwater lakes, and stock effluent and agrochemicals are blamed for decreased water quality in our rivers and lakes. Stock are blamed for the destruction of habitat for aquatic species and diminishing water quality by causing physical damage to stream banks (Unwin & Jellyman 2002).

However, over the last thirty years, or so, the idea of the inevitability of these as inescapable effects of economic development and prosperity has been challenged. The extinction of indigenous species, particularly of avifauna, is no longer considered acceptable and considerable public resources are put into the protection of threatened birds. Industrial pollution is now more rigorously controlled and pressure is mounting to mitigate the effects of agricultural pollution. To a considerable extent this has been
due to the development in Aotearoa / New Zealand, along with the rest of the western world, the development of an environmental movement which challenges some of the basic values and practices of agriculture and of industry and the society based upon them. Increasingly the 'clean, green' image which Aotearoa / New Zealand likes to trade on, and which is intimately associated with its landscapes, has come to be viewed with cynicism.

While it has been argued (Lochhead 1994) that voluntary nature conservation has a long history in Aotearoa / New Zealand, the event to which the current environmental movement traces its beginnings is the Manapouri controversy which began in 1960. The controversy hinged around the proposal to raise the level of Lake Manapouri in the Fiordland National Park of the South Island of Aotearoa / New Zealand in order to generate electricity for the production of aluminium. Lake Manapouri is widely considered a scenic gem drawing many responses such as this one from Herries Beattie, an early twentieth century commentator:

Not only do the islands exude loveliness, for it is all around us in the elegance of the whole design, in the symmetry of outline and in that harmony produced by conformity to each of their whole. There is not a discordant note in all this wonderful representation of nature (Cited in Peat 1994 P3).

The proposal to raise the level of the lake was opposed on the grounds of the scenic and ecological damage which would have ensued. A substantial campaign to protect the lake developed from 1960, including the presentation of a petition bearing over 250,000 signatures to Parliament in 1970. At the time, this was the largest ever petition presented to Parliament in New Zealand.

Wells (1998 P 24) characterises the Save Manapouri campaign as having been 'a consequence of a determination to voice a democratic concern' to a government traditionally given to controlling the direction of major projects, and at the same time 'a catalyst for popular environmentalism'. The issue was finally settled in 1972 with the election of the Third Labour Government who had stated as a campaign platform that they would not raise the level of the lake¹. The Third Labour Government lasted

¹ A power station was built at Manapouri, but without raising the level of the lake. However, other environmental impacts, particularly the diversion of water from the Waiau River, continue to be of grave concern to Kai Tahu (Field notes 17/4/2000).
only one three year term and was replaced in 1975 by a National Government led by, the highly interventionist Prime Minister, Robert Muldoon. Under his leadership this government went on to propose, and eventually build, a number of major public energy developments.

In the international context New Zealand had been suffering deteriorating economic prosperity for some years as a result of Britain’s 1964 decision to join the European Economic Community (EEC). On top of the loss of the traditional markets provided by Britain for New Zealand’s primary produce, the oil shocks of the early and late 1970s led to further economic deterioration and a heightened awareness of New Zealand’s economic vulnerability. As a consequence, central government moved to promote a number of projects intended to promote New Zealand’s energy self-sufficiency and industrialisation. These included the Clyde hydroelectricity dam in Central Otago and the Motonui synthetic petrol plant in Taranaki. Collectively, these projects were known as ‘Think Big’, and in order to facilitate these projects the National Development Act (1979) was passed to ‘fast track’ approval for their development (King 2003).

On completion, the Clyde Dam was expected to produce a surplus of electricity so a high energy consuming industry was sought to utilise the power. As Manapouri was to power an aluminium smelter so too, it seemed, would the Clyde Dam. A proposal was made to build a second aluminium smelter, this one to be located on the tidal flats at Aramoana at the mouth of the Otago Harbour. However, the proposal engendered a high level of resistance which eventually resulted in its failure, and increased levels of protection from potential development for the Aramoana salt marshes.

6.2.2 The local context

Up until the late 1960s, the Otago Peninsula had been a part of Dunedin’s rural backdrop. In 1967 the Peninsula County Council was disbanded and the Peninsula became part of Dunedin City’s administrative area. The harbourside communities which existed at Broad Bay, Company Bay, Portobello and further out towards the heads, had been largely crib communities. Retired farmers, shopkeepers and other
service people made up the bulk of the permanent residents, and most of the housing stock was either of small roughly built cribs or the more substantial holiday homes of Dunedin’s wealthy. (John, now in his seventies, recounted to me how, as a young boy on his way to Sunday School, he would pass the Rolls Royce belonging to Mr Hudson, of Cadbury Fry Hudson, the chocolate manufacturer, parked outside his weekend house in Broad Bay.) The nineteen seventies began to see a change in these communities.

Young urban intellectuals began buying the old cribs and houses and transforming them into permanent homes. An eclectic mix of hippies and young professionals moved into the area and transformed these quiet, semi-rural communities into commuter suburbs. Ben commented that in 1979 there were, ‘...probably more PhDs in Portobello than there were per capita in the rest of New Zealand.’ The Peninsula offered many and varied attractions to this new group of residents. Housing, often initially quite primitive, was very cheap. Women who had had young families in their early years on the Peninsula often mentioned to me the community feeling as important.

Around 1980 plans were made to extend the reticulation of water and sewerage to the communities north of Macandrew Bay. This was to be paid for in part by a contribution from individual ratepayers. A substantial campaign was run by affected Peninsula residents which resulted in the Council paying the entire cost of the work. Thus, when the Aramoana campaign began, there were already groups of organised, articulate, and politically well informed Peninsula residents ready to take up the cause.

A well-organised and vociferous movement arose to oppose the construction of a second smelter at Aramoana. Economic, scenic, ecological and cultural arguments were made against the smelter, and against its siting at Aramoana. Partway through the process a second possible site for the smelter was mooted. This site was the Okia flats at Victory Beach on the Otago Peninsula. While many Peninsula residents had

---

2 This is based on my own observations at the time when I had friends who fitted both these categories who moved there, and on those of respondents. In addition, the majority of the 'recent arrivals' I interviewed were professionals and/or academics who worked in the city, leading me to characterise this group as 'semi-urban intellectuals'.
already been active in the Save Aramoana campaign, the move of focus from their doorstep (Aramoana) to their living room (Okia) prompted the development of a second, more localised group, Save The Otago Peninsula or STOP. While initially the group included local landowners, the major contribution to the membership came, and continues to come, from the semi-urban intellectuals.

STOP was initially occupied in dispatching the idea of the aluminium smelter, but soon after actively opposed the plans of an Australian mining consortium that hoped to mine the gold which exists beneath the iconic Harbour Cone. This project, along with the smelter, was eventually dispatched into oblivion. STOP, however, was not. Having had their environmental awareness raised by their participation in these struggles the core members of the group continued on but turned their focus to other aspects of the environment (Maria, Int14, Community Group, 11/6/00).3

In 1982 a Department of Scientific and Industrial Research (DSIR) botanist, and Peninsula resident, published a survey of vegetation on the Peninsula in which he predicted the end of the pockets of remnant bush unless steps were taken to protect them (Johnson 1982). As a consequence of this report, revegetation and the protection of existing bush became a STOP priority. In 1988 the first Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust Open Space Covenant on the Peninsula was made on a piece of bush which STOP had taken charge of, and the regeneration of which it still manages. In addition other revegetation projects have been, and continue to be undertaken, by STOP (Maria, Int14, Community Group, 11/6/00).

At around the same time zoologists were taking an interest in another aspect of the local Peninsula biota, *Megadyptes antipodes*, the Yellow-eyed Penguin or Hoiho. In 1985 a local penguin expert attended a STOP meeting to inform members of what he considered to be the dire situation in which Yellow-eyed Penguins existed. Considerable predation of chicks was occurring and habitat destruction through grazing was seen to be both threatening in itself and encouraging of introduced predators. Also, in the early 1980s a disease had destroyed much of the tree lupins

---

3 As much of the history of the organisations I mention here was gleaned from interviews with people key in their development, rather than from the analysis of written records or secondary sources, I cite the respondent concerned in the text.
(Lupinus arboreus) that grew along Otago's sandy beaches, and the loss of this cover was also of great concern.

In response to this meeting, some members of STOP became very concerned for the future of the Yellow-eyed Penguin. They also realised that the bird was, at least potentially, a species that would capture the public imagination and purse, and saw the possibility of utilising it as a consciousness-raising tool. Concerned generally with the protection and restoration of coastal ecosystems, and specifically with protecting endangered species, these STOP members formed an offshoot that became, in 1987, the Yellow-eyed Penguin Trust (Maria Int14, Community Group, 11/6/00; David, Int 2, Community Group, 31/3/00).

Initially the Trust aimed to become a fundraising machine that could support the efforts of Wildlife Service⁴ and other agencies in their work. The share market crash in 1987⁵ destroyed some of their ambitions, but the gaining of sponsorship from Mainland Products⁶, plus the accuracy of their shrewd assessment of the penguin as a conservation icon, led to them becoming very successful. From raising funds to assist with revegetation and related activities, the Trust moved into purchasing properties with the intention of managing them for Yellow-eyed Penguins (David, Int 2, Community Group, 31/3/00). Two of these reserves are on the Otago Peninsula and I will discuss aspects of their management shortly.

In 1994, in response to growing public concern about land instability on the Peninsula, STOP called a public meeting to investigate the possibility of establishing a Landcare Group on the Otago Peninsula. The Landcare Trust is a national organisation under which local Landcare groups operate throughout the country promoting:

...an ethic of community based environmental stewardship and responsibility. We believe that, in addition to compliance with environmental requirements, the community approach has the greatest potential for advancing sustainable land management and solving environmental problems. (http://www.landcare.org.nz/trust/briefingpaper_Feb00.pdf downloaded 14/10/03)

---

⁴ The Wildlife Service has been subsumed by the Department of Conservation
⁵ In 1987 the New Zealand share market, which had become highly inflated by speculative investment, crashed leading the country into an economic slump
⁶ Mainland is a major dairy products manufacturer in New Zealand.
The Otago Peninsula Landcare Group was subsequently incorporated in 1995 and saw its primary focus as promoting practices to improve land stability. The Peninsula Group gives as its mission statement, ‘To achieve sustainable land management on the Otago Peninsula through community involvement’ (Otago Peninsula Landcare Group 1998 P2).

This attempt to forge a united, environmentally focused, group from the disparate groups on the Peninsula was struggling by 2000, when I did my fieldwork, and the absence of an Otago Peninsula Landcare group from the parent organisation’s website in 2003 suggests it has succumbed to its demise. However, during its period of operation the Otago Peninsula Landcare Group undertook field days, planted trees on slips with the aim of stabilising them, and produced a ‘Directory of Otago Peninsula Resource Information’. Fundamentally, irresolvable conflict between the agricultural and environmental discourses, exacerbated by a series of historical events and strong personalities, seems to have rendered this group unworkable.7

Other groups are involved in environmental concerns on the Otago Peninsula. The Otago Peninsula Trust, established in 1967, operates a tourist venture at the Royal Albatross colony at Taiaroa Head, and is involved in at least one revegetation project. In addition it has provided space and resources for the propagation of indigenous plants to other groups (Andrew, Int 16, Community Group, 16/6/00). A coalition of representatives from the Yellow-eyed Penguin Trust, Dunedin City Council, Department of Conservation, Te Runanga ki o Otakou, and the University of Otago are involved in re-establishing pikao8 on dune systems on the Peninsula (Evan, Int 12, Community Group, 2/6/00; Robert, Int 24, Professional, 11/8/00). A representative offered three goals for the group: to provide ‘cultural material’ (pikao is a traditional weaving material for Māori); to provide an educational resource through its use in amenity plantings; and to stabilise dunes9 (Robert, Int 24, Professional, 11/8/00). The Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society has involvement in a number of projects, both directly and through the Kiwi Conservation Club. These include the

---

7 See Chapter Five for further discussion of the Landcare Group and its internal conflicts.
8 Pikao (Desmoschoenus spiralis) is a dune plant of great cultural importance to Māori. It once covered sand dunes the length of the country but has been destroyed by burning and by the planting of the exotic Marram Grass for dune stabilisation. It is known as pingao in the northern dialects.
9 For a fascinating eyewitness account of the destruction of pikao and an insightful description of the consequences, see Eccles (1944).
establishment of a scientific reserve in conjunction with the Department of Conservation and STOP to facilitate the study of the Green Jewelled Gecko, and participation in revegetation projects around the Tomahawk Lagoons (Bob, Int 27, Community Group, 12/9/00).

At an institutional level, the Department of Conservation has extensive involvement in environmental issues on the Otago Peninsula. The Albatross colony at Taiaroa Head is within a Nature Reserve managed and controlled by DoC. In addition to this an extensive network of wildlife and other reserves come under the Department’s management and control. The major priorities for the Department of Conservation are established on a species basis and priorities are determined by the degree of endangerment they are perceived to be under. Thus as Yellow-eyed penguins are a high priority DoC is involved in the monitoring of the species on the entire Peninsula and the management of a number of reserves for their benefit.

Members and staff of all of these organisations were interviewed in the process of this research. It is the transcripts of their interviews, and the submissions made by some of these groups to the Dunedin Draft District Plan, which form the corpus from which the environmental discourse was identified.

6.3 The environmental discourse

The environmental discourse is evident at three differing levels on the Otago Peninsula. The discourse constructs an holistic view of the Otago Peninsula, thus a sense of responsibility for the whole place is expressed through it. As with the agricultural discourse, I suggest this is connected to the sense of attachment that is felt by its exponents to the environment in which they to live. The actions demanded by this holistic discourse are, however, constrained by systems of land ownership, economics and other pragmatic concerns. Thus the sense of responsibility for the whole place gains expression ‘on the ground’ at specific sites only. Thirdly, the holistic view of the discourse is expressed again as social action at the policy level in the form of submissions and arguments made at District and Regional Council levels.
6.3.1 Attachment to place

As I have alluded to, those respondents who most strongly expressed the environmental discourse on the Otago Peninsula were all ‘recent arrivals’, those I characterised previously as ‘young urban intellectuals’. Now not so young, most still make the Peninsula their home. When examining their motivations to move to the Peninsula, and the attachment to place that they now evince, several strong themes emerge. While not all of the ‘recent arrivals’ utilise the environmental discourse or are involved with, or interested in, the environmental organisations on the Peninsula, the similarities in their motivations and attachments, and their divergence from those of the exponents of the agricultural discourse, support an examination of these themes. The strongest themes of attraction and attachment to place were to do with the lifestyle, the sense of community, the rurality of the Peninsula, the scenery and, most commonly, the sea.

Ivan moved to the Peninsula with ‘a romantic, a really strong urge to live in a place where I had some sort of, some ability to control or sort of determine what sort of environment I lived in.’ Murray, a retired man with a passionate interest in radio, bought land on the Peninsula to facilitate his hobby. He said of the place,

Well I just enjoy the peace and quiet up here. I’m not very sociable at all and ah that suits me very well. I really enjoy the view. Radio reception is absolutely ideal and I can, within limits, do what I want, and it’s worked out very well. I don’t have neighbours cutting the grass or being close to them like you are in town and complaining about things… and it’s near enough to being in town for the number of times that I want to go in. As I said, ten minutes to main street. Everything’s either in the shopping areas adjacent or in town (Int 41, Small Holder, 13/10/00).

For many this rural or semi rural setting on the doorstep of the city is a key aspect of the attraction of the Peninsula as a place to live. Jeff, a professional whose work area includes the Peninsula, lives overlooking Papanui Inlet. He explained his attachment to the Peninsula in the following statement:

I’m not a big city person and to me the big attraction of the Peninsula, and why I’m still here really, is the fact that in the afternoon I can be on a beach that feels like as remote as the sub Antarctic in places, you know, and yet in that same evening I can come in and go to a movie or a restaurant or something (Int 26, Professional, 22/8/00).
He went on to say that:

> From a pragmatic point of view it gives me the opportunity to be able to work and still have a house which is basically remote...so in that sense it's the best of both worlds (Int 26, Professional, 22/8/00).

This pleasure taken in having the best of the rural and urban in close proximity is similar to that expressed by the farmers who had lived on the Peninsula most of their lives.

Many of those who had moved to the Peninsula in the late 1970s and early 1980s found that their Dunedin friends had the perception that they lived far away. Lynn and David reminisced of the time when visitors from Dunedin would feel that they should stay the night, rather than undertake the long drive home in the dark. Kate, who has lived in a cottage on the water at Otakou for sixteen years admitted that one of the criteria she used for choosing where to live was to be far enough out of town that people wouldn’t just drop in to visit10.

Grace ‘sort of fell in love with the Peninsula and the Bay.’ She said:

> I just loved the ruralness of it and the sea, and I can recall someone saying to me, ‘What was it like living down there?’ and I said that it was like waking up when you’re on holiday every morning (Int 3, Professional, 12/4/00).

Kate chose to live at Otakou because:

> I figured that the Māori would always pick the best place to live and they picked down here on the sunny side where there were quite fertile marine areas, you know, the flounders and the kai moana. The shellfish, pipis and other bits and pieces around here. There’s lots and lots of fish (Int 34, Professional, 29/9/00)

Kate’s partner regularly sets nets in the tidal waters outside their home.

For others, living on the harbour is important for the recreational opportunities it affords, particularly for boating. However, more subtle relationships also exist with the harbour. Neil, a landscape architect, commented that he was drawn to the Peninsula by the way it ‘reacts with the sea’. Maria grew up near the sea in the Pacific Islands and said, ‘For me, I need to be near the sea. I get quite depressed if

---

10 I myself noticed on my return to Dunedin in 1999 to begin my field work, after a ten year absence, that the city and Peninsula had ‘shrunk’. Journeys that I would once have considered a day’s outing became an afternoon trip. On reflection I attribute this ‘shrinkage’ to improved roads (straighter, wider, and better surfaced); more comfortable, more manoeuvrable speedier vehicles; and to a change in habit as living in Auckland had led me to consider a half hour journey to be a quick, short trip where once I would have seen it as a fairly long journey.
I'm not.' When living in Australia she used to think of the Peninsula and it was, 'the beaches, beaches without people on them...the coastal area, the harbour, the islands, the relations with the islands in the harbour,' that she visualised. She went on to say of the harbour:

I like the more bounded version of the sea...I actually like the more intimate feel you get with the harbour and the light play that you get on the um you know with the islands and the hills and so on (Int 14, Community Group, 11/6/00).

The combination of the sea and the ability to experience feelings of isolation and solitude was important for a number of respondents. Lynn said of her husband, David, that he 'tends to like the coast and those sort of habitats. He'll go off into isolation and get his satisfaction there, and pretends there's no people around.' Harvey, whose work takes him to some of the more inaccessible parts of the Peninsula said that a high point of his work there was 'being able to walk along the beaches and have no-one else there and just have the place to myself. That's the big high really.' Graeme, a Dunedin resident at the time of interview (he has since moved to live on the Peninsula also) and landscape architect, spends a lot of time on the Peninsula for recreation. He also expressed a liking for the feeling of isolation saying, 'You can get a feeling of remoteness, you can often be the only one on a beach.'

Amongst recent settlers on the Peninsula the scenic aspect of the harbour and ocean was also important. Shirley and her husband moved to the Peninsula because 'I suppose we really wanted to have a view out onto the water.' Similarly Edward and his wife were drawn to the Peninsula by the prospect of views over the water. 'We like water and it's never the same two days running: it can be grey, blue, smooth, rough, flat.' he said. Ruth and her husband picked the Peninsula for a yet-to-be-developed tourism venture because of its coastal aspect. Lesley, who has lived on the Peninsula for more than twenty years whilst carrying on a career in the city, commented that, 'The drive to town is so lovely, driving along the harbour.' Thus, what could be, for some, a gruelling journey along a winding road is, for her, one of the pleasures of living in the place.

The community, particularly that based around Broad Bay and Portobello, was cited as a strong plus by other respondents, particularly women who had children. For
Lynn the heterogeneity of the community, 'a whole mish mash of everything from hippies to retired people to people on the dole to professionals,' appealed as, 'whoever you were you sort of found someone who had sympathies with you.' For her, and for Grace, however, it was the uniting of this disparate group in their fight with the Dunedin City Council over payment for the installation of sewerage and water that really created the sense of community.

Ben and his wife astonished locals by choosing to emigrate from urban Canada to Portobello, in the 1970s. They chose the South Island as it was less populated that the North, Dunedin because its potential to expand was limited by being hemmed in by hills, and Portobello because it appeared to be a small rural community within easy commuting distance of the city. They aimed to remove their young daughters ‘...from North American materialistic values.’ Ben eschewed the label 'lifestyler' but described himself as a rural person and said of their decision, ‘well, we haven’t moved so this must be about one of the best places in the world’.

For others though, the attraction of the Peninsula was simply the desire to own land. Euan wanted to own land and now says that ‘grazing animals are the best way of keeping it’. Alan bought land because ‘it was really just to have a nice spot to live’. He has been able to pursue his interest in trees, and his wife her interest in perennials. In addition, with their neighbour, they have supported an area of indigenous forest which is now under a Queen Elizabeth the Second (Q E II) Open Space Covenant, all in all providing, ‘a nice sort of lifestyle in the country’. Andrew E and his wife moved to Dunedin in 1982. They thought the Peninsula 'looked nice' and in 1987 bought a ten-acre block on which they have built a house. Andrew E said that their main criteria in selecting a place was that it should be ‘a place we’d like to be’ but that their desire to have a piece of land that big was, ‘Because it’s nice to have some space, which you can’t have in England, so you can walk around in the evenings.’

Anne and Neville bought a block of land close to their suburban home in order to prevent it being subdivided for housing. Anne said of it:

I like just land and trees and nature and to me it was the greatest thing that you could just come over here and walk around with the dog and that was just my joy to be out in nature (Int 44, Small Holder, 15/10/00).
When their children had left home Neville began to want to build on their property. Eventually they did build and now live on the land. Anne now finds being on the land a central part of her lifestyle. She said:

So I live my life on this land honouring all the life forms on the land so I see when the birds come. I think, 'That’s a blessing, oh good, that means we’re getting it right, if the birds are coming’ (Int 44, Small Holder, 15/10/00).

It is from within this group that expresses this new found attachment to the land and sea of the Otago Peninsula that the environmental discourse arises. Their bond with the place is not generational, but one made of choice. The attractions of the place are of the broader environment rather than the piece of land they have ended up living on; the views, the beaches, the rural feel of the place, the potential for solitude. As such, it is not surprising that the strongest advocates for the maintenance and improvement in the quality of this environment come from within this group who have chosen to make the Otago Peninsula their home.

6.3.2 The construction of the environment

The environmental discourse constructs an holistic view of the environment. By this I mean that it takes a broad scale view, not limited by legal, political, or even ecological boundaries, a ‘landscape’ view, if you like. Thus, with regard to the Otago Peninsula, the ‘environment’ is all of the Peninsula and not an area limited by particular property boundaries. A consequence of this is that the impact of people’s actions on the land is a community concern and one that transcends property and other boundaries.

The concern for the larger environment can be seen very clearly in an examination of the submissions made by some of the environmental groups to the Dunedin City Council’s Draft District Plan. Section 10 of the Draft Plan ‘deals with management of the City’s landscape quality in terms of its aesthetic coherence and scenic values’ (DDP 1995 p 10:1). STOP made the following general submission on the landscape section of the Draft District Plan in its entirety:

We are delighted that the Otago Peninsula is recognised as an Outstanding Landscape Area in the Plan. We do have concerns about the real effects of this on landowners in

---

11 The *Oxford Compact English Dictionary* (1996) defines ‘environment’ firstly as ‘the physical surroundings, conditions, circumstances, etc., in which a person lives’.
the area and ask that provision be made to assist landowners comply with the rules provided to maintain the values appreciated by the wider community.

It goes on to request the following decision:

We suggest that the Council waver resource consent fees to aid in compliance with the new designation. Enhancement subsidies could also be available for these areas as well eg assistance with Native Bush Protection in the form of fencing assistance.

Section 10.6 of the Draft Plan sets out the Rules applying to the parts of the Peninsula included in the 'Landscape Management Areas'. This section sought to give the Council control of a number of activities including forestry. STOP's submission relating to this issue was as follows:

We are also concerned that the controls exercised by Council on block tree planting will deter landowners on the Otago Peninsula from planting for erosion control reasons in areas of landslip activity. We know that many landowners are reluctant to and / or do not have the resources to do extremely important land stability planting. In our view the Council is placing yet another barrier in the way of this happening. There is very little in the plan set to encourage landowners to comply with and undertake soil protection measures on the Otago Peninsula.

These submissions are interesting and significant in three ways. Firstly they both focus on the Peninsula as a whole underlining the holistic construction of environment which is characteristic of this discourse. The submissions are about overarching concerns as opposed to a submission relating to something which might have a personal or property specific impact. This is emphasised by the words, 'maintain the values appreciated by the wider community' in the general submission. The discourse clearly places community interests ahead of those of the individual landowner.

The second interesting aspect to these submissions is that they express concern for how the proposed plan might impact on a group other than that making the submission. This is not a purely altruistic gesture. It is clear that the motivation is to facilitate the betterment of the Peninsula environment. Specifically there is a desire to see soil conservation undertaken, and there is a concern that landowners, finding the Plan burdensome, might fail to undertake the actions considered necessary by the submitters. This expression of concern for the effects of actions on the wider community, and on groups outside of its own ambit, is very characteristic of the environmental discourse.
However, perhaps the most interesting aspect of these submissions is that they have been made on the landscape section of the DDP. This is the case even though they clearly demonstrate a concern for 'environmental' issues rather than 'aesthetic coherence and scenic qualities'. The section of the plan which would, perhaps, be a more appropriate focus for the environmental discourse (and I will examine submissions on this section shortly) is Section 12 Areas of Significant Conservation Value (emphasis mine). Section 12 isolates environmental concerns to specific areas and places. While the environmental discourse will support this as the pragmatic expression of the discourse on the ground, the holistic nature of the discourse requires a broader focus. Within the policy framework produced by the DCC, and foregrounded by the RMA91, the only way of gaining this broader focus is by conflating 'landscape' and 'environment'. Hence, we have submissions from within the environmental discourse on landscape policy. (I will discuss further aspects of the conflation of environment and landscape in Chapter Eight.)

The failure of the Draft District Plan to provide an holistic approach to environmental issues in keeping with the environmental discourse can be seen in submissions to Section 12 Areas of Significant Conservation Value. This section of the Plan has proved to be contentious amongst those utilising the environmental discourse. The original Section 12 of the Draft Plan was considered inadequate and the final Section 16 Indigenous Vegetation and Fauna has also been found to be inadequate. This has resulted in a lengthy process of negotiation between STOP, the Dunedin City Council, the Department of Conservation and other concerned parties to avert a referral to the Environment Court for a judicial decision.12

The basic thrust of the concerns expressed about the section was that it simply applied rules to areas already protected by dint of being a public reserve already or a covenanted area on private land. Ivan made an individual submission on Section 12.5 Areas of Significant Conservation Value – Rules, in which he said:

I oppose the need for any rules in this section. The Department of Conservation has its own rules and all existing covenanted areas have tailor made conditions which have been agreed to by the landowners.

---

12 This process is as yet incomplete at the time of writing in May 2004 (Buxton R. pers com April 27 2004).
Resource consent applications are unnecessarily bureaucratic and costly to landowners involved.

Only protected areas have been identified.

I would like to see the rules either be removed or areas already protected by covenant or similar be excluded from rules.

While Ivan, in this instance, is an affected landowner having a QE II covenant on his own property, his concern is still expressed in terms of a broader group.

That the underlying concern is not for people but for the environment is underlined, however, by a submission from STOP on Section 12. They complain:

Methods and rules under this section do not allow or support Policy 12.3.4 [To support efforts to protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna in private ownership in the City.]

We feel the Dunedin City Council through this plan is not providing for 'The protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna' as it is required to do under the Resource Management Act. Through this proposed District Plan they are merely recognising the work of other organisations and landowners and putting their mark on these areas by the imposition of rules. The net effect will be less protection not more.

The Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust echoed that sentiment saying, 'We fear that the approach taken in the District Plan will serve to act as a distinct disincentive to landowners to formally protect important areas.'

It is important to make a further point with regard to these submissions. Not only is the content significant and informative, but the very act of making the submission is significant. The environmental discourse has a didactic aspect and, as can be seen from the discussion immediately above, an activist aspect as well. Not only must the community be encouraged to learn about the threats to the environment but also it is important for people to intervene in the broad scale management strategies which may support the goals formulated within the discourse.

This can also be seen with regard to another issue, that of weeds. Grace complained in 2000 of the Otago Regional Council's (ORC) Pest Plant Strategy that:

The problem is that the Regional Council's Pest Plant Strategy looks at farming type weeds, the weeds that are a problem with farming, not the weeds that are a problem with the things I'm interested in which is the indigenous vegetation. Banana passionfruit is the only one, from memory, that you're not allowed to sell or distribute. Bomaria is not even mentioned.
The ORC’s pest strategies have subsequently been reviewed and a new strategy took effect on 1 September 2001. Bomaria (*Bomaria caldasi* & *B. multiflora*) has now been included as a pest plant, and the strategy now has an entire section focusing on the plants which threaten indigenous vegetation specifically on the Otago Peninsula. This must be seen as a reflection of the level of activity of those promoting the environmental discourse’s take on issues on the Peninsula, and the power which they are able to wield in the local political scene.

### 6.3.3 The human connection

The environmental discourse constructs social/environmental actors in two major, and oppositional, ways. These constructions can be characterised as the ‘agent of destruction’ and its partner, the ‘responsible saviour’. I will discuss each of these in turn.

- **The agent of destruction**

Perhaps one of the strongest themes running through the environmental discourse is that human actions have, at least in the past, had a strongly detrimental effect on the environment and on nature. Lesley put it bluntly saying, ‘I think humans are a disaster.’ This theme is reflected directly, as in this statement, and by implication.

Neil considered that lifestyle blocks would be ‘the saviour’ of the place’ returning the land to native bush and making that option economically valuable. The remaining indigenous bush is seen as threatened and requiring protection. John K described the main threats to the indigenous vegetation on the Peninsula: ‘I always think of the four fs:- farming, forestry, fire. What’s the other one? Fishing is the fourth one but that doesn’t really threaten vegetation.’ That these threats are primarily consequences of human endeavour is clear.

A strong sense of loss accompanies this view. Lynn, when recounting what she called the ‘testosterone days’ of the nineteenth century when (male) Dunedin residents

---

13 Throughout this section I have italicised words in quotations in order to emphasise aspects of the vocabulary of the environmental discourse. These emphases do not reflect any emphases in the respondents’ speech.
would cut trees on the Peninsula for recreation, said of the result, 'It's very sad really cause apart from Glenfalloch there's very few areas where you get any large trees remaining.' Maria spoke of a stand of Kowhai:

We actually asked those people, and he was involved with STOP, if we could fence off this set of kowhais which were just beautiful. They didn't give us permission. Now those kowhais are old and are falling down and stock have rubbed against them, they've rubbed all the bark off them and effectively ring barked them. Every time I go past that poor, forlorn looking, dead lot of trees with just a few branches out I think, 'Oooh', you know, 'That's been lost to us' (Int 14, Community Group, 11/6/00).

Ivan asserted that most of the little creeks on the Peninsula would once have had rocky bottoms, but that forest clearance and subsequent erosion have muddied them. 'You'd be lucky to find three or four rocky creeks on this Peninsula now,' he said.

This sense of loss is clearly connected to the romantic experience of wild nature.

Maria, for example, said:

I guess you're getting into the spiritual feeling about wild places and what it does for you, recharges your batteries and so on. I work in town during the week and it's really good to have places that you can walk in and you can feel as though, 'Yes, I've done something positive here.' You just feel better after you've walked along a beach or walked through some dunes, watched some butterflies, watched the white faced herons, seen the lizard, seen the green jewelled geckos. It just makes you feel good; makes me feel good (Int 14, Community Group, 11/6/00).

It is interesting to note that Maria uses the mechanistic expression 'recharges your batteries' to describe the experience of wild nature, underlining her separation from that nature, whilst nonetheless appreciating its effects on her. This romantic experience is also seen in the love of the solitude which can readily be experienced on the Peninsula and which was recounted in the section 6.3.1 above. High value is attributed to being able to have the place to oneself, and the presence of other people detracts from the experience. This clearly reflects Short's words when he said:

For the romantics...untouched spaces have the greatest significance; they have a purity which human contact tends to sully and degrade. Wilderness for the romantics is a place to be revered, a place of deep spiritual significance and a symbol of an earthly paradise (Short 1991 P6).

Humanity is unpleasant and destructive, but individual humans clearly find solace and healing in the experience of nature.

As is clear from this discussion a primary motivation for the concern expressed is what we, the human community, stand to lose. This is true both of the beauty and
The richness of indigenous species, but also of the restorative relationship we can have with (in) nature. We need wild nature in order to be fully human.

- **The responsible saviour**

As humanity has damaged nature, and as we need nature to be fully human, then we must take responsibility for the damage and put it right. Lesley owns a twenty-hectare property which is under a Q E II covenant and on which she and her husband are supporting the regeneration of the indigenous flora. She put it this way:

I just think that ecosystems are so amazing and I think what we have now is just such a pitiful remnant of what was here once. I went to Kapiti Island just about a fortnight ago and I was just astonished. It’s a bit sad when you come back to the mainland and you realise we’ve lost so many things. At the moment I think we’re losing in terms of conservation values. I think the problems of possums and introduced weeds are horrendous and they’re not being tackled (sighs). So I suppose this is our personal contribution. I think there’s a danger of humans being totally divorced, of ending up in a sea of concrete and, maybe teaching, I realise how little people know about what really belongs to New Zealand in terms of what’s been here for eons or were introduced for a particular reason. I just think we lose touch (Int 5, Small Holder, 30/4/00).

Ivan too lives on a smallholding, 75% of which is devoted to regenerating indigenous forest protected by a Q E II covenant. He has been actively managing this regeneration process for some years and, from propagating seedlings for his own use, has now developed a commercial nursery. Of this he said:

It’s not a large business but it’s a constructive way of being involved with the community doing what I really like doing promoting conservation, and just promoting a quality environment. It’s such a big part of people’s enjoyment of life when they can actually have trees around with birds giving them a morning greeting (Int 4, Small Holder, 29/4/00).

Thus a restored environment is a quality environment, and a quality environment is something people will enjoy.

Corrective and educational activities are required, and interconnected. Thus, the planting of Pikao, as mentioned above, not only results in the restoration of indigenous dune vegetation and the provision of weaving materials, but also provides an educational resource. Robert expanded on this theme:

I like to think of [pikao] as a flagship for trying to galvanise people into thinking about what their landscape was like and about the use of the plants and the
recognition of those plants but also about recognition of issues that are attached with the use of restoration. So it’s not just about a single species dominating a particular area because that was what was there. It’s also about how you behave in those particular areas and what you do in those particular areas. If you can modify people’s behaviour by placing plants and by positive interaction with that, then you might, hopefully, galvanise them into other things like not riding their motor bikes in the dunes and not bringing the dune buggy and not having fires and that sort of thing (Int 24, Professional, 11/8/00).

Ivan periodically welcomes school groups and others to visit his property to see the work that he has done to promote the regeneration of the indigenous flora. These people are able to walk through his property on a network of tracks which:

…gives them quite a pleasurable place to walk around and see the sort of work that I have done, and to encourage them to do likewise if they wish. I would say this place here has been a substantial influence on many of the properties around the Peninsula in general. Several of our neighbours have actually bought their places with specifically that in mind; to take stock off and regenerate the bush (Int 4, Small Holder, 29/4/00).

Thus Ivan’s efforts are both restorative and educational in nature.

When discussing the impact of houses on the Peninsula landscape, Evan made the point that given the time for trees to grow they will eventually just merge in. ‘It just takes time to heal those wounds,’ he said. On consequently being asked if he saw the Peninsula as wounded he replied:

Oh yeah. It’s had ninety percent of its native forest cover removed and in doing that it’s fallen over. It’s vulnerable to erosion. There’s development going on in areas where it shouldn’t be creating these great big catchment areas of house back yards and driveways that can run off vast quantities of water. We’re going to get problems down stream you know. There’s not enough guidance on planting around these pockets, likes of lifestyle blocks. People should be required to plant a certain amount of native forest to ameliorate these changes (Int 12, Community Group, 2/6/00).

Thus people are still causing environment problems on the Peninsula. However, Evan moves beyond education to compulsion in his belief that ‘people should be **required** to plant’ indigenous trees. Infact, this is sometimes the case, and I discuss this compulsion in the next section.

### 6.3.4 Land management practices

Having discussed at some length the environmental discourse as it is expressed within the corpus, I now discuss the expression of that discourse in actual land management practices on the Otago Peninsula. I will examine the practices of two large
institutions, the Dunedin City Council (DCC) and the Department of Conservation (DoC). Both these organisations have statutory responsibilities in the management of land and the environment. The third organisation, the practices of which I examine, is the Yellow-eyed Penguin Trust. This voluntary organisation owns two substantial reserves on the Peninsula, one jointly with the DCC, and is making a substantial impact on the Peninsula environment.

Examining the practices of these organisations fulfils a further function than simply explicating the discourse in practice. It demonstrates some of the complexities of the interacting discourses which eventually are expressed upon the land. The large institutions have both their own management discourses, which impact on their expressions of the environmental discourse, but also form loci for conflicting and resisting discourses from within the public body. The Yellow-eyed Penguin Trust produces the most 'pure' expression of the environmental discourse, but again, the management of Okia reserve which it owns with the DCC is a process of compromise between its goals and the discourses put forward by the other organisations involved in its management.

Two major institutions lend their weight to the environmental discourse on the Otago Peninsula. These are the Dunedin City Council (DCC), primarily through its Reserves Department and its landscape architect, and the Department of Conservation (DoC). Both these institutions express the environmental discourse in the management of land under their control. However, it is also the case that individuals within these organisations are able to have extensive influence both within the institution, and as a consequence of their position there, outside of them as well.

• **The Dunedin City Council**

The Dunedin City Council manages a number of reserves on the Otago Peninsula. The environmental discourse is expressed in their management largely through the practice of favouring the planting of indigenous species. The DCC staff interviewed

---

14 In addition to the reserves discussed here the City Council manages cemeteries and the network of road corridors. However, the environmental discourse is not evident as a major force in the management of these.
stressed this was not an official policy, but say the increasing use of indigenous species is a result of a number of factors.

Robert, a member of the Reserves Department staff and a Peninsula resident has, by his own admission, played a key role in the increasing use of indigenous species in the reserves on the Otago Peninsula. As a member of the Pikao Recovery Group he has worked to re-establish pikao on the DCC managed reserves at Te Rauone and Pilots Beach. He is a Council representative on the management committee of the Okia Flat reserve which is jointly owned by the DCC and the Yellow-eyed Penguin Trust. However his enthusiasm for indigenous species is simply part of a larger trend within the organisation. In part he attributes this to a change in the training of the Reserves Department staff from Royal Horticultural Society qualifications to New Zealand based ones.15

Katerina, talking about the approach of the Reserves Department on a district wide scale said:

On a general basis, specially with reserves like our big scenic reserves and things like that, we’re very much moving towards saying, ‘Yes, it would be natives that are planted but also it’ll be locally sourced stock,’ so we’ve actually got the right genetic makeup going into the local reserves. With the smaller reserves and things like that it’s not such a big issue and sometimes things that are not native, it’s appropriate to plant in there depending on what you’re trying to achieve and what the local community want (Int 24, Professional, 11/8/00).

It is not only indigenous species which are favoured, but locally sourced stock. In this regard Robert said, ‘It’s quite a hard thing for people like myself not to force people [to use locally sourced plants] but to introduce the concept of endemic species’.

Working with the local community is clearly important in the management of reserves, and Robert gave an interesting example of working with the community on the Portobello Domain. Of it he said:

Portobello domain is quite a classic example. There’s a long row of poplar trees running along Allan’s Beach Road but then inside that there’s a drain that’s been planted up all in natives, right through the middle, and then on the other side you’ve got oak trees that have been planted as well, so it’s a real funny mix. You’ve got what I guess we have to call a traditional parkland look, but then you have this interaction with the community that said, ’Well, we want the drain planted, but we

15 Infact the move towards favouring indigenous species in planting programs is, ironically, an international movement.
want it done in traditional natives,' so you've got this strange mix (Int 24, Professional, 11/8/00).

It is interesting when considering the power of the environmental discourse on the Otago Peninsula that in this instance it was the community that wanted the indigenous planting along the drain producing the 'strange mix'.

The Dunedin City Council also enacts aspects of the environmental discourse through its Resource Consent Process. Applications for Resource Consents for developments on most of the Peninsula are evaluated by the Council's landscape architect. He recommends the use of native species as a matter of course, and can, under certain circumstances require their use as a condition of the granting of the Consent. He said that his desire to see indigenous species used came from:

...your education, your training. You do know about natural ecosystems. You look at a grass paddock and then you look at a native forest and all the life that sustains. Even though it's not a policy of Council you have that influence and it really influences your judgement. So if these people had come and said, 'Oh we want to put a house here but we want to replant the whole site in natives and here's our management plan,' that would count really strongly towards their argument. Even though, visually, you might still be able to see the house, that might be offset by the native bush that they're going to plant cause I also think that increases the natural quality of the area as well.16 (Int 53, Professional, 4/12/00)

The Department of Conservation

The Department of Conservation (DoC) also manages a number of reserves on the Otago Peninsula. Some of these, for example Sandymount and land fronting onto Hoopers Inlet, are leased to farmers for grazing. Others, such as Sandfly Bay, are managed fairly passively, the sandhills being largely left alone to provide habitat for penguins, sea lions and other wildlife. One extensive reserve, Boulder Beach, has, however, been the focus of an active revegetation project.

This revegetation project was primarily motivated by the desire to re-establish indigenous habitat suitable for Yellow-eyed Penguins. To this end it was undertaken largely by volunteers and with the active involvement of the Yellow-eyed Penguin

---

16 See Chapter Eight for a discussion about how this practice also evinces the picturesque discourse, and for a discussion of the conflation of ecological health (a focus of the environmental discourse) with picturesque scenic quality.
Of Boulder Beach Harvey, a DoC worker resident on the Peninsula for the previous ten years said:

We started with pretty much grazed land and, up until about two years ago, we’ve had a very active revegetation program going there, so we’re getting to a point now where you’re actually starting to see relatively developed shrub land back in the areas that have been replanted. So that’s an obvious major change there, and then the next block around, which wasn’t as intensively grazed or managed by the farmer, is regenerating fairly naturally by itself, so that’s a whole strip of coast that was pretty much bare farmland when I arrived, and now it’s certainly not back to

Fig 6.1: Progress photographs of revegetation planting at Boulder Beach, Otago Peninsula. (Photos: D Nelson).
what it was, but it's starting to redevelop some of the characteristics of what it would've been like originally, as in coastal shrub land (Int 13, Professional, 7/6/00).

Since the Boulder Beach revegetation project ended the management of the reserve has become passive, to the dismay of local farmers. Maurice said of the reserve:

I have no quibbles in certain ways with them, but they own quite an area of land that will never, in a considerable time, be of any use to them, and it was reasonably good grazing ground. They're just growing weeds and gorse (Int 20, Land Owner, 5/7/00).

Of the gorse his wife, Bess, said, 'They're the type of people who should be setting an example. They should have theirs cleared really shouldn't they.' Another neighbour, Don, complained:

It's only a minor thing, I suppose. We've got quite a good relationship with DoC. They've never done anything to upset us. The only thing is they seem to have a lot of gorse on their property and they seem to be able to get away with it. We've got to try and contain ours but they're allowed to get away with the gorse and rabbits and things like that (Int 22, Land Owner, 6/7/00).

This divergence of opinions about the use and management of this piece of land can be represented diagrammatically.

![Diagram](#)
The Department of Conservation’s expression of the environmental discourse is tempered by its own institutional discourse. DoC operates on a system of priorities primarily established to ensure the survival of our many endangered species. This species focus distinguishes it quite clearly from the broad scale and holistic view explicitly expressed in the environmental discourse. Thus, for example, while the revegetation of Boulder Beach is supported, it is not a priority as it is unclear that it is essential for the future of the population of Yellow-eyed penguins there. Control of the gorse is not supported by the management discourse (because of the expense entailed) as well as by the environmental discourse, because of its potential as a nursery crop. Similarly, the management of the nature reserve at Taiaroa Head is unlikely to entail any revegetation as Harvey said, ‘The main issue with the headland itself is the albatross basically like clear areas’.

Fig 6.3: Bishop Selwyn’s sketch of the entrance to Otago Harbour (1844). Taiaroa Head, to the left, is covered in low forest, indicating that Pukekura Pa had been abandoned for some time. (From Anderson 1998 P55)

A further and very specific way in which DoC actions the environmental discourse, however, is through its volunteer program. Department of Conservation volunteers


18 Kennedy notes that DoC practitioners’ ‘sense of purpose is embedded in the ethics of a predominantly western conservation discourse. This in turn is informed by knowledge derived in the rational scientific tradition’ (Kennedy 2003 P108). He also notes that ‘Disparaging talk of ‘greenies’ is remarkably prevalent in practitioner conversation’ as they are ‘regarded as the antithesis of reasonable argument and unhelpful to the fulfilment of mission goals’ (ibid P135).

19 The albatross colony at Taiaroa Head has only existed since the 1930s when Southern Royal Albatross first nested there in a highly modified environment. With intense human intervention the colony became established and continues there, now being the focus of a major tourism enterprise.
undertake planting, weeding and track clearing on public and private land on the Otago Peninsula. In this way the Department acts to improve the environment, plus the requirements of the discourse that the community be involved and learning undertaken are fulfilled. Of the activities undertaken on private land the DoC volunteer co-ordinator said:

The Department’s not resourced to support them in terms of giving them money or whatever. The best way we can support them is by bringing a van load of volunteers out (Int 26, Professional, 22/8/00).

He continued:

Most of the time it’s habitat restoration stuff. Most of the time it’s tree planting or weeding or whatever. I try to introduce as much variety as possible. For instance, I’ve got the one day event on the Peninsula – the planting bee might start at ten in the morning and in reality it’s probably all over by two or three in the afternoon, but the rest of the day we’ll either go down to Sandfly Bay, maybe, and see the Yellow-eyed Penguins come in, or we’ll go and I’ll show them where there’s some Blue Penguins, or we’ll maybe go to one of the lizard areas and see if we can find Jewelled Geckos, so in that sense the rewards you’re giving them are not monetary. You’re giving them an experience as a reward for doing the work (Int 26, Professional, 22/8/00).

The sustaining and enlivening experience of wild nature, discussed earlier, is a reward for taking action as a responsible saviour.

Fig 6.4: The conflict within the Department of Conservation between a species focused management discourse and the environmental discourse.
The Yellow-eyed Penguin Trust

As mentioned previously, the Yellow-eyed Penguin Trust (YEPT) grew from the local environmental group, Save the Otago Peninsula (STOP). The trust’s primary concern is with the restoration of coastal ecosystems which provide Yellow-eyed penguins with their normal habitat. The trust owns two quite extensive reserves on the Otago Peninsula. I will examine their management, focusing mainly on the larger, Okia, in order to illustrate both the clear expression of the environmental discourse in action, and also some of the related and resisting discourses with which it tangles.

---

1 There is actually debate in scientific circles as to just how much influence deforestation has actually had on *Megadyptes antipodes*. 
Okia Flat is an extensive area of rolling sand dunes, rich in wildlife and with a long history of human occupation. Many archaeological sites exist on the reserve, most of the obvious ones being at the southern end bordering the mouth of the inlet. It was part of the original Native Reserve Lands and entered into European ownership during the twentieth century. For most of the past one hundred and forty years Okia Flat has been used for grazing sheep and cattle. The area was also used for artillery practice, mine laying and mine detecting practice from the 1880s up until the Second World War (Harsant 1980). As a protection against wind erosion and as a long-term cash crop, substantial blocks of *Pinus radiata* have been planted.

![Image](image.jpg)

**Fig 6.6:** Okia Flat looking north from McKay’s Road. The reserve boundary runs from the Pyramids, visible slightly left of centre, to the edge of the inlet at far left. The reserve extends to the foot of the hills to the north.

During the 1930s and 1940s several cribs were built on the southern most part of the flats near the entrance to the inlet. Three or four generations have now spent time at these cribs, and their owners have a strong attachment to the place. A love of the outdoors and of the wildlife that surrounded them there was expressed by these people. Stranded whales were rescued, scrub fires extinguished and an overall sense of care for the place exercised by these people, their families and guests. Tenure
during all this period was a casual relationship with the successive landowners (Robert N, Int 59, Cribbie, 9/12/00; Bill, Int 55, Cribbie, 4/12/00).

In 1991 The Yellow-eyed Penguin Trust, in conjunction with the Dunedin City Council (DCC) in a 60:40 partnership purchased the two hundred and thirty one hectare block that occupies the eastern edge of Okia Flat. The area extends from the mouth of Papanui Inlet at the south to the cliffs of Te Whakarekaiwi in the north. In August 1991, the whole area was gazetted as a recreation reserve. Te Runanga o Otakou and the Department of Conservation (DoC) were invited to form a joint management committee.

![Flax circle](image)

**Fig 6.7:** A flax circle in the area in which revegetation has been undertaken at the northern end of the Okia Reserve. (Photo author. 2000)

The reserve area is of importance to a range of indigenous species in addition to *Megadyptes antipodes*. The extensive dune hollows contain native turf plants that harbour native moth species. A wide range of indigenous bird species is to be found in the area. At the north end of the site New Zealand Fur Seals have a rookery and Hooker’s Sea Lions are taking up residence in the southern dunes in increasing numbers (Okia Reserve Management Plan 1998).
Grazing ceased immediately ownership was transferred, except along a firebreak which divides the site north and south. Revegetation planting has been completed at the northern end of the property, the Yellow-eyed Penguin habitat. This planting has been of mixed species which have been grown at the Trust’s own nursery from locally sourced seed. *Phormium tenax* has been planted in circles in the expectation that penguins will burrow into the middle to nest. Earlier attempts at this pattern of planting have simply produced dense clumps, but it is thought that this was simply because the plants were planted too closely. In addition to the habitat restoration planting the Pikao Recovery Group has planted several plots of pikao, primarily as an educational resource.

![Image of Pikao planted along the pathway to Victory Beach at Okia Reserve.](image)

Fig 6.8: Pikao planted along the pathway to Victory Beach at Okia Reserve. (Photo – author, 2000).

One of the immediate actions taken by the new owners was to attempt to impose Licenses to Occupy on the crib owners. These licenses, according to the cribbies¹, entailed rather draconian conditions, a very considerable rise in annual rental, and a sunset clause requiring all evidence of the cribs to be removed following the death of the registered owner. Only one cribbie signed. As a consequence the remaining cribbies found their access road locked against them and for nine years were locked out of their cribs. A compromise agreement was achieved in 2000 and cribbies are now reunited with their holiday homes. A sunset clause still exists and now all

---

¹ “Cribbie” is local slang for a crib owner, but has connotations beyond that of being down to earth and a lover of simplicity.
occupation is to cease in 2012. It is considered inappropriate, by the management committee, to have private occupations on a reserve, in part as a matter of principle, but also occupiers are seen as a significant source of risks such as fire, dogs and vehicles.

Over the ten years since the Trust purchased the site extensive growth of bracken fern has occurred over most of the reserve. It is expected that this will form a nursery crop under and through which indigenous plant communities will spontaneously regenerate. *Phormium tenax* and *Pittosporum sp* are indeed growing through the bracken in a number of areas. However, one cribbie complained that the view that the sandhills would ever regenerate mixed species indigenous cover was highly dubious in his view. To this end he presented me with a report he had commissioned from a scientist at Landcare Research, Lincoln, who concluded that on a site such as Okia spontaneous regeneration is likely to be a very long term process, threatened by the likely colonisation by exotic weeds and the high potential for fire in bracken fern stands. Restoration planting would be feasible only in small dense patches (Partridge, T 1998). In addition, the farmer who sold the land to the Trust commented to me that he was disappointed to see that they had ‘not done anything with the land’ (Field notes 24/10/00), clearly indicating another site of resistance, this time between the environmental discourse and the agricultural discourse.

I have been party to some discussions of ways to accelerate the spontaneous regeneration processes. The local area is rich in seed sources and the birds which disperse them. A suggestion was made to place ‘T’ shaped roosts around the site in the hope that the birds will take advantage of them and spread seed into new areas (Field notes 20/8/00). In addition it has been noticed that some of the small rare turf plants that exist on the site are being smothered by rank grass. Controlled grazing is now being undertaken as an option to release these plants.

Public access to the site is entirely free and is achieved by a walkway. Visitors are diverted from the Penguin habitat by signage and a clearly marked track that follows the firebreak to the beach. Interpretive signs explain some of the history and biology of the site. Access to large areas of the site is inhibited by the dense bracken fern and this loss of the potential for the site as a recreational resource angered Robert N, one
of the cribbies, who had played golf in the sandhills when they were kept clear by grazing.

Predator control is actively undertaken with trapping of ferrets and stoats done intensively in the spring and summer. It was originally thought that the growth of rank grass on cessation of grazing would deter rabbits which in turn would deter mustelids. However it has since become clear that rank grass actually provides cover for these predators, particularly stoats (Ratz 1997). Further, the penguins themselves don’t like the rank grass and at Otepahi, the other Peninsula reserve owned by the Yellow-eyed Penguin Trust, old carpet has been used to provide loafing sites for penguins which were otherwise hopping through the fences out of the reserve to loaf in the neighbouring farm paddocks. Feral goats exist in the Okia area and regularly cause extensive damage to revegetation plantings. DoC and DCC staff shoot them whenever they get the opportunity, but the rugged and still forest covered terrain which backs Okia reserve provides them such good cover that eradication has not yet been achieved. Possums are hunted annually in the local area. Protection from possums is afforded new plantings by the use of wire netting cages over such species as *Grisellinia littoralis*, and tyres placed around seedlings seems to afford good protection from rabbits, the tyres being removed after a year or two once the plant is established.
Fig.6.10: A young *Grisellinia litoralis*, part of the revegetation planting at Okia, showing extensive evidence of browsing by goats. (Photo, author. 2000)

Fig 6.11: Carpet being used to provide loafing platforms for Yellow-eyed Penguins at Otepahi reserve, Otago Peninsula. (Photo, author. 2000).
The oversight of the reserve is undertaken by a committee comprising representatives from the Yellow-eyed Penguin Trust, the Dunedin City Council, the Department of Conservation and the Runanga ki o Otakou. Described by Robert, the DCC representative on the Management Committee, as ‘a very diverse group;’ he noted that:

The Yellow-eyed Penguin Trust’s sole focus is on wildlife management whereas the Council, we have a very broad focus. We have recreation; we have the environmental aspects of it too; we have the community aspects there too, the whole raft of things…and the Runanga’s concerns with Okia are predominantly cultural and historical (Int 24, Professional, 11/8/00).

This diversity led to it taking some years to develop a management plan acceptable to all parties. An interesting contrast between the approach of the Yellow-eyed Penguin Trust and the local Runanga was alluded to by Robert when he said:

They said, ‘We have a cultural right, you know. We’re kaitiaki of this area and we have rights to be on here without notification or anything’. And then they said, ‘Of course, we cultural harvest.’ Well that sent them [YEPT] into a spin because they meant they were going to eat penguins! (Int 24, Professional, 11/8/00)

The relationship of Māori with Papatuanuku and her resources is clearly very different to that proposed by the environmental discourse.

The Management Plan for the reserve and makes it clear that the protection of Yellow-eyed Penguin habitat is the priority for the reserve and the maintenance of habitat for other indigenous species a secondary priority. ‘Where necessary and appropriate, management of the Yellow-eyed Penguins will be carried out to assist the survival and growth of a breeding population…’ (Okia Reserve Management Plan 1998 P5). It is interesting to speculate what the response might be if the population of the endangered Hooker’s Sea Lions (a higher priority for the Department of Conservation than the Yellow-eyed Penguin) increased to the point where their predation of the Yellow-eyed Penguins became problematic.

6.4 Conclusion

One of the most notable features of this discussion about the environmental discourse on the Otago Peninsula is that, particularly compared to the agricultural discourse, it is less clear and less distinct in its application. This is unsurprising. It is a much newer discourse than the agricultural, and as such, is still ‘gaining ground’. This is
the case in both the literal sense that more land is coming under its influence, and also in the sense that the power it wields in the networks of discourses of land management on the Peninsula is increasing. However, while the environmental discourse is relatively new on the Otago Peninsula its connection with the romantic tradition of early nineteenth century Britain is strong. Nature is idealised and humanity, while we may visit for our spiritual enrichment, should not be allowed to intrude.

Further, the holistic and didactic aspects of the discourse bring it into conflict and resistance with more discourses than the agricultural discourse, with its emphasis on private, individual actions. The management of Okia Flat is a clear instance of this, where organisations other than the owners are invited participants in its management. This shows the practical acknowledgement that groups other than the owners have an interest in the management of land. That this makes the actual management more difficult in practice, than it perhaps would be if only the owners were involved, is something which simply has to be worked through.

Clearly the relative power of the environmental discourse has been increasing on the Otago Peninsula over the past twenty or so years. The strongest evidence of the increasing power of the environmental discourse exists in the policy arena. The ability of the discourse to influence the Otago Regional Council’s Pest Management Strategy has been noted. Also, the refusal to accept the DP’s Section 16 Indigenous Vegetation and Fauna leading to a five year consultative process which has not yet ended (Buxton, R pers comm April 27 2004) indicates both the increasing power of the discourse, and the drive and tenacity of its proponents. This is both in keeping with the community view of the discourse and its didactic aspect. Further, Dunedin City has adopted the albatross and the yellow-eyed penguin as icons which it uses widely in its pantheon of images for publicity and promotions.
The increasing number of areas of land on the Otago Peninsula which are now maintained as reserves offers further evidence of the increasing power of the environmental discourse. However, it is necessary to be wary of assuming too direct a translation from land area to influence. The holistic nature of the environmental discourse means that its influence does not necessarily begin and end at boundary lines. What happens on others’ properties is, in terms to this discourse, everybody’s business. The land constructed by the environmental discourse is not discontinuous with that constructed by the agricultural discourse. Thus, while a case could be made that these reserves are, arguably, managed in terms of the environmental discourse, it is likely that aspects of the broader environment are also. What differs, perhaps, is that while practical actions may be taken on privately owned or reserve land, the
actions available to the discourse, on others land, are restricted to more abstract social actions – the application of policy; social influence.
Chapter Seven: Other significant discourses

7.1 Introduction

The complexities of the tangled web of discourses which construct the landscape of the Otago Peninsula are beginning to become evident. In Chapter Four I discussed the intrapersonal conflict which some Māori expressed between their feelings for the land as Papatuanuku and the demands of the Pākeha agricultural discourse. In Chapter Five I discussed the agricultural discourse and some of the points of resistance which occur between it, the environmental discourse and the public access discourse. In Chapter Six I discussed the environmental discourse. I revisited points of resistance with the agricultural discourse and also discussed points of resistance with the recreational discourse. I also discussed intra-agency conflict in the form of resistance between the DoC management discourse and the environmental discourse, and also between agencies within the management committee of the Okia reserve.

My purpose in undertaking this rather drawn out summary is to make the point that while I am representing these points of resistance as conflict between Discourse A and Discourse B this is a gross oversimplification. As I have shown it is possible, likely even, for there to be many discourses conflicting at points of resistance. In this chapter I examine several further discourses which are embroiled in this system, and which add to the richness and complexity of the construction of the Otago Peninsula.

A further complication is that while discourses are ‘group[s] of statements which provide a language for talking about – a way of representing the knowledge about – a particular topic at a particular historical moment’ (Hall 2001 P 291), they are dynamic systems themselves. The boundaries of discourses can be highly permeable (although some, for example physics or mathematics, are clearly not) and thus it is to be expected that language and concepts characteristic of one discourse might crop up in another. A small example of this is that, in discussing the presence of gorse of DoC land, a farmer referred to it being ‘allowed to regenerate’. The term ‘regenerate’ is characteristic of the
environmental discourse, but within that discourse would only be used to refer to indigenous vegetation. The concept is being used the same way by the farmer, to mean allowing or encouraging vegetation to regrow, but the expanded use and adoption within the agricultural discourse serves, I would argue, to conflate the regrowth of indigenous forest with the regrowth of gorse, both acts which symbolically and actually destroy the economic potential of the land. By adopting the vocabulary of the environmental discourse the agricultural discourse is able to resist and disempower it.

Thus I reach the purpose of this chapter, which is to discuss three further discourses evident in the corpus of this research. While I have referred to them in the title as ‘other’ discourses, this is only because they are disparate in nature, focus and power – they are certainly not trivial nor insignificant. The first I am going to discuss is the gardening discourse. The gardening discourse warrants discussion because of its relationships with both the agricultural and the environmental discourses. In addition, some substantial blocks of land come under its influence and with a growth in the number of small holdings on the Peninsula, its influence is likely to increase.

The second discourse I discuss is the heritage discourse. This is another discourse which is gaining power and influence on the Peninsula and nationally. Again its relationship with the environmental discourse and its resistance to the agricultural discourse make it significant and worthy of examination.

Finally I am going to examine the neo-liberal economic discourse. Many books have been written about this discourse, and books could be written specifically about its impact on land and landscape management. However, here I am discussing it as it is evinced within the corpus as part of the dynamics of the construction of the Otago Peninsula. My interest in discussing the neo-liberal discourse is twofold. Firstly, it is a major discourse in terms of the context within which the other discourses act to construct the landscape of the Otago Peninsula. Secondly, as an immensely powerful discourse in Aotearoa / New Zealand I think it important to demonstrate how it interacts with those resisting discourses, and how those discourses maintain themselves against its power.
7.2 The gardening discourse

The garden as an object or a place represents, at least at times, one of humanity’s most intensive and intimate manipulations of nature. Whether for pleasure or for food, some species are selected and nurtured, while others, both plant and animal, are attacked and destroyed. In Aotearoa / New Zealand a major industry is based upon the provision of plants, other consumables, equipment, books and magazines to gardeners. Infact gardening ranks as Aotearoa / New Zealand’s number two leisure pursuit (Goodchild et al 2000), second only to walking. Writers in popular gardening magazines are at pains to distinguish ‘real’ gardens from the designed spaces created by landscape architects and other design professionals. Within this case study the discourse of gardening is significant in that it underlines and exposes some key presumptions about nature and our relationship with it. In addition the gardening discourse bleeds out of the spatial boundaries usually associated with it into the larger landscape influencing decisions and actions on a broader scale.

The gardening discourse constructs a primarily domestic space focusing on the home. Open space is usually found closest to the home, and wild space, or economic space, in the case of the farm, furthest from it. The intervening areas are a varied patchwork of productive and decorative space. Thus in large areas where the garden is surrounded by shelter and amenity tree plantings these latter areas are not seen to be garden. Infact these areas fulfil a similar role, or are seen in a similar way, to the regenerating (and also nurtured) indigenous bush surrounding a number of the gardens I visited.

Ivan (Int 4, Small Holder, 29/4/00), Allen (Int 9, Small Holder, 31/5/00) and their families are neighbours on a property they originally bought jointly, and which they subsequently subdivided. They are surrounded by indigenous bush, the regeneration of which they both actively support. Both operate small nurseries, Ivan’s producing only indigenous species, and Allen’s (or more correctly speaking, Allen’s wife’s) producing predominantly exotic perennials. At first sight their gardens are quite different also, their
plant selections mirroring the species produced in their respective nurseries. However, closer examination draws out strong parallels.

The ornamental areas of Ivan’s garden contain only species which are Aotearoa / New Zealand native species. However, they include species which are not indigenous to the Otago Peninsula, but which are able to grow in this particular microclimate. The hillside on which both gardens lie slopes to the north west and is relatively sheltered from wind. Thus Ivan is able to grow species such as Puka (Meryta sinclarii) and Whau (Entelea arborescens), both species that are not endemic to the South Island. These plants have been selected for their showy foliage and are clearly used for their ornamental effect.

Alan has a garden of about one hectare higher up the ridge from Ivan with the house located at the eastern edge of it. The areas closer to the house are planted with perennials, mostly exotic but some indigenous, and roses. Further away from the house are exotic deciduous trees, rhododendrons and a collection of seven or eight different bamboo species. Of his property Allen said:

Ivan’s more total native and nothing else is considered. I like all trees and so what has transpired is to have natives around us. I plant some special natives, not necessarily ones that grow here, in the areas around our house, and in the covenanted area I plant trees that would normally grow there...so that’s the idea. Natives around us, and around the house and our walks round the ridge we plant exotics (Int 9, Small Holder, 31/5/00).

Thus while one garden is native only, and the other predominantly exotic, infact the essential structure of both is the same. This is further underlined when one looks at the productive parts of the gardens. Ivan has a number of orchards and vegetable gardens which were sited to avoid frost and to capture as much sun as possible. All are out of sight of the house. Allen has an orchard which, due to being higher up the hillside past his house, is frost free. In it he is able to grow subtropical fruits such as Tamarillo, Avocado and Mountain Pawpaw. In both gardens production is based in the transitional zone between the ornamental domestic space and the indigenous wild space. The seclusion of this productive space from general view may be seen as an inheritance from
the picturesque discourse (see Chapter Eight). The designers of the picturesque parks went to great lengths to hide economic and productive uses from sight, the presentation of large unproductive areas being a means of expressing the power and wealth of the estate’s owner (Crandall 1993).

As both of these examples suggest, and other examples confirm, an important aspect of the garden is as a collection of plants. They may be collected because of their rarity or their aesthetic appeal, but in either case the aim is to have a broad range of different species. Frank and Christine (Int 11, Gardener, 1/6/00) have a long held passion for alpine plants and have held permits to collect indigenous species. However, they chose not to exercise their permits, deciding to photograph the plants in their indigenous habitats rather than risk killing them by moving them. Rather they extended their interest into unusual rhododendron species1 including a collection of vireyas2 and a small number of tree rhododendron species which they described as having been ‘planted for posterity’.3

Con (Int 7, Small Holder, 30/5/00) has a garden of about a hectare in area high on the Peninsula where it is frost-free. He has a very eclectic collection of exotic and indigenous plant species in his garden including such endangered species as Helicrysum selago var toledum which is endemic to the Otago Peninsula. In addition he grows a wide range of indigenous species including a selection of Acyphilla sp, not often seen in gardens, and other species not indigenous to the South Island.

Grace, who works for a voluntary organisation assisting the preservation of indigenous ecosystems, described to me how she fell in love with native plants while tramping with her husband. She said:

---

1 Rhododendrons are a popular species of garden plant in Dunedin. They do well in the local climate and the Dunedin City Council runs a Rhododendron Festival every spring.
2 ‘Vireyas’ here refers to the Vireya rhododendrons which are the tropical and subtropical varieties of the genus which come from South East Asia.
3 Tree rhododendron species are slow growing and may grow to as much as 9 metres in height.
I just got to really love them and vowed that my garden would be totally native and at Broad Bay and here it pretty much is. The rhododendrons and azaleas get lopped and the natives come in (Int 3, Professional, 12/4/00).

On being asked what made the natives special she continued:

The foliage. The fact that they belong here, they're part of the landscape. I love the variety of the foliage; I don't like big showy flowers. I love the green, the tones of green. Green's a very restful colour. I love the tussocks in the winter when everything else is looking a bit dreary. They come out into their own and they almost come alive in the wind and stuff. And the variety. There's huge variety. It's amazing. I challenged someone one day. They said, 'But they haven't got any flowers,' and I said, 'I bet you I can pick flowers from my garden twelve months of the year if I wanted to,' because there is always something in flower; a tussock in flower or a, well the hebes are great, the olearias (Int 3, Professional, 12/4/00).

Grace’s garden is much more suburban than Con’s, Ivan’s or Allen’s, but mirrors the same form on a much smaller scale.

Grace’s view can be contrasted with that of Maria (Int 14, Community, 11/6/00). A stalwart of STOP and the Yellow-eyed Penguin Trust and a past trustee of the Peninsula Trust, Maria has worked hard for years to gain protection for and assist the regeneration of remnants of indigenous bush on the Peninsula. This extends to her own property where she and her husband have re-established bush where there were once pine trees. However, Maria said that she actually found the bush a bit depressing in winter and considered that this was due to her having grown up in the tropical Pacific islands with much colour present all year round from the tropical plants. Her solution is to live surrounded by natives, but to grow exotics with bright coloured flowers in the domestic space closest to her home.

These examples illustrate a number of themes which are common to plant selection processes whether indigenous or exotic species are chosen. The plant qualities identified as desirable within the gardening discourse as evidenced in the corpus of this project, are summarised in Table 8: 1. All of these characteristics are attributed to examples of both exotic and indigenous species by differing respondents, except for ornamentality. I consider this to be because ornamentality is assumed of exotic species which are not grown for food. Thus discussions of the suitability of indigenous versus exotic plants as garden and amenity species must be evidence of the overlay of another discourse in
which the separation into indigenous and introduced is a fundamental categorisation (see Chapter One.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desirable Plant Qualities</th>
<th>Exotic species</th>
<th>Indigenous species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ornamental</td>
<td><em>Are assumed to be ornamental if they are not productive.</em></td>
<td>Con speaking of <em>Chionochloa rubra</em> – 'it’s beautiful’, 'you can see all the different leaves and different colours'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarity</td>
<td>Rhododendrons (Frank and Christine), bamboos (Allen)</td>
<td>Con’s <em>Helichrysum selago var toledum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foliage</td>
<td>'There’s some with tiny leaves, some with blue leaves, some with bright green leaves, some with light green leaves, some with scales all over them and some without and some with woolly backs on them...it’s the foliage that really counts.' Stephen talking about the attraction of rhododendrons.</td>
<td>'The foliage...I love the variety of the foliage...I love the green, the tones of green.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>'...there's such a wide variety of them. There's little ones, little wee low ones and then the things sixty and seventy feet high. There's some with tiny leaves, some with blue leaves, some with bright green leaves, some with light green leaves, some with scales all over them and some without and some with woolly backs on them...it's the foliage that really counts...There's a tremendous variety just looking out there.' Stephen talking about the attractions of rhododendrons.</td>
<td>Grace talks about what she loves about native plants ending with, 'And the variety. There's huge variety, it's amazing.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Green is not a colour. 'There's usually some colour somewhere most of the year.' Edward talking about being a 'serious gardener'. Maria growing brightly coloured flowering exotics to relieve the depressing green of the bush.</td>
<td>Green is a colour. 'I love the green, the tones of green. Green's a very restful colour,' Grace talking about why she loves native plants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowers</td>
<td>'The form of a bush is important, the sort of foliage that it's got, flowers.' The qualities of a good garden plant – Stephen.</td>
<td>'...there is always something in flower [in my garden]' - Grace.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1: Desirable plant qualities are characteristics of the gardening discourse and thus both exotic and indigenous plants can be identified as possessing these qualities. This strongly suggests that debates about the suitability or desirability of either exotic or indigenous species as garden plants or amenity plants are part of another discourse.

The gardening discourse eschews design. Edward described himself and his wife as having been 'into serious gardening’. He explained what ‘serious gardening’ meant:

Well, we like a variety of things so there’re all sorts of things, no one particular theme. There’s just a lot of interesting little areas, each one a bit different. There’s usually colour somewhere most of the year (Int 10, Gardener, 1/6/00).
Stephen commented that, ‘When you have a garden you pull it to bits all the time and redo it, rebuild things’. Later he explained that while some of the rhododendrons in his garden had been planted when he had first established the garden some thirty-five years earlier, new ones had been planted and others removed. Of this process he said:

Well, some of them were too big and you get different ideas and you want to change things round and you find you can grow that so you chuck it out and get something else and we did lose some down there because they got waterlogged (Int 17, Gardener, 17/6/00).

Neville and Anne claimed to each have a (different) vision for their property, as opposed to a plan. Neville’s intent is to recreate the setting of a particular alpine hut with their house eventually nestled under the edge of the canopy of beech trees (*Nothofagus sp*). Anne’s vision, somewhat more esoteric, is to act on her interest in women’s spirituality by running workshops for women on their land. Of this she said:

My vision is that I’m going to have workshops here for women and that part of it is going to be actually walking around the land and actually recollecting of the land and the fact that we’ve got native trees is really important in well and the tradition that the earth is feminine. It seems to me like a really special opportunity to have this block of land and to be able to work with the energies and then to be able to share it (Int 44, Small Holder, 15/10/00).

Con showed me one area of his garden which he described as ‘our cottage garden’. He asked me if I knew what a cottage garden was and, finding my answer unacceptable, laughed and said:

No, no. I always put it this way. A cottage garden is a piece of ground. When a friend gives you a plant you put it in regardless how tall it grows, how big it grows, what colour it is, or whatever. You just put it in, you know (Int 7, Small Holder, 30/5/00).

Thus the garden is dynamic, being formed and reformed according to changing ideas and needs. While there may be an overall vision for the site, this is very different to a designed space which usually has a more static intent and limited palette of plant materials. This is not to say that things are planted at random within the garden. Soil and light conditions, if not taken into consideration at planting, will impact on the health and viability of the plant materials regardless of the human instigator. And it is true to say that aesthetics dictate the associations of plants within the garden, to a large extent based around flower and foliage colour and texture, and plant form. However, while this could be interpreted as design, my argument is that this is at a micro scale within the site as a
whole, and that this is distinctly different from the whole site design approach used by professional designers.

A further significant aspect of the gardening discourse is that the desire to create this controlled, contrived, domestic space entails enormous effort. All of the gardens I specifically visited, as gardens, were built from scratch by the current owner and all had new homes built on them by, or for, the current owner. Stephen complained that:

There was nothing here when we started. In fact it was scraped clean. The bulldozer came in one day when we weren’t here and removed all the soil and tipped all the stuff down here and of course covered up all our good soil. There was some reasonable soil on the place before but it’s very clayey (Int 17, Gardener, 17/6/00).

Over the thirty five years he has lived there he has built stone retaining walls, gathering the stones himself from a friend’s property. He said, ‘That’s part of the Peninsula, that’s where the stones came from. There were no stones here. I brought them all out on the trailer over the years.’ Frank and Christine, similarly, have put a huge effort into the construction of their garden over the fifty years they have lived there. Frank described the original soil as ‘wet concrete or dry concrete’ (Int 11, Gardener, 1/6/00). Like Stephen he brought in tonnes of Peninsula stones to build retaining walls and built up the soil with bark, sand, compost and mulches, plus lime. He said that initially the soil was so acidic he could not even grow vegetables. Con (Int 7, Small Holder, 30/5/00) also has built stone retaining walls on his property to facilitate the planting of the species he enjoys. He had the advantage of the stones coming from his own property. In addition he also felled a Cupressus macrocarpa shelter belt in order to expand his garden and as he could not, at the time, afford a chainsaw to cut them up, left them to form further retaining. Both Frank and Christine’s garden and Stephen’s also have springs on them which required drainage to enable them to grow the species they desire.

As can be seen, these interventions are both extensive and intensive. Whilst climate is seen as a limiting or facilitating factor, determining the range of species which might be grown on a particular site, issues such as hydrology, soil composition, and topography are all factors which can be extensively manipulated. The garden is seen as a sort of neutral space which can be manipulated in order to transform it into the desired space. The
topography can be changed by the construction of retaining walls, and the moving of soil. The hydrology can be changed by the construction of drains (and the provision of irrigation). The soil composition and chemistry can be changed by the addition of organic matter, sand and chemicals. Thus the garden becomes a constructed space, an improvement on nature, which bares little resemblance to or relationship with, any indigenously occurring natural systems.

While I have thus far discussed the gardening discourse only in terms of the construction of the domestic garden, its primary focus, the discourse bleeds out of the domestic space and into the broader landscape in two ways. The first is in the selection of species for shelter planting in the broader landscape. The second is in the approaches taken to the revegetation of indigenous ecosystems.

Whilst the selection of species for shelter planting on farm land is primarily determined by pragmatic considerations, there is evidence of the same sort of aesthetic choices that are made in the selection of garden plants. Theresa and Don said of their selection of shelter plants for stock:

*Don:* Well, we’ve actually found the natives are as good as any really, like a flax belt is really the best probably and the native olearias and ngaios, those types of things. They seem to be quite bushy and they’re quite hardy. Pine trees and macrocarpas will grow so high and they’ll just burn off or brown off and lean over.

*Theresa:* We’re better to stick to flaxes and native things and they look better anyway.
(Int 22, Land Owner, 6/7/00; emphasis mine.)

While poor or inappropriate appearance would not prevent the use of a species if the other criteria for good shelter were met (see the discussion in Chapter Five), when they are, appearance can be selected for.

The ‘bleeding’ of the gardening discourse into the wider landscape is even more in evidence in the practices of revegetation. Species mixes for revegetation projects are selected on the basis of what was present in the indigenous ecosystem prior to disruption, and on what is likely to grow in the current conditions. Thus species placement is generally made largely on the basis of re-establishing plant communities. However, I
was fascinated to be party to a discussion in which regret was expressed about the placement of *Coprosma sp* on a spur because it was going to displace a colony of silver tussock (*Poa cita*). The silver tussock, an indigenous species, would have only occurred on the highest and most exposed parts of the Peninsula prior to land clearance. It now grows on many southerly faces and its growth is promoted and maintained by the grazing of sheep which prevent the exotic grass species out competing it. Thus the justification for maintaining the colony of *Poarita* was aesthetic.

![Fig 7.1: A spur above Albert and Cecily Beaches, Otepahi Reserve. The area on the right is grazed, and the *Poa cita* forms drifts across the spur. The area on the left is not grazed. The *Poa cita* here is being smothered by the exotic grasses, and will be displaced by the *Coprosma sp* which have been planted amongst it. (Photo – Author 2000).](image)

The methods of planting used by the Yellow-eyed Penguin Trust for revegetation on the Peninsula are essentially gardening methods also. Holes are dug, the subsoil broken up and fertiliser tablets provided for each new plant. The seedling is mulched with piece of a synthetic fabric, about a metre square, as weeding, or releasing as it is called, is an unpopular activity. In hot weather, where it is possible, plants may be irrigated to aid their establishment. This contrasts with forestry planting methods where small, bare
rooted seedlings are placed in slits in the ground, sometimes with fertilizer, and then receive no maintenance until pruning some years later.

Fig 7.2: A kanuka (*Kunzea ericoides*) seedling immediately after planting, showing the placement of the weed mat. (Photo: Author 2000).

One respondent who has developed intensive revegetation practices described his processes as using forestry techniques. However, on closer examination these practices clearly have their origins in gardening. Site selection decisions are made on the basis of skilled and sensitive observation of the subtle variations in the site’s microclimates. Thus subtle hollows where there is more moisture available and possibly more shelter will be
found by close observation of the existing vegetation cover. Once these sites have been found seedlings, particularly of species such as ngaio (*Myoporum laetum*) will be planted, using much the same techniques as the Yellow-eyed penguin Trust use. Releasing (weeding) will occur a few times a year. When the seedling has become established and gained some height it will be ‘limbed-up’. In this process side branches are removed to encourage a central leader to develop. This process is intended to imitate the effects that competition for light has on these species in a naturally regenerating indigenous forest. Less wind tolerant species are then planted under the shelter provided by the pruned tree, further imitating natural processes. Thus the revegetation proceeds from the dampish hollows outwards as shelter extends. Once a canopy is created, understorey species will be introduced also. Of this process its designer and instigator said:

You want to see something happen in a lifetime. Now these techniques are only suitable to apply to key areas depending on your manpower, perhaps crucial areas, only narrow areas or small areas. You can at least do it yourself but if you’ve got more manpower you can expand this technique. It’s just speeding up nature (Int 27, Community Group, 12/9/00).

I argue that this intensive husbanding of small areas so as to see a change ‘in a lifetime’ is clearly an extension of the gardening discourse into the broader landscape, albeit as a means to an end. That is, it has in common, with gardening, the intensive manipulation of biological systems and processes with a view to controlling the larger outcomes.

### 7.3 The heritage discourse

The heritage discourse is a minor discourse in terms of its visibility within the interview data of this research project. However, attachment to and pride in the historic past, both in terms of extant buildings and other relics, and in early events, are key parts of Dunedin’s Pākehā self-image and in the promotions undertaken by its tourism industry. Thus I include a discussion of it as it is a significant discourse which is increasing in power and influence.

---

4 *Dunedin was the economic, cultural and educational capital of Aotearoa / New Zealand during the nineteenth century, due in part to its central role in the gold rushes of the 1860s, in part to its Scottish heritage which placed a high value on education (King 2003).*

5 *See the Dunedin City Council website, www.dcc.govt.nz for examples of this.*
The Resource Management Amendment Act 2003 elevates the ‘Recognition and protection of the heritage value of sites, buildings, places or areas:’ from Section 7, Other matters, of the RMA 91 to Section 6, Matters of national importance. Section 7 required that:

...all persons exercising functions and powers under [the Act], in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall have particular regard to...

issues such as heritage, kaitiakitanga and other issues of social and biological significance. Section 6, on the other hand, requires that:

...all persons exercising functions and powers under [the Act], in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall recognise and provide for the following matters of national importance:

Clearly ‘recognising and providing for’ is a more stringent requirement than ‘having particular regard to’. This has been heralded as a major advance in the recognition of heritage issues by both the heritage lobby and the Historic Places Trust (HPT)6, a quango charged with the monitoring and protection of New Zealand’s historic heritage. This could be seen as part of a generalised western move to value and protect the relics and memories of past events (Lowenthal 1985).

Along with this increase in the degree of statutory protection, moves are afoot within the Historic Places Trust to change that organisation’s approach to viewing heritage. In an internal discussion paper, a Heritage Advisor within the HPT acknowledged that:

...while the Trust and other heritage management agencies are achieving reasonably well in the protection and management of individual buildings and sites, and even at a 'precinct' level, there is not yet a coherent and robust approach to the management of heritage at a landscape level. This inability to manage heritage landscapes adequately is leading to the erosion of heritage values as land is put to new uses, developed or subdivided (Stephenson 2001 P1).

This move within the HPT culminated in a ‘Think Tank’ on heritage landscapes held in April of 2003. Some one hundred and forty five people attended this meeting, from a wide range of organisations including national and local government, iwi, and professions and academic disciplines with an interest in heritage, landscapes or both. The

6 The Historic Places Trust is a voluntary organisation governed by a board of directors elected by the membership. It is charged with the responsibility of monitoring and protecting Aotearoa’s historic heritage by the Historic Places Act (1993).
report notes that there was no apparent disagreement within the group regarding the concept of heritage landscapes which had been put to them in their briefing papers (HPT report 2003 P2). The briefing paper defined heritage landscapes as:

...those landscapes, or networks of sites, which deserve special recognition or protection because of their heritage significance to communities, tangata whenua or the nation. They encompass the physical structures and changes made to the environment by people, natural landforms modified by human action, the meanings given to places and stories told about them (HPT briefing paper 2003 P3).

This definition is extraordinarily broad, and the ‘Think Tank’ report notes several times that concerns were raised within the participant group of its potential to lead to (exacerbate?) tension between private property rights and public values and expectations (HPT report 2003 Pp5, 10, 14, 16). This has a very interesting parallel with the environmental discourse discussed in Chapter Six. Indeed, Stephenson, in her original paper says:

I see the situation as somewhat akin to that in the biological sciences. Thirty years ago, the focus of science was still very much species-based. Individual species were studied and attempts made to preserve them, but with little recognition of the importance of their surrounding ecosystem. Today, an ecosystem approach is central to both conservation and resource management (Stephenson, J 2001 P15)

Both this evolving heritage discourse, and the existing conservation discourse, have a broad scale view of the environment, and give precedence to the public good over private property rights. Some of the issues raised by this can be seen by an examination of some of the case study data.

I discussed Jill and her husband, Bob, and their attachment to their farm in Chapter Five. Their property is notable for the fine stonewalls and buildings which were constructed by Bob’s forbears in the nineteenth century. They maintain their walls as best they can, and some of the stonewalls are listed with the Historic Places Trust. Jill said:

We do as much as possible. It’s a lot of work. Bob has done quite a lot in the past, and his uncles and so forth before him but at the present time we have a young man giving us a hand to repair one or two major falls. He’s up the road at the moment, on a sidewall. He’s a stonewaller, he comes from overseas. He’s done one piece for us and we’re quite happy with that so he’s working on this next piece but it’s a very expensive thing to get done, I mean the hours it takes. Bob at times has helped him a bit with that but he can’t at the moment because we’re on the lambing round. So, yeah, it’s costly. People say, ‘Shouldn’t you maintain this a bit more?’ and I say, ‘Well if you’ve got a golden lined pocket!’ (Int 39, Landowner, 11/10/00).
When asked why they continued to maintain the walls she said:

Well they are part of the scene of our farm and, particularly down your driveway, you really want that to look attractive as people come in. And it's a bit of history really. It is history as far as our farm's concerned because the family did, mainly, put them up themselves and they're all over a hundred years old now, but with a bit of subsidence here and there you do have them collapse on you (Int 39, Landowner, 11/10/00).

When I commented that wire fencing would be a cheaper alternative she said:

Well, it would be to bulldoze them down but they are actually covered by a, what do you call it? Heritage c class, but they don't give you any assistance, they just tell you, 'You can't bulldoze this wall on the main road down,' but they offer no assistance whatsoever so it's just a theoretical thing really, the Historic Places Trust (Int 39, Landowner, 11/10/00).

Fig 7.3: An Otago Peninsula stone wall under repair. Note the ground surface on the uphill side is higher than on the downhill side. This is due to ploughing causing soil to move down hill. Also, sheep huddle against the walls and, in their scrabbling around to get close to the warm stones, undermine the walls and cause their collapse.

I have reproduced these quotations at length because they provide a clear insight into a personal commitment to the management of private heritage. Jill and Bob stayed on the farm because they got 'entrenched in the history' of the place. A personal connection to
Bob’s forbears is located in the sweat soaked land, and is made clearly visible in the stonewalls they built. However there is also an aesthetic aspect to the walls in that they are ‘part of the scene of the farm’. Further there is a tinge of resentment that they must shoulder the expense of maintaining the walls with no assistance from the Historic Places Trust, which through its listing has some say in their management. (It is important and interesting to note, however, that to be listed in the first place the HPT must have had Jill and Bob’s agreement.)

This can be contrasted with the views of Neville, a smallholder and resource management lawyer, and Jacqui, who is involved with the Historic Places Trust. Neville is an active participant in the democratic process having made submissions on the Draft District Plan and ‘...on annual plans for at least twelve years...’ Regarding the Peninsula stonewalls he said:

The other thing I’ve submitted on in respect of the Proposed Plan is to require a resource consent to be obtained if you wish to build a fence within twenty metres of a dry stonewall that’s ceased to be functional. The intention being to force Peninsula property owners to maintain dry stonewalls rather than to allow them to fall into disrepair and replace them with post and wire (Int 44, Small Holder, 15/10/00).

Jill and Bob accept the responsibility for their stonewalls as part of their personal heritage. Here Neville is aiming to force owners to accept responsibility for the maintenance of their walls for the public good, a very different prospect.

Jacqui expresses a similar view to Neville. Of the impact of the District Plan on heritage protection on the Peninsula she said, ‘I’m aware that there are a lot of features out there that currently aren’t protected that could well be protected.’ In response to being asked for examples she said:

Oh there’s a whole mixture of things, like the patterns of stonewalls out there are just wonderful and the way they relate to the shapes of the hills and evoke the past so wonderfully. Currently, apart from one bit of stonewalling which is protected, you know people could just knock those down tomorrow...(Int 60, Professional, 7/6/00).

Jacqui’s statement is particularly interesting for two reasons. Firstly she moves the focus from particular stonewalls to ‘patterns of stonewalls’ and their relationship to the wider landscape. At least potentially this moves the focus from individual properties and property owners to groups of neighbouring properties and owners. Secondly, and in
common with Neville’s statement, the walls are constructed as under threat unless under protection. Landowners are constructed as unable to be trusted with a public resource. Thus we have a somewhat paradoxical position arising in which heritage, a common possession, is under threat from members of the group of its ‘owners’ and must be protected from them. The ‘expert’ is necessary to adjudge what is of value and protect it from the actions of the ignorant.

A further aspect of the heritage discourse which is of interest, and in which it parallels the environmental discourse, is in the objectification of values. It is common to hear the expression ‘heritage values’ as in ‘The heritage values of a place’. I find this construction particularly interesting because, as discussed in Chapter Six, it implies that value is somehow inherent in the thing being talked about. For example, at one point in her interview Jacqui points out that:

...a number of councils, and particularly regional councils, have got involved in landcare type strategies where people learn how to manage their farms or their properties to enhance and protect natural values whether it’s bush or whatever, and one thought is, is there room somewhere for a similar type of advisory service for people who’ve got properties which have heritage values in them, whether that’s as simple as offering lessons on fixing the stonewall through to managing heritage in the landscape in a broader sense (Int 60, Professional, 7/6/00).

This statement is interesting in two ways. Firstly, ‘natural values’ are equated to ‘bush’ and ‘whatever’ suggesting that other similar material things can be linked within this concept, ‘value’. Secondly, the heritage equivalent, ‘heritage values’ are to be found in and not on properties, accentuating the inherent nature of these values. It is my contention that the use of this objectified construction of values is a means by which the contestable nature of values can be subverted. If a value is inherent within something then the potential to argue about that value is eliminated. If a value is something a person attributes to something, then another person can attribute another value. It is, in effect, a means of increasing the power and authority of a discourse. I discuss this further in the following section.
7.4 The neo-liberal economic discourse

Bordieu has defined neo-liberalism as '...a political project for the restructuring and re-scaling of social relations in accord with the demands of an unrestrained global capitalism' (Cited in Fairclough 2001 P4). As this definition suggests, it is not likely that the content of a section on the neo-liberal discourse within a chapter entitled 'Other Discourses' can possibly do it justice. I am happy to accept that assessment. Whole theses could (and hopefully will) be written about the impact of neo-liberalism on the landscape. However, this has not been my intention. Further, following from my theoretical framework, I have focused upon discourses which gain physical expression in actions in the environment of the Otago Peninsula, which construct landscape. The neo-liberal discourse, while impacting on physical expressions in the landscape, does so in an indirect manner, more by influencing, supporting and undermining other discourses, than by prompting direct action on the land.

There is a further methodological aspect to this, however. Neo-liberalism is a powerful discourse in contemporary Aotearoa / New Zealand society. Since 1984, a watershed year in the political history of the country, neo-liberalism has been the underlying discourse driving radical economic and political reforms, or, alternatively, stimulating intense resistance. As such the neo-liberal discourse is very much a normal part of everyday life, something like ugly wallpaper which catches the eye only from time to time, mostly simply forming the background against which life continues. Thus it has only been in the process of analysing other discourses more central to this thesis that the pervasive and insidious influence of neo-liberalism has begun to become clear. There are two ways in which this influence can readily be seen. The first is contextual in terms of the legislative changes and socio-economic impacts of neo-liberalism. The second way in which neo-liberalism manifests in the corpus of this project is in the ways it has

---

7 It was largely in response to the un-mandated nature of the radical neo-liberal reforms instituted in 1984 that led to the replacement of the First Past the Post electoral system with a system of Mixed Member Proportional Representation, for example.
impacted on the expression of other discourses. This takes the form of both outright colonisation where the concepts and language of neo-liberalism have been adopted by conflicting discourses, and in the adoption of specific language forms by which resistance to the neo-liberal discourse can be exerted.

The neo-liberal discourse constructs human society in economic terms, arguing that individuals act consistently to maximise benefits to themselves (Hazledine 1998 P81), and thus that the market is the fairest and most efficient was to allocate resources. As a consequence individualism is to be encouraged as large groups acting in concert might distort the working of the market. It assumes that the worth of all things can be determined by people’s willingness to pay for them and as a result constructs even wildlife as ‘resources’ (Murray & Swaffield 2000). The neo-liberal discourse obfuscates agency inferring that actions based on human decisions are infact inevitable consequences of ‘market forces’. Most significantly it considers that, as the market is the most efficient mechanism for distributing goods and services, the intervention of governmental agencies in their distribution should be kept to a minimum.

Looking first at the contextual impact of neo-liberalism on the Otago Peninsula at the turn of the twenty-first century, it is necessary to look back to 1984. 1984 was a turning point of immense significance to all aspects of the society of Aotearoa / New Zealand. Prior to that time, in the words of Jane Kelsey (1999):

Government intervention had driven the New Zealand economy from the earliest days of colonisation, and was deeply embedded in the social structure well before the emergence of the Keynesian welfare state. In 1984, agricultural production still depended on a system of family farms. Industry was supported by domestic intervention and border protection, while training was subsidised through apprenticeships in government departments and free education. Government commitments to regional development, social welfare and universal provision of core public services, such as health and education, had shaped the structure and values of the society (P8).

8 Ironically, 1984 is renowned for the dismantling of complex state apparatuses which were often referred to as ‘Big Brother’, the key institution in Orwell’s famous dystopian novel, ‘1984’.
In 1984 the newly elected, and, reputedly, socialistically inclined, Labour Government set about a program of radical neo-liberal economic reforms. These reforms have led to the situation where:

There is universal agreement that these reforms shifted New Zealand from being one of the most regulated countries in the developed world to being one of the most open and market-oriented economies anywhere (Dalziel & Lattimore 2001 P27).

Whilst operating from the foundation of an economic model of the world and human relationships, the neo-liberal reforms were not only economic in the narrow sense of the word. Neo-liberalism focuses upon individual freedoms and responsibilities and assumes that individuals behave consistently to maximise their self interest. As a consequence of seeing the market as the fairest and most efficient way to balance the self interest of individuals within society, ‘Political strategies associated with neo-liberalism promote values of private property, capital development and personal freedom within a minimal framework of rules and regulations that protect fundamental freedoms’ (Hayward 2000 P15).

Fairclough (Undated) argues that the ‘knowledge based’ socio-economic order of new capitalism ‘implies that it is also ‘discourse driven’ suggesting that language may have a more significant role in contemporary socio-economic changes than it has in the past’ (Pp5-6). One of the primary features of the neo-liberal discourse which enables it to function in this way is that change is constructed as inevitable, a process without responsible agents (Fairclough 2000b), leading Fairclough to conclude:

Both national governments and international agencies...increasingly construe their task as managing change, rather than implementing policies which shape the direction of change (ibid Unpaginated).

The Resource Management Act 1991 is an excellent example of legislation which demonstrates this principle.

---

9 A major criticism of the reforms was based upon the lack of mandate held by the Labour Government to undertake them. The intention to undertake the reforms was not discussed prior to the election and a clear parliamentary majority allowed them to drive through changes with little consultation. This approach was continued by the National Government elected in 1990 (Mulgan 1997).

10 ‘New Capitalism’ is the name given to capitalism expressed under the neo-liberal project, particularly in Britain and particularly associated with New Labour.
The neo-liberal turn has had two major impacts on the socio-economic structure of Aotearoa / New Zealand which have had notable effects on the Otago Peninsula. Firstly, the reforms have had a dramatic impact on the distribution of wealth within Aotearoa / New Zealand (as is also the case, internationally) (MacEwan 1999). Between 1984 and 1999 the top 10% of income earners in Aotearoa / New Zealand increased their income by 43%, and the next 20% held their own. The other 70% saw a decline in their income during this period (Walsh 1999). This period of wealth redistribution coincides with a national increase in ‘lifestyle’ property developments and the spread of these lifestyle blocks is evident on the Otago Peninsula.

Secondly, the focus within neo-liberalism on the development of a ‘knowledge economy’ has resulted in a shift from a focus on production to consumption (Fairclough). This has had two impacts on the rural environment. First it has resulted in what Baragwanath has termed the ‘(agri)cultural cringe’ (Baragwanath 2003), the political devaluation of the contribution which agriculture makes to the economy which directly challenges the power of the agricultural discourse. Further, the Resource Management Act effectively traded increased responsibilities on rural landowners for increased development rights (Swaffield pers com), hence a strong connection between the neo-liberal turn and the residential development of periurban areas is apparent.14 Secondly, the lifestyle block is, in a sense, an almost archetypal representation of the shift from production to consumption (Pawson 1996), once productive farmland becoming, at least in some instances, little more than large gardens.15 In such a way the new, neo-liberal order becomes very apparent in the physical landscape and the statement by Azaryahu (P319) that, ‘Landscapes do not merely reflect and articulate social relations; by reifying them

---

14 As in many ways the neo-liberal discourse is a natural ally to the agricultural discourse (see Leipens and Bradshaw 1999), this represents another of the many paradoxes of the impact of neo-liberalism in Aotearoa / New Zealand.

15 This is not to suggest, however, that lifestyle blocks are necessarily unproductive, or that 'unproductive' use of land is necessarily undesirable. In some instances, the small holdings on the Otago Peninsula are actually farmed very efficiently in terms of the agricultural discourse. Also a number of these small holdings are managed for the regeneration of indigenous ecosystems.
they are also active in legitimating these same relations' underlines the significance of these changes.

Dunedin City Council planners endeavoured to control this process on the Otago Peninsula by making the building of houses on lots of less than fifteen hectares a prohibited activity in the Draft District Plan. This engendered howls of outrage from people who had bought small blocks of land, not necessarily ‘lifestyle blocks’, on the Peninsula, often for retirement homes, and who were not in a position to build within the grace period allowed.

Henry, a Councillor, who was a key player on the committee which heard submissions to the plan, had a rather different objection to the ‘fifteen hectare rule’. ‘You just can’t have prohibitions,’ he said. He continued, ‘If you’re effects based you have to have reasons so we had to develop the policy basis for it.’ These reasons for not allowing small rural subdivisions were, he stated, ‘landscape and the waste of resources’ in terms of the extended infrastructure the Council would be expected to provide by new residents.

When the plan went out the thinking in Dunedin was, ‘We shall direct where you live cause we want you to make our service more efficient.’ That’s trying to manipulate people’s decisions which we weren’t in favour of. We said, ‘No. Let’s just look at the effects on the environment’ (Int 56, Professional, 5/12/00).

As a consequence building houses on lots of more than two hectares is a non-complying activity in the Dunedin District Plan with consent dependent on negotiation with Council officers.

There are a number of features of this text that are interesting. Firstly, while Henry is clearly an enthusiast for effects based planning, the post hoc nature of the process doesn’t seem to be in the least problematic to him. One could argue that the point of regulatory and legislative controls is always to influence people’s decision making – the speed limit influences my decisions as to how fast I drive – but Henry constructs this as ‘manipulation’. Further, he suggests that the rule was tantamount to telling people where they were to live, when it could be argued that in fact it was doing the exact opposite – simply telling people where they could not live. In this way the Council as a local
government body is constructed as overextending itself into the realm of personal rights. Intriguingly, Henry argues that this extension into the realm of personal rights is done with the aim of maximising the Council’s efficiency. Efficiency, or at least the attainment of it as a goal, is a key feature of the neo-liberal discourse, but here Henry is accusing the Council of cheating, of trying to make its residents create its desired efficiency, rather than do it itself. Another paradox of the neoliberal turn becomes evident in this discussion – the resistance to direct people’s activity by rules ultimately exposes them to greater and more arbitrary control by planners acting within the Council’s bureaucracy. 16

As I have stated above, the neo-liberal discourse constructs even wildlife as ‘resources’. It would appear from the corpus of this study that this construction is beginning to colonise other discourses. Its presence in the narrative of those involved in the plan development is unsurprising. For example, Maryanna, a Councillor who had been a key player with Henry on the committee which heard the submissions on the Draft District Plan, spoke of members of the Yellow-eyed Penguin Trust being ‘good because we could relate to them...they weren’t professional people...they were people who had a heart for the resource (Int 57, Professional, 6/12/00).’ However, it is, perhaps, more surprising to hear Evan, who worked for a voluntary conservation body, talking about coastal wildlife areas as resources. However, the context makes it an interesting example. Evan was talking about conflict over public access across privately owned farmland. He said:

  Why should you have locked up all those resources, those coastal wildlife areas and things that are really ours you know? New Zealanders have the right to see it – at one time they did. (Int 12, Community Group, 2/6/00; emphasis mine).

In this piece of narrative Evan is remaining true to the communitarian nature of the environmental discourse by asserting that the coastal wildlife areas belong to all New Zealanders. However, he is simultaneously adopting the neo-liberal construction of these areas as resources. This illustrates the colonisation of the environmental discourse by the neo-liberal. It is a pragmatic necessity for Evan to accept the construction of these areas

16 See Chapter Eight for examples of this. A consequence of this results in design decisions being made routinely by planners, untrained in design.
as resources for him to be able to argue for our communal ownership of them, creating common ground in order to facilitate a discussion.

However, the environmental discourse, among others, does resist the neo-liberal discourse and the means utilised to resist it are extremely interesting. One means I focus on here is the use of a particular example of metaphorical representation. This form, a grammatical rather than semantic metaphor, leads to the representation of processes as entities. ‘Entities, things (as well as persons) are congruently represented linguistically as nouns, whereas as (sic) processes are congruently represented linguistically as verbs...’ (Fairclough 2003 P143). The particular process of concern in this case is that of valuing, a quintessentially human activity (process) which has been transmuted into an entity represented by a noun, ‘values’, modified by various adjectives, commonly ‘landscape’, ‘ecological’, ‘heritage’, ‘amenity’ and so on. Thus it is rare to have a conversation about the environment in Aotearoa / New Zealand in the early twenty-first century without being confronted with one of these grammatical metaphors. It is my argument that this is a form of resistance to the effects of the neo-liberal construction of the world.

As I have argued above, the neo-liberal discourse constructs human society in economic terms and argues that individuals act consistently to maximize the benefits which they can accrue to themselves. This results in all things being potential resources which can be allocated efficiently and fairly only through the actions of the unfettered marketplace. It is the actions of individuals within this market place, effectively bidding against one another for the desired commodity, which establishes the value of the resource. Thus, in terms of the neo-liberal discourse, public goods (such as landscape, ecological health, heritage, and amenity) are only worth what the community is prepared to pay for them. (I am stating an extreme neo-liberal position here – even Simon Upton, a strong proponent of neo-liberalism and Minister for the Environment through the first years of the

17 In the corpus of this study ‘values’ collocates in this way with ‘conservation’, ‘natural’, ‘recreation’, ‘scenic’, ‘landscape’, ‘ecological’, ‘heritage’, and ‘botanical’. It also collocates with ‘Māori’, but this instance is not metaphorical, referring as it does to the actual values expressed by Māori people.
implementation of the RMA91, has admitted that the market is not the best way of securing ecological well being (Upton 1996).

In order for a community to value a 'resource' those self-actualising individuals of which the community is made up, must value the resource for themselves. That is, in terms of the neo-liberal discourse the value of a landscape, of ecological health, of heritage, ultimately boils down to the evaluations of their worth by individual people. There is not an expectation of anything as crude as actual valuation, or literal bidding, the expression of this evaluation being made, primarily (in theory) through the electoral system, residents voting in support or against policies depending on their assessment of their worth. However, the consequence is that the value of these entities is always uncertain, fluctuating, and changeable.

From the point of view of the communitarian discourses (the environmental, the heritage, and the picturesque landscape discourses in particular) this is a major point of tension and resistance. If the protection or enhancement of ecological health, heritage buildings, picturesque (and other) landscapes is reliant, fundamentally, on individual preferences then these are always contingent and at risk of changing priorities. However, if the process of evaluation is denied, and the site of the value(ing) is transferred from the human to the entity where it becomes intrinsic, then the case for protection/preservation/conservation can be more simply made.

Having described the RMA91 as a neo-liberal document and having argued that the use of these grammatical metaphors is to hide the act of valuing and make values appear intrinsic, it seems necessary to address the use of the same metaphors within the RMA91 itself. The RMA 91 refers to 'amenity values' which it also defines as 'those natural and physical qualities and characteristics of an area that contribute to people's appreciation of its pleasantness, aesthetic coherence, and cultural and recreational attributes'. This definition clearly recognises that the evaluation of the qualities and characteristics is a human activity. Section 7(d) speaks of the 'intrinsic values of ecosystems'. However, again this is defined (in S2(1)) and although the definition includes a statement about
‘...their constituent parts which have value in their own right...’ the definition continues to provide the criteria for assessing this value, shifting the site of valuation from the ecosystem back to the human evaluator.

This leaves only one instance where the Act utilises this grammatical metaphor without relocating the site of evaluation and that is when it refers to ‘heritage values’ (S7(e)). The RMA91 does not define these but does locate them in ‘sites, buildings, places or areas’. This, and the examples given above, represent another form of the colonisation of resistant discourses by their co-optation. By adopting the form of resistant discourses the neo-liberal discourse, in this instance expressed in the RMA91, is able to disempower them. It effectively unpacks the claim of intrinsic value from ‘amenity values’ and from ecosystems. That it does not actually do this for ‘heritage values’ is interesting, but perhaps it is unnecessary, as heritage in this context, set against ‘natural features and landscapes’, ‘the natural character of the coast’, ecosystems and so on, is clearly a matter for human evaluation.

7.5 Conclusion

In this chapter I have examined three very different discourses. They differ vastly in focus, scale and power. However, all three serve to illustrate the interconnectedness of discourses; their dynamic natures; and, in the case of the neo-liberal discourse, the contextual influence of an extremely powerful discourse in contemporary Aotearoa / New Zealand.

The gardening discourse has its historical roots in Western Europe, and before that in the Middle East (Jellicoe & Jellicoe 1995), and has been influenced by the picturesque (see Chapter Eight). Its influence on the Otago Peninsula is increasing, particularly as a function of the development of more lifestyle properties. In addition to increasing amounts of land being ‘gardened’, this discourse bleeds out into the broader landscape, entangling with the agricultural discourse and influencing the choices of species made for
shelter planting. Similarly it entangles with the environmental discourse influencing planting practices and species distribution in revegetation projects.

In both these instances, it is important to note that the primary discourse retains its essential integrity. The influence is permitted and thus the potential to withdraw consent exists. Thus the choices of shelter plants are still made on an ultimately pragmatic basis and the choices of species for revegetation on the basis of what is understood to have been present prior to European settlement.

The heritage discourse is particularly interesting because of the parallels it holds with the environmental discourse and for the increase in its influence over the past twenty years. This discourse is concerned with protecting and promoting the public interest against private property rights and in this is similar to the environmental discourse. The similarity between these discourses is increasing as the heritage discourse expands its view, developing and promoting a more holistic approach of heritage landscapes. It seems clear that part of the increasing prominence of both the heritage and the environmental discourses in the past twenty years is a consequence of the increasing challenge of the neo-liberal discourse.

The neo-liberal discourse has had considerable influence in the broader socio-economic environment of Aotearoa / New Zealand over the past twenty years, reflecting its ascendency in the international arena. As such its influence on the construction of the landscape of the Otago Peninsula is largely contextual. However, this is not to say that its influences have been insignificant. Resistance of neo-liberal to other discourses, and resistance from them, is notable.

While the impact of neo-liberal policies on farmers was strong and harsh (see Chapter Five for a discussion of them) the neo-liberal and agricultural discourses are natural allies (see Leipins & Bradshaw 1999). While the neo-liberal discourse does not directly entangle with the gardening, its influence on the distribution of wealth in Aotearoa / New
Zealand and on planning law have allowed for its increasing expression on the increasing numbers of 'lifestyle' properties on the Otago Peninsula.

It is in its entanglements with the environmental and heritage discourses that the neo-liberal discourse betrays its greatest influence. Both of these discourses have come into prominence during the period of ascendency of the neo-liberal discourse in broader Aotearoa / New Zealand society. Both of these discourses are fundamentally in conflict with the neo-liberal discourse, promoting holistic views of the environment and promoting the public good over private property rights. They are both primarily forms of resistance to the expression of the neo-liberal discourse in the broader environment. Given that both rely upon the neo-liberal Resource Management Act for statutory support and expression; it would seem that the neo-liberal discourse is readily able to hold them at bay.
Chapter Eight: Landscape management and the picturesque

8.1 Introduction

The previous four chapters have been organised in such a way as to illustrate the dynamism and complexity of the ‘dance of landscape’. The actions and interaction of the discourses discussed produce the complex patterns of land use and land management that make up what we call ‘landscape’. But the story is not over yet. Governmental systems operate further levels of land(scape) management in order to protect the environment for the public good. The primary legislative framework through which these systems operate is the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA91) which has as its purpose the promotion of ‘the sustainable management of natural and physical resources’ (RMA91 S5(1)). This management is largely undertaken at the level of local government by Regional and District Councils. This Chapter focuses upon the Dunedin District Plan (DP99) as a landscape management tool.

Among its many functions, the Dunedin District Plan includes specific policies to manage some dimensions of the landscape of the Otago Peninsula. These policies are implemented by the application of rules and guidelines. These policies, rules and guidelines have been analysed as part of the linguistic corpus of this study, as have the relevant parts of the Draft District Plan and the landscape assessment report upon which they were based. This analysis shows that the primary discourse adopted by the Plan and used to construct the landscape, and subsequently define issues and policies for its management, is the picturesque.

The picturesque is different to most of the discourses discussed so far in that its characteristics have been identified elsewhere. As an aesthetic system it has been identified as central to the practice of landscape architecture in Aotearoa / New Zealand (Bowring 1997). It is through the landscape architecture profession that it has gained its key role in landscape management on the Otago Peninsula. Thus an analysis of the role of the profession is an integral part of an analysis of the power dynamics inherent in the use of the picturesque as a means of landscape management.
Further, this planning and management regime is a relatively new one having been borne out of the neo-liberal economic reforms of the 1980s. Consequently an examination of the political context of its development is also necessary.

8.2 Planning and the neo-liberal turn

Aotearoa / New Zealand’s first comprehensive planning legislation was enacted in 1926 and required Town Planning schemes for all cities and boroughs with more than 1000 inhabitants. In 1953 the requirement for land use planning was extended and became a mandatory function of all local authorities. The Town and Country Planning Act of 1977 simplified and clarified responsibilities and procedures, but retained the primary land use planning approach (Williams 1985). The advent of neo-liberalism in the mid 1980s, and some of its impacts, are discussed in Chapter Seven. Supporters of neo-liberalism eschew the idea of land use planning (as it involves limiting the rights of the landowner) arguing instead that ‘private co-ordinating mechanisms such as covenants, will produce more efficient resource allocations than mandatory public regulations such as land use zoning’ (Hayward 2000 P35). It was against this background that the revision of environmental planning and resource management law was undertaken in the late 1980s, resulting in the Resource Management Act 1991.

The Resource Management Act 1991 aimed at consolidating and simplifying resource management law. It restricts the scope of environmental planning to regulatory activity undertaken, principally, at the regional and district council levels (Memon, 1993). These councils are required by the Act to plan for the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources within their geographic and jurisdictional boundaries. This includes a number of provisions which are directly implicated in landscape management on the Otago Peninsula, and which I will discuss shortly.

The RMA is a complex and rather confusing piece of legislation, having been heralded as both pro-environment and pro-development. Hayward (op cit P102) suggests that the reason for this inherent contradiction is that the Act was conceived under a Labour Government, but implemented under a National one. While both
parties had similar neo-liberal economic agendas, their social and environmental agendas were different. Whether this explanation can hold up to scrutiny or not is beyond the scope of this project. However, it is clearly the case that, as Hayward goes on to state:

On the one hand the Act is neo-liberal, seeking a restrained role for the State in the management of natural resource, but on the other hand the Act reflects demands by the environmental movement for greater consultation in planning (op cit P103).

Regional and District councils are required by the RMA91 to plan for the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources within their geographic and jurisdictional boundaries. Among the many provisions of the Act, it requires councils, as a matter of national importance, to protect ‘outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development’ (S6(b)RMA91). Councils also must have regard to the ‘maintenance and enhancement of amenity values’ (S7(c)RMA91) and ‘the recognition and protection of the heritage values of sites, building, places or areas’ (S7(e)RMA91). Amenity values are defined as, ‘those natural or physical qualities and characteristics of an area that contribute to people’s appreciation of its pleasantness, aesthetic coherence, and cultural and recreational attributes’ (S2(1)RMA91). Thus the RMA91 recognises that a quality environment has social and aesthetic aspects as well as biophysical ones.

The passing of the Resource Management Act and the neo-liberal reform of the economy and state sectors, were to have significant impacts on the developing profession of landscape architecture. In 1991 The Landscape, the journal of the profession, carried enthusiastic accolades from practitioners regarding the RMA91. Claire Findlay stated, in an editorial, that the RMA provided, ‘unprecedented scope for the ideals which are embodied in the [New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects] philosophy statement to be made good in reality’ (Findlay 1991 P4), and noted that landscape architects must be alert to the opportunities the Act provided them. Stephen Dowling, in the same issue, said that the focus on effects within the

1 The institution of the RMA went hand in hand with the restructuring of local government, also according to a neo-liberal agenda.
2 The Resource Management Amendment Act 2003 elevates heritage matters to Section 6, matters of national importance.
3 Bowring notes that ‘Pleasantness and aesthetic coherence immediately suggest picturesque qualities’ (op cit P125).
RMA91, 'is going to validate and reinforce the approach that landscape architects have already been advocating in their work' (Dowling 1991 P9). However, he did also report Dr Tony Jackman's concern that the profession is 'not strong on true ecological principles' (ibid P9) and that this would be a problem. I will return to this point later in the Chapter. At the same time, the impact of the neo-liberal reforms on the public sector meant that organisations which employed many landscape architects were restructured, resulting in a shift in the focus of the profession from government agencies to private practice (Swaffield 1999). Many of these private practitioners were then re-employed by their past masters as consultants.

The responses to the passing of the RMA91 in Planning Quarterly, the journal of professional planners in Aotearoa / New Zealand, were not nearly so enthusiastic. Cathy Sheehan interviewed planners about the newly passed RMA and quoted one planner saying:

> It seems barmy to throw out 30 to 40 years of case law. Trying to put 50 Acts into one, just to solve the problems that have hit the headlines in 1% of cases, is throwing the baby out with the bathwater (cited in Sheehan 1991 P27).

In a further, prophetic⁴, quote another of Sheehan's respondents said, 'The Act is going to make everything slower, more expensive, and more time consuming...' (ibid P27).

By the mid 1990s it could be said that cracks were beginning to appear in the RMA. Planning Quarterly of December 1994 responded to a report on the RMA by Alan Dormer commissioned by the Business Roundtable⁵ in which he was critical of the inclusion of social, economic and cultural considerations in definitions of 'environment'. Batty considered:

> That view cannot be accepted, as those matters are fundamentally linked to any environment in which human beings are present. The way in which any plan or planning decision gives effect to Section 5 and subsections (a), (b), and (c) is, of necessity, a matter of judgement. Focus upon the primacy or otherwise of different

---

⁴ Complaints about the time taken to process applications under the RMA91 and the cost of compliance with its processes have continued since its passing. In 2003 the Resource Management Amendment Act was passed aimed at reducing both, but the Government has recently announced another review of the RMA 'aimed at giving greater certainty about costs and the time it takes to handle applications' The Press, May 13 2004 P5. These ongoing complaints underline the tension between the neo-liberal and conservationist aspects of the Act.

⁵ The Business Round Table is a right wing think tank which continues to provide energetic support for the neo-liberal reforms.
parts of that section is unlikely to contribute to the quality of any particular plan or decision (Batty 1994 P6).

This disagreement reflected another traced through the pages of the NZ Planning Quarterly between Simon Upton, who was the Minister responsible for the RMA, and critics who eschewed Upton’s strong neo-liberal stance on the Act and its interpretation. This culminated in 1997 with a paper by Upton in which he conceded, ‘that changing the law does not change the reality on the ground. We don’t achieve better environmental management simply by passing a statute with a purpose of ‘sustainable management’ (Upton 1997 P5). However, some planners, at least, considered the failing to be inherent within the effects-based approach of the Act. Bailey, for example, stated that, ‘Traditional town planning interventionist methodologies need to be employed to achieve sustainability, and the quality of the environment that the RMA itself ultimately seeks’ (Bailey 1997 P14).

The application of the RMA91 in regional and district planning has not gone smoothly in some areas. The proposed plans of the Far North District Council, the Hurunui District Council and the Banks Peninsula District Council led to concerted campaigns against their adoption orchestrated by Federated Farmers, largely due to the plans’ attempts to protect landscapes. (See Chapter One for a discussion of some of the details.) In an editorial of Landscape New Zealand, Stephen Brown complained of ‘the morass that environmental management has been plunged into over recent months’ (Brown, 1997 P2), and noted that Federated Farmers wanted a return to the laissez-faire environmental management which had existed in these rural areas prior to the RMA.

Thus we come to one of the key ironies of the RMA. Whilst being a fundamentally neoliberal document, its interpretation and application have actually had the effect of increasing the amount of state control and intervention in the management of, particularly, rural land. However, what is often not acknowledged is that with this redistribution of responsibility (the environmental aspect of the Act) came the increased right to realise capital in terms of development rights (the neo-liberal aspect of the Act) (Swaffield pers comm 25/5/04). Thus, while the increase in responsibility has been a key point of contention, both nationally, as I have already shown (see
Chapter One) and on the Otago Peninsula as I will demonstrate in this chapter, some landowners have gained significantly in financial terms. Central in both processes has been the landscape architecture profession as it has indeed taken advantage of the opportunities on offer.

Bowring (1997) has illustrated convincingly that the central aesthetic expressed by the landscape architecture profession in Aotearoa / New Zealand is the picturesque. This picturesque aesthetic arose from the work of the naturalist landscape painters of seventeenth and eighteenth century Europe. The principles of painting composition were extracted and applied to the design of the landscape garden or park, which became a model of how nature should look. This model was widely applied to the design of the English landscape parks, and soon the countryside outside was also being assessed by such criteria, with an expectation that it too should be scenic (Crandall P112). During the late eighteenth century, the picturesque became the subject of a prolonged and public debate which led to it being, ‘...codified, and formalised, with an emphasis on the relationship of landscape design to pictures...’ (Bowring 1997 P23).

By the mid nineteenth century the picturesque, in England, was going through a period of what Bowring (ibid, p32) describes as ‘reproduction and repression’. A focus on the practice of design, rather than its theory, led to the naturalisation of the picturesque criteria as design truths. As such, it was transported to New Zealand, and other colonies, with the early European settlers and here completed its transformation from a specific design vocabulary to, simply, a way of seeing. Thus, perhaps it is not too surprising, then, that Bowring concludes that:

The picturesque exists as a set of covert conventions in the discourse of the NZILA. It is naturalised and myth-like, with the adoption of picturesque principles seemingly taken for granted in the practice of New Zealand landscape architecture (ibid P122).

She also points out that ‘the profession of landscape architecture developed in parallel with the picturesque, forging links that persist today’ (ibid P1).

Consequently, it should be of no surprise that the involvement of landscape architects in landscape planning has led to the picturesque becoming a key tool of landscape management. This is not to say that the picturesque has been absent from landscape management...
management in the past. A primary landscape management tool prior to the RMA was the network of scenic reserves which extend all over the country, and which are based upon a picturesque sensibility (Park 1996 P143). This is the case to the extent that it has been remarked that they would be more correctly named ‘reserved scenes’. Further, as Bowring points out, ‘The influence of the picturesque extends far beyond the profession of landscape architecture’ (op cit P130). It is quite possible that the picturesque may be a prevalent aesthetic within broader society, and that landscape architects could be said to be simply giving a clear voice to the preferences of the majority of the population anyway. But this again raises key issues about the role of the landscape architecture profession and brings to mind Treib’s warning that, ‘In any profession the continuance of existing practice with neither termination nor questioning is numbing and perhaps even dangerous’ (cited Bowring op cit P122). I will discuss this further in Chapter Nine.

Landscape architects were involved in the writing of Dunedin City’s Draft District Plan in two ways. The Council (DCC) began preparing its new Plan more or less immediately after the passing of the RMA91, and contracted a local landscape architecture firm to undertake an assessment of the city’s landscape upon which to base issues and develop policies regarding that landscape. This firm undertook a type of process which has been characterised as ‘expert’ (Uzzell, 1991) which was standard practice at the time and continues to be widely used. The expert type of assessment is entirely user-independent in its methodology and thus no consultation with any residents or user group was undertaken. Their approach relied entirely on the interpretation made by an expert (landscape architect) of the landscape as they saw it from public roads and significant public sites within the area. The resulting report was used as the basis on which the Landscape, and much of the Rural, section of the Plan was formulated, the Landscape section being largely written by the DCC’s staff landscape architect. This Draft District Plan (DDP) was released in 1995, leading to significant levels of ill-feeling in some sectors of the Peninsula community, ill feeling that was still palpable in 2000 when I undertook my field work there. Central to this discontent was the privileging of the outsider’s view (quite literally) over that of the residents, and this, I argue, is a direct consequence of the application of the picturesque discourse naturalised in the practice of landscape architecture.
8.3 The picturesque discourse

The picturesque is somewhat different to the discourses discussed previously. As an aesthetic system, the picturesque has been the focus of a large number of scholarly works (among them Andrews, 1994; Bowring, 1997; Crandall, 1993; Hipple, 1957; Hunt, 1992; Hussey, 1967). Thus, as with the neo-liberal discourse, the features of the picturesque have been identified independently of this case study. Consequently the picturesque discourse can be identified independently of others, rather than only at points of resistance. That is not to say, however, that points of discord and resistance between the picturesque and other discourses are not clearly present, and I will discuss some of these.

In order to elucidate the nature of the picturesque discourse, that is the linguistic expression of the picturesque aesthetic, it is first necessary to examine the features of that aesthetic. In doing so it is helpful to reflect on Jay’s statement that, ‘What is ‘seen’ is not a given, objective reality open to an innocent eye, but an epistemologic field constructed as much linguistically as visually’ (1986 P182). Precisely because the picturesque is so naturalised a way of seeing, identifying it in practice can be very difficult. After all, what other way can there be? In Foucaultian terms this is because examining the picturesque requires analysing one’s own archive, and this can only have limited success.

Bowring (1997 P66) likens the process of identifying the picturesque from within her corpus to that of archaeology. The metaphor is useful, not only for the notion of the process of digging which it entails, but also because what is recovered from an archaeological excavation is, usually, a mass of fragments. These fragments require piecing together, both literally and conceptually, in order to reconstruct the cultural

---

6 While none of these authors specifically define the picturesque as a discourse, it fulfils the criteria discussed in Chapter Two, as will be seen shortly.

7 To an extent this could be said to be true of the other Pākeha discourses I have examined. However, the picturesque as a way of seeing is the most naturalised, even embodied, of the discourses discussed here.
milieu of the site and in order to come to an understanding of their individual meanings and significance.

This is, of course, a similar process to that undertaken in the definition of the other discourses I have identified. In this instance, however, there is a clear test which can be applied to ensure that the appropriate pieces are connected. Bowring makes the point that:

One of the most succinct ways in which to highlight the arbitrariness of these absolute rules [of the picturesque style] is to illustrate the types of landscapes that are produced when the rules are not followed. For example, some of the world's most revered, eternal, and frequently photographed landscapes result from conventions which are not 'natural'. French bosques and allées, Californian agricultural landscapes, Japanese padi fields (1997 P104).

Thus not only are the definitive criteria discussed above available to determine the picturesque discourse, but knowledge of other aesthetics enables further clarification.

8.3.1 The picturesque aesthetic

Bowring argues, 'the notion of language is of specific relevance to the picturesque. From its origins the picturesque was closely associated with notions of textuality and 'reading' the landscape.' She develops a means of identifying a visual language within linguistic material and applies this to the body of text produced by the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects. I have adopted and adapted Bowring's criteria for identifying the picturesque and they are detailed in Tables 8:1 and 8:2. She uses a linguistic metaphor and distinguishes between 'vocabulary' and 'syntax', 'vocabulary' referring to the content of the picture or garden or view or photograph. 'Syntax' refers to the way in which this content is arranged, and follows very distinctive conventions. In order to explain the concepts further it is useful to illustrate them further using pictures and to this end I refer to picturesque paintings of the Otago Peninsula. The numbers and letters in the text refer to the item of vocabulary or syntax in the table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary Feature</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Muted colours</td>
<td>Arise from varnish of old masters – patina provided a harmonising influence. (Bowring P66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Variety</td>
<td>Variety seen to provide excitement. (Bowring P68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Irregularity/roughness</td>
<td>Uvedale Price – the picturesque is founded on 'roughness...sudden variation...age, and even...decay.' (Cited Bowring P69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Age</td>
<td>Uvedale Price – time can convert a beautiful object into a picturesque one by the accumulation of stains, disintegration of the structure and the actions of plants (Bowring P70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tree groups and mounding</td>
<td>A legacy of Capability Brown usually used by him to define spaces and vistas (Bowring P72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ruins</td>
<td>Ruins provided visual interest and embodied a nostalgic atmosphere (Bowring P74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Accident/neglect</td>
<td>Picturesque was characterised as 'design by neglect' in the late eighteenth century. (Bowring P75)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.1: Characteristics of the picturesque adapted from Bowring (1997). These items of design ‘vocabulary’ refer to the features and their representation within a painting.

Fig 8.1: Nicholas Chevalier; Sandfly Bay, Otago; 1879.

The first painting, Fig 8.1, is ‘Sandfly Bay, Otago’ painted by Nicholas Chevalier in 1879. Chevalier’s colour scheme is muted (1), even the ocean being richly highlighted with gold and brown. The foreground is the darkest part of the painting and textual variation (2) is provided between the vegetation in this part of the painting, the road surface, and the vegetation and sand of the midground. Decayed and fallen trees are evident in the left foreground indicating age (4) and possibly, the
inevitable displacement of the indigenous. The presence of the Māori family in this part of the painting, also, could be interpreted as part of this association, displacement theory\textsuperscript{8} predicting their demise in addition to that of the indigenous flora and fauna.

As well as the fortuitous (6) accident of the trees’ demise indicating the work of nature, these dead trees are used to frame the more distant view of Sandymount which is painted with a pale palette.\textsuperscript{9} This pale sandy area appears open and accessible, ‘parklike’. The curve of the beach and the curve of the roadway both follow the curve of Hogarth’s ‘line of beauty’\textsuperscript{10}, a common convention in picturesque painting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntax</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Backdrop/foreground</td>
<td>Background, midground and foreground tripartite division of space established by Claude in paintings (Bowring P76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Screening</td>
<td>Screening or coulisse, a side scene in theatre (Bowring P56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Blending in</td>
<td>All parts should ‘. . . form one beauteous, nicely blended whole.’ (Knight cited in Bowring P78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Framed views</td>
<td>‘The notion of frames and views refers to both physical interventions in the landscape through the creation of frames, and to an attitude towards landscape with the identification of views as primary sources of scenic pleasure.’ (Bowring P81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Park like</td>
<td>‘Park-like has become synonymous with picturesque design, immediately conjuring up a vision of a grassy landscape surrounded with groups of informally planted trees.’ (Bowring P83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Serial vision</td>
<td>‘The peripatetic view is a sign of the picturesque, as ‘While it renders Nature an object of manipulation, the Picturesque garden is perceived, not as a thing in itself, but as a series of relationships that are gradually revealed to the moving spectator.” (Constant cited in Bowring P84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Natural looking</td>
<td>The concept of designed nature is central to the picturesque but on her own is not adequate – she requires improvement. (Bowring P87)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8:2: Characteristics of the picturesque adapted from Bowring (1997). These items of design ‘syntax’ refer to the compositional structures within a painting.

\textsuperscript{8} Displacement theory is discussed in Chapters One and Six.

\textsuperscript{9} A comparison of this painting with the works of Salvator Rosa and Claude Lorraine, classic European picturesque painters, makes very clear the conventional nature of the features of this painting. See Bowring 1997 P56 – 57.

\textsuperscript{10} Hogarth, an eighteenth century picturesque theorist, argued that the curve of a woman’s body was the essence of beauty and this curve was adopted within both picturesque painting and landscape design (Thompson 2000).
The second painting, Fig 8:2, is ‘Otago Harbour from the Highcliff Road’ painted by George O’Brien in 1866. O’Brien’s painting follows similar conventions to that of Chevalier. The tripartite division of space into foreground, the roadway; midground, the western side of the harbour and the eastern harbourside edge; and background, the distant west harbour hills and the northern reaches of the Peninsula, are very clear in this painting (A). The foreground and, in particular, the apparently dead tree at the right of the painting, provide a screen (B) which emphasises the framing (C) provided by the west harbour hills to the left and the Peninsula hills on the right. Together these elements lead the eye to the distant view of Port Chalmers. The midground hills of the Peninsula, in particular, and the west harbour hills to a degree, are shown cleared of indigenous vegetation. If one knows that the land was all once forested, then the evidence of clearance can easily be seen, but as no fence lines are visible, nor houses or other buildings, the appearance is of parklike nature (E, G). While two roads are visible in the painting, the one on the west harbour hills following the form of Hogarth’s line of beauty, the overall impression is of minimal human intervention in the landscape. The presence of ships on the harbour and the roads on the land both suggest the presence of people, but in a transitory way. The view, in both of these
paintings, is taken from a point on a road underlining the picturesque convention of serial vision (F).

One of the important features of the picturesque, and one I will return to, is its claim to naturalism. Nature in the picturesque is, however, designed nature. ‘Nature herself was not considered adequate, and improvement was required (Bowring 1997 P 87). My own early responses to these works are informative in this regard. My impression of O’Brien’s work was of accuracy, that he had got his portrayal of the Peninsula and harbour ‘right’. I felt I could almost identify the spot from which he had painted it, and as such felt it presented an accurate portrayal of the area in the 1860s. Chevalier’s work initially stimulated a similar sense in me. I felt I was seeing somewhere familiar to me as someone else, in the past, had experienced it. However, as I studied it further I began to feel puzzled. While it was clearly of Sandfly Bay I could not work out where he could have painted it from to get that particular angle. I was certain the beach at the foot of Sandymount was rocky. In fact, O’Brien was criticised by contemporaries for being too realistic in his landscape paintings and failing to fulfil the picturesque criteria adequately (Pound 1983). His nature was not adequately improved. Chevalier, on the other hand, while effectively evoking a real landmark, reorients the coastline to incorporate Hogarth’s ‘line of beauty’ in the curve of the beach\textsuperscript{11}. The point is, that we are very ready to accept the picturesque view as representing accurate records of the landscape, only realising on reflection the modifications made to fulfil the style’s requirements.

That this is not the only way of seeing or portraying landscape can be underlined by examining other pictorial representations of the Peninsula. Fig 8:3 is a painting by Colin McCahon\textsuperscript{12}, entitled ‘Otago Peninsula’. Painted in the late 1940s this painting reflects an entirely different way of seeing, one that reduces the landscape to its bare morphological bones. In fact, McCahon was one of a number of artists within Aotearoa / New Zealand at that time strongly influenced by Cotton’s book,\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{11} Chevalier received a grant from the provincial governments of Otago and Canterbury to help fund his 1866 visit. The works he completed during the trip were shown in Europe the following year (Schenker 1995).
Geomorphology of New Zealand, first published in 1926 and reprinted a number of times. It is central to the views of O’Brien and Chevalier that human intervention in the landscape is an improvement. McCahon eliminates any trace of human presence seeking to identify an essence of place.

Figure 8:3: Colin McCahon, Otago Peninsula, 1946 - 1949.

8.3.2 The picturesque discourse in landscape planning

The characteristics of the picturesque aesthetic are clearly evident in the Dunedin District Plan (DP99) and in its precursors, the landscape assessment report and the Draft Plan (DDP). These documents were subjected to analysis using Bowring’s ‘vocabulary’ and ‘syntax’ as a template to identify the presence of the picturesque discourse. It is important to note, however, that Bowring’s use of the terms ‘vocabulary’ and ‘syntax’ are metaphorical in nature and cannot be directly translated into a lexicon of the picturesque. Thus phrases which clearly mean, describe or would result in the criteria are included as examples of the picturesque discourse. Tables 8.3 and 8.4 illustrate the process and give examples of the picturesque discourse from within the assessment report and the DP99.

12 Colin McCahon is widely considered to be New Zealand’s greatest artist. This early example of his work hangs in pride-of-place in the Dunedin Public Library.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Assessment methodology</th>
<th>Assessment text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muted colours</td>
<td>Impact of change – colours should not contrast with existing colours (P11).</td>
<td>The viewer is constantly being exposed to new vistas (P38). Winding roads sensitise the viewer to changes in the extent of visual closure (P39).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>Visual complexity acts to increase viewer stimulation and visual diversity is desirable (P8).</td>
<td>The convoluted landscape has the effect of heightening the value of this landscape (P38).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregularity / roughness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident / neglect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>Assessment methodology</td>
<td>Assessment text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backdrop</td>
<td>Visual flow through landscape facilitated by well defined three dimensional structure incorporating a foreground, middle ground and background (P8).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening</td>
<td>An activity assessed to have minimal visibility outside its immediate precinct has less impact on landscape quality (P11).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blending in</td>
<td>Visual assessment is a process whereby the visual landscape is subdivided into areas which are of coherent visual structure (P4). An activity, the scale of which conforms to the scale of the structural elements of the landscape has less impact on landscape quality. An activity which engenders little contrast in colour, tone, and textures, and line, form and patterns with those existing within the landscape has less impact on landscape quality (P11).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing</td>
<td>Topography tends to dominate the process of visual subdivision because containment is provided, most commonly, by landform features (P4).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parklike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial vision</td>
<td>Aggregate landscapes comprise smaller landscape units (P7). Aggregate landscape are further grouped into districts reflecting a larger scale of visual relatedness (P14).</td>
<td>The viewer is constantly being exposed to new vistas (P38).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural looking</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peninsula landscapes show great natural beauty (P37). Rural land on the upper slopes contrasts with the intensive human landscape of the lower hills and shoreline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.3: Application of Bowring’s ‘vocabulary’ and ‘syntax’ as a template to the text of the Landscape Assessment Report illustrating the presence of the picturesque discourse. It is interesting to note the instances where a lack of correspondence between the methodology and the text. This indicates the high level of naturalisation of the discourse.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Examples of Plan Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muted colours</strong></td>
<td>High quality landscapes result where the land use activities and development are in harmony with the natural topography, vegetation and colours. (Objective 14.2.1, Explanation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variety</strong></td>
<td>The views within this area are highly stimulating because of their diversity and complexity and because of the consistent and prolonged exposure to a series of high quality scenic experiences. (14.5.1 (a) (ii))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irregularity / roughness</strong></td>
<td>The views within this area are highly stimulating because of their diversity and complexity and because of the consistent and prolonged exposure to a series of high quality scenic experiences. (14.5.1 (a) (ii)) There is an awareness of extreme climatic conditions created by dramatic cliffs and windswept vegetation. (14.5.1 (a) (ii))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>This dominance of the natural elements containing the human elements is important in maintaining the character and a sense of maturity and harmony which the landscape currently possess. (14.5.1 (a) (ii))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tree Groups</strong></td>
<td>Pasture is the dominant vegetative cover with patches of bush in the gullies and on steeper slopes. (14.5.1 (a) (ii))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ruins</strong></td>
<td>There are, in many parts of this landscape, the remains of old abandoned farm buildings and shelter plantings, usually of Macrocarpa. These, together with the stone walls, add historic interest. (14.5.1 (a) (ii)) The human-made features which are relics of the past and provide highlights at the detailed scale, eg stone walls, remnant shelter plantings, Larnach Castle. (14.5.3 (b) (ii))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accident / neglect</strong></td>
<td>There is an awareness of extreme climatic conditions created by dramatic cliffs and windswept vegetation. (14.5.1 (a) (ii))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syntax</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Backdrop, mid-ground and foreground</strong></td>
<td>The [coastal] area is backed and defined by higher, more rugged hills to the west. (p14:1) It provides a significant portion of the setting, visual containment and skyline for the urban areas of Dunedin and the harbour communities. (14.5.3 (b) (i))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Screening</strong></td>
<td>Inappropriate siting, design, scale, density and finish of structures such that they become visually dominant from public viewpoints. (14.5.3 (b) (iii))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blending in</strong></td>
<td>It is important that land use activities and development are complementary to, and sensitive towards, the underlying landforms. (Objective 14.2.1, Explanation) The effects of a development need to be managed to achieve a harmony with the landscape. (Objective 14.2.3, Explanation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Framing</strong></td>
<td>The areas visible from major transportation routes are particularly high profile landscapes. (Objective 14.2.4, Explanation) The primary viewing perspective to be considered is that of the road traveller or pedestrians on public walking tracks or beaches within the area. (14.5.1 (a) (ii))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parklike</strong></td>
<td>In the rural environment, vegetative and other natural elements predominate over built structures. (Issue 14.1.3, Explanation) Areas of indigenous vegetation or landform features and characteristics such as openness and spaciousness contribute significantly to landscape quality and character. (Policy 14.3.3, Explanation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serial vision</strong></td>
<td>The views within this area are highly stimulating because of their diversity and complexity and because of the consistent and prolonged exposure to a series of high quality scenic experiences. (14.5.1 (a) (ii)) The roads are generally narrow and winding, and because of this the traveller moves through the landscape relatively slowly and is exposed to a wide and varied range of views at both large and small scales. (14.5.1 (a) (ii))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.4: Application of Bowring’s ‘vocabulary’ and ‘syntax’ as a template to the text of the DP99 illustrating the presence of the picturesque discourse.
The landscape as an object of scenic beauty, or as a visual resource, is strongly promoted by the landscape assessment upon which the Plan was based. The sub-title of the assessment document is, 'Assessment of visual value, visual sensitivity and visual contribution'. In the Introduction the 'landscape' becomes the 'visual landscape', but following the introduction the terms are used interchangeably.

Further, we are told:

The landscape is experienced in two ways. At the larger scale the viewer and the viewed are divorced from one another, at the more intimate scale the observer is part of the landscape (P5).

That 'experience' should be so directly equated with 'sight' or 'vision' underlines the landscape as scenery. The experience of the smells, the wind, the sounds, the activity of the muscles used to climb the hills, are clearly not a part of landscape experience.

Further, the use of the word 'visual' as a chosen adjective to modify the noun 'landscape' is very interesting, being as it is common parlance within the landscape architecture profession in New Zealand, and further a-field. It is used to emphasise that what is of concern is the landscape as it is seen, as opposed to the agricultural landscape or the geomorphological landscape. The adjective which would reflect this meaning most directly is 'visible' which is defined by the Oxford Compact English Dictionary as '1 a that can be seen... 2 that can be perceived or ascertained'. 'Visual' is defined by the same dictionary, as an adjective to mean, 'of, concerned with or used in seeing'. It can also be a noun, however, and when used as a noun it means an 'image or display, a picture'. That the noun meaning reflects the concept of a picture and the adjectival meaning the attributes of the eye underlines the naturalisation of this way of seeing; what is actually 'visible' out there becomes 'visual', an attribute of our own eyes.\(^{13}\)

The DP99 groups the District's 'most significant landscapes' into three categories. The entire south eastern side of the Otago Peninsula is categorised as an Outstanding Landscape Area (DP99 P14:11). The north western side of the Peninsula is categorised as a Landscape Conservation Area (DP99 P14:23). In seeking to control 'Threats to Visual Quality', rules enable the Council to apply restricted discretion in

\(^{13}\) The adoption of terminology and its subsequent change in meaning is, as Fairclough points out, one of the ways discourses change (Fairclough 2003).
the approval of certain activities, principally the construction of new buildings and, in
the Conservation Area, forestry. ‘The Council’s discretion is restricted to the visual
impact arising from the activity on the landscape character and quality of its setting’
(DP99 P14:29). In addition ‘Other Threats to Visual Quality’ which include activities
such as track building, planting of shelter belts, quarrying and the removal of bush
‘will be covered by design guidelines which operate in conjunction with the District
Plan’ (DP99 P14:29).

The Landscape section of the Plan operates in addition to the underlying zoning.
This, for most of the Peninsula, is Rural. The primary issue defined in the Rural
section of the Plan is that, ‘Certain activities have the potential to adversely affect the
amenities of the Rural Zone’ (DP99 P6:3). In explanation the Plan states, ‘The rural
area has a number of qualities which contribute to the amenity values of the area.
These qualities include openness, quietness, outlook and privacy’ (DP99 P6:3). As a
consequence, ‘Land management practices which contribute to the sustainable
management of the land and water resources’ is only third on the list of ‘Anticipated
Environmental Results’, the ‘Maintenance of the open space and amenity values of
the rural area’ being the primary environmental goal (DP99 P6:21).

This strong emphasis on the visual, started in the assessment and carried through to
the final plan, is strongly picturesque in character. That the primary concern of the
Rural section of the Plan is the protection of the amenities of the rural area and that
the definition of this includes ‘openness’ and ‘outlook’, both picturesque qualities,
underlines the broad influence of the picturesque discourse. A consequence of the
strong visual emphasis and the consequent construction of the landscape as scenery is
the construction of the subject as an observer.

The construction of landscape as scenery and the subject as observer clearly come
from the picturesque’s roots as a style of painting through its development as a style
of garden design. A classic feature of this picturesque design, exemplified in such
landscape parks as Stowe and Stourhead in England, is that a series of vistas are
created which are then revealed in sequence to the perambulating observer. Thus the
picturesque is primarily about the visual experience of landscape pictures and picture­
like landscapes.
The specific application of the subject-as-observer gains explicit and influential expression within the Landscape Section of the DP 99. After defining the landscape character of the Peninsula Coast Outstanding Landscape Area the plan states:

The primary viewing perspective to be considered is that of the road traveller or pedestrians on public walking tracks or beaches within the area. The roads are generally narrow and winding, and because of this the traveller moves through the landscape relatively slowly and is exposed to a wide and varied range of views at both large and small scales. The present form of the roads is fundamental to the manner in which the landscape is viewed and appreciated. The views within this area are highly stimulating because of their diversity and complexity and because of the consistent and prolonged exposure to a series of high quality scenic experiences (14.5.1(a)(ii) DP 99)

Clearly the landscape is still something that is to be viewed as a series of scenes, but now by a traveller or pedestrian on a public route.

This construction of the subject-as-observer has a number of implications. The original picturesque landscape parks used various devices to obscure the boundary between the park and the surrounding countryside. The paths and roads from which the scenes were to be viewed were internal to the park and the scenery mainly within the bounds of the estate. Thus the owner of the private land reserved the experience for the guests and visitors of the estate.

In the DP99 this is turned on its head. The viewer is now situated on public land, the roads, walking tracks and beaches of the Otago Peninsula, in this instance. The scenes are composed of the features of private land and by the activities undertaken on that land, almost always motivated by reasons other than the public good. This is considered to be a serious imposition by some landowners. As Chas put it:

Of course the City Council have declared most of the Peninsula as a landscape area which is all very well but it restricts us in developing something that we have actually created. They talk about the Peninsula being a landscape area because of the scenic value of it but they don’t realise that we’re the ones, I mean the generations of farmers, that created the scenery and we’ll continue to create it if we’re allowed to. It won’t be the same but it must keep going (Int 8, Landowner, 31/5/00)

This conflict is represented diagrammatically in Fig 8.4.

14 It is important to note however, that I am not claiming that this is a sudden and original transformation. Rather I suspect that is has been a process which has been occurring for, probably, one hundred and fifty years. Further, it is fascinating to note that the development of the picturesque coincided with the idea of the panopticon, and it is very tempting to apply Foucault’s analysis of the processes of disciplinarity to the application of the picturesque as a land management tool.
Shirley concurred, seeing the Plan as an attempt to appropriate private land by stealth. She said:

I see the landscape as a living thing. To preserve it exactly as it is today for all the other people that will come later on is really making everything into a museum. We’re also very much part of this world and we’ve shaped this world for whatever it is, but we can’t then say, ‘well we have to remove ourselves because we get into the tourist postcard view’... We have to bear the costs for everybody else’s enjoyment. We do all the hard work, we spend all our money and our lives on making the land but at the end of the day, we have neither the say nor do we derive any benefit for it. We’re just unpaid landscape gardeners (Int 40, Small Holder, 12/10/00).

Perhaps the conflict between the visitor and the farming inhabitant can best be summed up by Crandall when she says:

Travellers survey rather than inhabit; they look down from prospects rather than up to the sky for a preliminary forecast of nature’s next move. Today’s traveller is the tourist who has inherited the scenic view (1993 P166).

Further, the idea that the narrow and winding roads are an integral part of the landscape experience for members of the public, with the implication that they too should be preserved, is of concern to, and a further cause of resentment for, local residents. For Theresa and Don tourist traffic, in particular, is having a deleterious effect on their lifestyle. Don said:

You know we’ve got to live here and we’ve got to drive our cars up here. These roads are narrow and they were made a hundred and forty years ago and they were
made for horses and carts, not for big buses and trucks and things like that (Int 22, Landowner, 6/7/00).
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Fig 8:5: The conflict and resistance between the construction of the winding Peninsula roads as part of the picturesque quality of the area, and as part of the inconvenience of living there.

Another very important aspect of the picturesque discourse is its construction of ‘nature’. Bowring (1997 P100) argues that ‘the connection between the natural and the picturesque is at the origin of the aesthetic’. Nature was, however, inadequate to the task of creating true picturesque beauty. In Gilpin’s words:

Nature is always great in design; but unequal in composition. She is an admirable colourist; and can harmonise her tints with in (sic) infinite variety, and inimitable beauty: but is seldom so correct in composition, as to produce an harmonious whole (Gilpin cited in Barbier 1963 P103).

Thus the emphasis within picturesque design was to conceal the artifice and present the vistas as truly natural. Bowring (op cit P100) argues that in the transposition of the picturesque into the, apparently\textsuperscript{15}, truly natural New Zealand landscape during the nineteenth century, ‘the picturesque became an unchallenged language for the natural and the two were seamlessly blended’. Thus picturesque design should be, at least, imitative of, if not an improvement on, nature and nature should, in turn, be picturesque. Nature and culture thus become indistinguishable (Bowring op cit P101).

\textsuperscript{15} Aspects of the New Zealand landscape were in fact dramatically modified by Māori occupation, in particular the burning of about 30% of the previously existing forest cover.
As a consequence of the conflation of 'picturesque' with 'nature' many of the features of the picturesque identified in Table 8:1 are simultaneously features in their own right and evidence of nature. Thus, the colour palette, whilst ceasing to be 'muted' in the landscape, is expected to be limited to colours occurring within nature. Tree groups, \textit{a la} Capability Brown, and the grassy open areas between them, are seen to be a natural pattern of plant distribution. In Crandall’s words:

\begin{quote}
It is precisely this visual, or pictorial, conception of nature that typically dominates the use of the word today. It is as if we believe we can point to anything green and growing that has not been damaged recently, and pronounce it natural (1993 P3).
\end{quote}

Most importantly, the necessity to conceal artifice in the designed landscape has translated into the necessity to conceal human presence in the landscape in any other than aged buildings and constructions, or ruins.

The picturesque construction of nature is evident within the DP 99. A most interesting logical process is applied in S14.1.2. Noting that S6(a) of the RMA91 requires the Council to 'provide for the preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment…' the Plan goes on to argue that ‘Protection of the natural character of these areas involves protection of their natural landscape characteristics’. Natural landscape character is then defined ‘as those visual attributes which can be defined as predominantly an expression of natural processes, elements and patterns’. Thus the DP99 very clearly asserts that natural and visual quality can be linked, in essence affirming Bowring’s assertion of the conflation of nature and culture.

This conflation is reasserted in the explanation of Issue 14.1.3. Here the Plan asserts that:

\begin{quote}
High quality landscapes result where the land cover (both natural and influenced by human activity) reflects the variations in the landform. This is both in terms of people’s attitudes to the landscape they perceive, and in terms of the physical landscape itself (ecological diversity).
\end{quote}

So it is that the coincidence of perception (culture) and ecological health is again asserted. The plan continues (Issue 14.1.3):

\begin{quote}
In the rural environment, vegetative and other natural elements predominate over built structures. In Dunedin, however, only limited areas can be described as natural landscapes. A large part of the rural landscape is a reflection of, and is significantly affected by, land use activities.
\end{quote}
It should be noted that this paragraph, and the plan itself, actually contains a number of different constructions of nature, which are blended into an overarching picturesque construction of nature. The first use of the term ‘natural’ clearly means, in this context, indigenous. The second use of the term ‘natural’ refers to biotic and biophysical elements and could include, as the New Zealand Environment Court has ruled (Harrison vs Tasman District Council 1993), exotic animals such as sheep. The third use of the term ‘natural’ to describe landscapes, clearly means ‘uninfluenced by human activity’. These different constructions of ‘nature’ and ‘the natural’ are bound together by the conflation of nature and culture into a picturesque whole\(^\text{16}\).

The Plan continues to progress the picturesque construction of nature. We are told that ‘High quality landscapes result where the land use activities and development are in harmony with the natural topography, vegetation and colours’ (14.2.1 emphasis mine). Objective 14.2.3 acknowledges that ‘Landscapes will change naturally over time (emphasis mine)’ but asserts that it is necessary to manage ‘the effects of land use activities and development to ensure that these matters are able to be integrated into the landscape’ (14.3.1 emphasis mine). Specifically relating to the Peninsula landscape, while acknowledging that the coastal area is pastoral in use, 14.5.1 argues:

To date the overlay of human elements of roads, plantings and buildings has been mostly small scale...and this has allowed the natural environment to maintain its dominance. This dominance of the natural elements containing the human elements is important in maintaining the character and a sense of maturity and harmony which the landscape currently possesses (emphasis mine).

Further, the plan argues that one of the features and characteristics to be protected is ‘The minimal influence of any large scale structures or exotic plantings to diminish the impact of the natural landscape forms’ (14.5.1). Interestingly, the presence of open grasslands vegetated with exotic grass species are not seen as impacting on the ‘natural landscape forms’ when, in fact, it is their presence, instead of the indigenous forest that predates them, that reveals these forms.

\(^{16}\) Kim Sorvig (2002 p10) lists a total of sixteen different meanings of ‘nature’ and a further seven meanings of ‘natural’. He argues that ‘if the landscape professions...do not adopt a clearer vocabulary about nature and culture, all of the differing interpretations of landscape will continue to suffer because we are constantly (and perhaps deliberately) miscommunicating’.
Perhaps the most striking examples of the picturesque construction of nature relate to the placement of buildings within the Peninsula landscape. Shirley and her husband wanted to build a house on their small farm and applied for a resource consent to do so. Their application was initially declined. The landscape architect, Brian, who assessed their application said:

I said I wasn’t against building on the block of land but I just said that the platform they’d decided on was unsatisfactory because from a visual point of view it was blocking the view out up the harbour. It was really intrusive actually. It was right beside the road, and also the design was incompatible. It was a domestic, urban red brick house with corrugated iron on the roof and it looked very urban. So it was two things: the design and the platform that I felt uncomfortable about (Int 50, Professional, 30/10/00).

The Council returned the application to him, as the site on which they wished to build was the only site available to them on their property. He continued:

I said, well, because it’s such a prestige site, right along a tourist corridor, I thought it was going to downgrade the whole tourist corridor. My view was that they get a professional architect who had a good feeling for the Peninsula...[he]came up with what I thought was a very good design. It had a nice rounded roof instead of an apex. It was a rounded folded roof that followed the landform, corrugated iron which was good. I forget what the cladding was but I think it was untreated macrocarpa or something like that, and the impact was going to be reduced by some careful contouring and mounding (Int 50, Professional, 30/10/00).

Fig 8:6: conflict between the picturesque discourse and the residential discourse

![Diagram](attachment:diagram.png)
Eventually Shirley and her husband gained resource consent to build a house of yet another design, screened by earth mounding upon which indigenous species were to be planted. The net result that the Council (although not the original landscape architect) deemed acceptable will mean that the view that was at issue will eventually be lost to the road but due to the presence of indigenous trees and not the obvious presence of a house. In commenting on the outcome Brian said,

I felt a wee bit concerned about the Council not taking a hard line on this housing cause when you go up the Highcliff Road, over the last four or five years, it seems to me, quite a lot of houses have been built which to me are completely incompatible with the Peninsula. When you see a place like this out at McMeeking's, the little weatherboard and lean-to cottages, then you go out there now and there's red brick houses and bits and pieces, to me it just seems to have lost some of its special qualities and that's only happened over the last four or five years (Int 50, Professional, 30/10/00).

More recent application of the DP99 follows a similar ethos, but one which indicates more strongly the power of the picturesque discourse. The Dunedin City Council’s landscape architect, Alan, while discussing his work with me in interview, said of the Resource Consent Applications he deals with:

The majority are houses. We've just had one on Grassy Point which juts out quite a bit into the harbour. They were wanting to stick it right on the ridgeline, right on the
most prominent part. When we looked at the views it wasn’t so important looking from the Broadbay side or the Port Chalmers side, but from the city side it had quite strong values because it had a visual connection with Harbour Cone\(^{17}\) and the entrance to the harbour. We ended up mitigating it quite a bit (Int 53, Professional, 4/12/00).

When asked what these mitigations entailed he said:

Probably the biggest one was moving the location of the house from on the ridge round onto the Portobello side...and then we put in landscaping conditions, basically that the landscaping should screen the house and that it shouldn’t be visible at all from St Leonards or the city side at any time (Int 53, Professional, 4/12/00).

Landscaping conditions include:

Usually it's the siting, the design of the house, colour schemes and planting. Planting is usually just screening but you can get quite specific. With this one I decided to go for a performance condition because basically what we were trying to do is screen the building so you couldn’t actually see it. And we recommended that they use native species and plant them in an irregular fashion rather than in shelter belt sort of form (Int 53, Professional, 4/12/00).

The recommendation to use indigenous species is not official Council Policy. Alan said that his desire to see them used came from:

...your education, your training. You do know about natural ecosystems. You look at a grass paddock and then you look at a native forest and all the life that sustains.

Even though it’s not a policy of Council you have that influence and it really influences your judgement. So if these people had come and said, ‘Oh we want to put a house here but we want to replant the whole site in natives and here’s our management plan,’ that would count really strongly towards their argument. Even though, visually, you might still be able to see the house, that might be offset by the native bush that they’re going to plant cause I also think that increases the natural quality of the area as well (Int 53, Professional, 4/12/00).

This example is interesting from a number of perspectives. On the one hand it demonstrates the picturesque requirement that human habitation, specifically evidenced by buildings, should not dominate the ‘natural’ forms of the landscape by being placed on hilltops or ridgelines\(^{18}\). Further, there is an interesting assumption made that planting indigenous species will enhance the ‘natural quality’ of the area. While many New Zealand plant species are endemic to the three major islands, there are many species and subspecies which are limited in their range. Planting indigenous species does not mean the same thing as planting locally endemic species. Further,

\(^{17}\) Harbour Cone is a conical shaped hill prominent in many views of the Otago Peninsula and which has developed iconic status in recent decades.

\(^{18}\) In this the picturesque is in accord with Māori sensibilities which preclude the building of structures (or even standing upon) hilltops as they are often the heads of ancestors.
the conflation of the picturesque with nature can be seen in the recommendation that
the indigenous species be planted in an irregular fashion. Irregular planting patterns,
as opposed to the linear patterns of formal gardens, are very characteristic of the
picturesque, and the underlying assumption that straight lines do not occur in nature.
A further leap of logic is made, when Alan moves from 'irregularly planted natives',
to 'native bush', completing the conflation of nature and the picturesque. Further,
there is an assumption in Alan's discussion of the ideal case, that if someone said that
they wanted to plant a site entirely in natives that this would automatically mean in a
naturalistic fashion.

It should be clear from this discussion that the application of the picturesque as a
landscape management discourse creates a number of problems. The privileging of
the outsider's view as against the inhabitants' occupation is only one of them. The
conflation of ecological health with scenic quality has serious implications for the
sustainable management of our natural and physical resources, and I discuss this
further in the next chapter. In addition, the picturesque construction of a nature in
which the (built) evidence of human occupation must be hidden, supports and
maintains a position that humanity is not a part of that nature. I will discuss the
implications of this further in the next chapter.

8.4 The picturesque discourse and conservation

While the focus of this chapter is upon the role of the picturesque discourse in
planning, the picturesque construction of nature is evident elsewhere in the corpus,
particularly in association with the environmental discourse. In view of the conflation
of nature and the picturesque it is important to examine this. The environmental
discourse, as I have argued, is increasing in its influence and it is important for
planners and policy makers to be able to identify points at which the picturesque
discourse conflates with it.

For example, the management plan for an area covenanted by the Queen Elizabeth
National Trust states its objectives as:

a) To protect and maintain the open space values of the land
b) To protect and enhance the natural character of the land with particular regard to the indigenous flora and fauna, [detail deleted at request of landowner].

c) To protect the natural scenic values of the land, especially as seen from [several local roads in the vicinity] [detail deleted at request of landowner].

The idea of 'natural scenic values' is clear evidence of the picturesque. While the covenant is clearly concerned to protect and enhance the habitat of indigenous flora and fauna, the plan also states:

- The visual impact of any new buildings or structures will be kept to a minimum. This will be achieved by the use of local natural materials, natural colours, sympathetic shapes/textures, minimal dimensions and associated plantings. The site, design and materials used in any new construction will be chosen in consultation with, and will require the prior approval of, the National Trust (s13.4).

The landowners have subsequently built a house on the property using *Cupressus macrocarpa*, an exotic species sourced on the property, underlining the picturesque construction of nature. Further, the Covenant allows for a plantation of *Cupressus macrocarpa* to be grown for timber. The owner informed me that they were avoiding planting the trees in rows and were scalloping the edges of the plantation. This was so that natives could be planted amongst the exotics to soften the appearance of the plantation and to make it blend into the landscape (Field notes 1/5/00).

The local field officer for a national conservation group said in interview:

> People accuse people like me, you know, a greenie, of wanting the whole of the Peninsula back in bush again. I don't. It's impossible. I quite like the open space of the Peninsula as well. But the bush remnants in the gullies and the special habitats for the plants and animals that are there: I'd like them looked after (Int 3, Professional, 12/4/00).

While the protection of the flora and fauna is important the open, parklike, picturesque quality of the Peninsula landscape is also important.

John K, a botanist, described the major threats to the indigenous vegetation on the Peninsula as 'farming, forestry and fire'. Lamenting the poor condition of much of the remnant bush on the Peninsula he listed stock and exotic weeds as the major problems. He continued:

> There are landscape threats in the form of planting pines in places where they have a big impact on the scenery. Some of them go wild too, on the dune country (Int 61, Professional, 8/6/01).
After complaining about the lack of action from the District and Regional Councils, with responsibility in the area for weed control, he continued to move seamlessly from issues of biodiversity, to the inappropriate planting of pines, to say:

The spread of housing’s a bit of a threat, rural subdivision. There’s mansions go up in the wrong places, usually sitting on hilltops and they’re painted white { .. } too visible (Int 61, Professional, 8/6/01).

For John K the quality of the environment includes both biological and picturesque aspects which, as the picturesque construction of nature suggests, are intertwined.

### 8.5 Conclusion

Chapters Four to Seven demonstrated that the construction of the land(scape) of the Otago Peninsula is a complex and dynamic process resulting from the interactions and resistances between a number of discourses. In this chapter I have shown that the picturesque discourse has been used as a landscape management tool at the District Plan level. This discourse constructs the landscape as scenery and privileges the subject position of observer over that of inhabitant or occupant. In a sense, it has been laid over the Peninsula ignoring the dynamics of the system which is already active there. The profession of landscape architecture is complicit in this process being the vector which has transmitted the picturesque discourse from its own professional discourse to that of planning. A number of serious implications arise from this which I attend to in the following Chapter.

Suffice it to say at this point that, as this Chapter concludes the presentation of the substantive research, it should be clear now ‘How this landscape is made’. The interactions and resistances between the agricultural, environmental, gardening and heritage discourses, and their interconnections and resistances with the Māori constructions of the environment create the mosaic of land uses and of land values which make up the Peninsula landscape. The neo-liberal economic discourse has had a major role over the past twenty years in reorganising the power distributions within that network. In addition the neo-liberal turn has led to the RMA91 and its resource management regime. This has enabled the profession of landscape architecture to increase its power and influence through the district planning process. This has
resulted, in the Dunedin area and further a-field, in the application of the picturesque discourse as a landscape management tool.
Chapter Nine: Discussion and conclusion

9.1 Introduction

The explicit aim of this project has been to unpack the processes behind the cultural construction of landscape. To do so I have undertaken a case study of a small corner of late twentieth century Aotearoa / New Zealand. This chapter then, aims to bring the project to a close, and to do so requires focusing on three major areas.

Firstly, as I stated in Chapter Three, the crucial aspect of a case study is its relationship to theory:

A case study makes no claims to be representative of a broader reality. Thus its findings are not generalisable to other sites or situations. However, a case study, to claim validity, must be based on articulated theory, and it is the investigation of this theory that is its focus...In this study, the theoretical framework articulated in [Chapter Two] forms the justification for the selection of a case study approach. The refined research questions frame the theoretical principle at issue as the efficacy of the use of discourse as a model for the explanation of the production and maintenance of landscape (See this volume P58).

To determine this issue requires assessing the adequacy of the answers found to the fundamental research questions. To this end I recap on the substantive arguments of the thesis to demonstrate that this case study does present a compelling case for the ‘construction’ of the landscape of the Otago Peninsula. I examine the strengths and weaknesses of the approaches used and argue that the study of discourse is an effective and instructive route to understanding the construction of any landscape.

Secondly, as I pointed out in Chapter One, knowing how landscape is made may be interesting, but without asking the question, ‘So what?’, is of little practical use. Thus the implications of both the substantive and the theoretical findings of the work need to be examined. For the purposes of this project these focus on the implications for landscape management, and for the practice and profession of landscape architecture.

Finally, it is necessary to bring the project to a close, make final conclusions and recommendations for further study. In making these final conclusions I will relocate this project within the field of landscape research and speculate upon its possible consequences for that field of study. As with much research this project probably
raises more questions than it answers. Thus I focus on the ones which I consider have the potential to provide the most interesting and rich contributions to our knowledge and understanding of landscape.

Part One: The construction of landscape

9.2 So, how is the landscape of the Otago Peninsula made?

In Chapter Two I argued that landscape was a dynamic system produced, maintained and altered by the interactions of varying discursive systems. As a discourse creates the object of which it speaks, so people try act to ensure that their environment is consistent with their ideas of what should be. I say 'try to' because their actions may be constrained by the actions of other discourses. Networks of power operating through the multiplicity of discursive systems enable and constrain people's ability to act in the ways the discourses require. In addition, 'natural' processes continue and are interpreted and responded to through this same discursive network. The landscape of the Otago Peninsula is made in such a way as this.

9.2.1 What are the discourses that construct this landscape?

- Mana Whenua

Human occupation of the Otago Peninsula is longstanding and Mana Whenua trace their attachment to the place back to the creation. The rich resources obtainable locally, particularly the marine resources and ti kouka, made it an ideal habitation site. The impacts of the exploitation of these resources can be seen in middens and in the umu ti which pit the land on the northern reaches of the Peninsula.

Attachment to the land is by blood ties, the land itself being tupuna, as well as the resting place of human tupuna. This kin relationship is expressed in treating the land gently, leading to reluctance to plough and topdress. Alternative forms of land ownership are used in order to maintain the connection with the land of the increasing numbers of human kin. An earlier consequence of the imposition of Pākeha systems
of land tenure was land alienation, but the retained land is extensive enough to give the locals a sense that there is a place for them. The land does not have to be used to be cared for and about, nor do the owners have to be present for it to be valued, or for their connection to be maintained. Interest in and concern for sites which are not ‘owned’ in the Pākeha sense, continues undiminished. However, the potential to interact with these important sites is denied by the hegemonic Pākeha discourses of land ownership.

• The agricultural discourse

The agricultural discourse, supported by a raft of others promoting the superiority of European ways and the inevitability of the demise of the indigenous, has had the most extensive and most obvious role in the construction of the landscape of the Otago Peninsula. The agricultural development of the Peninsula began with the establishment of whaling. However, it was not until the 1860s that systematic development began, to some extent financed by the Central Otago gold rushes. The clearance of forest, in particular, has lead to a transformation in the appearance and function of the land, and now open paddocks extend where once it grew. The planting of exotic *Cupressus macrocarpa* for shelter has left the location of the early European settlements marked clearly on the landscape. Networks of stone walls are further relics of the efforts expended to make the land farmable.

Underlying these efforts is the construction of the land as an economic resource. This is a personal resource in that it accrues benefits to its owner and as such entails certain responsibilities and rights. Constant improvement in the use, management and productivity of this resource is possible and necessary to justify ongoing ownership of the land. This constant improvement includes fencing, new buildings, new tracks, drain clearance, tree planting (for forestry, shelter and erosion control), water reticulation, fertiliser application and so on, but is ultimately measured in productivity. Thus the ultimate vision is to have lush green pastures grazed by healthy, fecund stock which produce a good financial return, and thus the productivity of stock is the measure, and justification, of land management practices.
The practice of continued, ongoing improvement through hard work underlies the attachment to the place expressed within the discourse. Great respect is shown for the efforts of the forebears in the development of the land, and the need to leave the place improved for future generations is strongly expressed. However, aspects of the larger environment: the scenery; the sea; the close proximity of the city; are also expressed as part of the attachment to farming the Otago Peninsula.

This attachment to the place leads the owner of the land to expect to be able to undertake the business of farming unhindered by regulations or other external pressures or controls. Thus the subject position ‘farmer’ is constructed as strongly individualistic. Communal action is acceptable when motivated to protect individuals’ rights. In accordance with this strong individualism, inductive knowledge is highly valued and experience and observation are given much higher credence that expert or theoretically derived knowledge.

- The environmental discourse

The environmental discourse arose on the Otago Peninsula in the 1980s in response to proposals for industrial development at Aramoana and Okia Flat. The resistance to these proposals was centred upon a group of recent arrivals on the Peninsula. These recent arrivals were attracted to the place by a number of factors including an appreciation of the broader environmental qualities of the place: the harbour; the sea; the beaches; the hills.

The environmental discourse constructs the land of the Otago Peninsula as biological potential, and places people into the primary subject positions of ‘agent of destruction’ and ‘responsible saviour’. Agents of destruction, initially industrialists but also farmers and, more recently, developers, have damaged the land. The responsible saviour takes action to heal and protect the broader Peninsula environment, not that bounded by any particular property lines. In this sense the discourse is strongly oriented to communal action to promote the healing of environment, and to prevent further harm.
In addition to this holistic construction of the environment, the environmental discourse is characterised by its didactic nature. People must be educated about threats to the environment, particularly erosion and habitat destruction, and about ways to avert these threats. Practical actions to promote healing and prevent further harm have included the establishment of a number of reserves. Active revegetation has been undertaken on most of these reserves in order to support remnants of indigenous forest and provide habitat for indigenous fauna. This pattern of revegetation extends onto areas in private ownership as well. Social actions include lobbying regional and district councils which has resulted in the extension of regulations on weed control to include plants which threaten indigenous forest, and to extend Council regulations to protect significant areas of indigenous ecosystems on private land.

There is a connection evident between the environmental discourse and the nineteenth century Romantic Movement. The experience of wild nature is necessary for people to be fully human. The wilderness is revered as a place of spiritual significance and the presence of humans, other than those responsible saviours who visit, is seen to degrade that significance as well as providing a pragmatic danger to the plants and animals present. Thus action to protect the environment is also action to promote the public good.

- **The neo-liberal economic discourse**

The international rise of neo-liberalism began its manifestation in Aotearoa / New Zealand in radical state sector and economic reforms started in 1984. The neo-liberal discourse constructs human society in economic terms, arguing that individuals act consistently to maximise benefits to themselves, and thus that the market is the fairest and most efficient way to allocate resources. Most significantly, it considers that, as the market is the most efficient mechanism for distributing goods and services, the intervention of governmental agencies in their distribution should be kept to a minimum. Similarly to the agricultural discourse, land is constructed as economic potential.
In keeping with this philosophy one of the first actions of Government taken to implement the neo-liberal agenda was the removal of a number of agricultural subsidies. The impact of this was still clearly remembered, if not actually felt, by farmers on the Otago Peninsula in 2000. Key amongst the practical consequences had been a radical reduction in the application of fertilisers resulting in lower productivity. However, by 2000 an adjustment in keeping with the neo-liberal discourse’s focus on efficiency was well under way, new technology being embraced to facilitate this.

A further major consequence of the neo-liberal turn in government policy was the passing of the Resource Management Act 1991 which aimed, through the institution of effects based planning, to support the actions of the market to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. This had major impacts on the Otago Peninsula. As a requirement of the RMA91 Regional and District Plans were developed and the latter, in particular, stimulated strong resistance around two issues in particular. The first was the application of rules to protect landscape quality. This was seen by some landowners as compromising their private property rights, which could be seen to be contrary to the neo-liberal agenda.

The second issue which prompted strong resistance was the attempt to control the spread of housing developments into the rural areas of the Peninsula by prohibiting the building of new houses on lots of less than 15 hectares. The move failed primarily due to the resistance exerted by existing landowners with small blocks of land who, effectively if not intentionally, lent their weight to the neo-liberal agenda of effects based planning. Thus while Peninsula landowners may be subject to more controls over land use than before, they stand to gain when they wish to retire if they split their farms into constituent blocks for sale as small holdings. The spread of this pattern is apparent already transforming the Otago Peninsula from a landscape of agricultural production into one of (urban focused) consumption.

- **Planning and the picturesque discourse**

The RMA91 devolves responsibility for managing the country’s natural and physical resources to Regional and District Councils. The Act requires the ‘protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and
development' (S6(b)). The Dunedin City Council has deemed all of the southern side of the Otago Peninsula to be an outstanding landscape zone and the northern side of it to also require management as a significant landscape.

The Dunedin District Plan uses as strongly picturesque discourse which constructs the landscape of the Otago Peninsula as scenery. This picturesque discourse is an eighteenth century English aesthetic which has been transported to New Zealand, amongst other colonies, and become naturalised here. As the paintings I used to illustrate the qualities of the picturesque indicate (see Chapter Eight), there is a long history of the picturesque interpretation of the Otago Peninsula. The winding roads that give access to a series of limited view shafts presents a direct parallel to the design of picturesque parks in England such as Stowe.

The Plan manages activities on private land in such a way as to protect the scenery for the subject-as-observer, usually the tourist or visitor travelling on the public roads and footpaths. Given the neo-liberal basis of the RMA91 it is a deep irony that the result of this effects based approach to planning is that Council staff have considerable say in the execution of developments. Ecological health and scenic quality are conflated by this discourse.

- **The heritage discourse**

Another discourse which has paradoxically gained in strength as a consequence of the passing of the RMA91 (and more so since the elevation of heritage matters to a Section 6 concern in 2003) is the heritage discourse. This discourse constructs the landscape as the repository of history and has a number of strong parallels with the environmental discourse. In particular it advocates strongly for the interests of the community over those of private property owners. This is a minor discourse on the Otago Peninsula, but one which is growing in influence.

- **The gardening discourse**

Finally, as farms are split up into constituent blocks and these are sold as lifestyle blocks, it seems likely that the gardening discourse may gain wider influence on the
Otago Peninsula. The gardening discourse constructs the land as almost infinitely malleable. Land forms and soil types which are unsuitable for the desired garden effect are changed until they are appropriate and this occurs on a relatively small scale of up to a hectare of so through terracing and similar structural changes. These structural changes are undertaken to create domestic space (or, perhaps more accurately, to domesticate space). This domestic space is, by definition, non-productive and ornamental in nature, and can extend to include substantial areas (several hectares) particularly on lifestyle properties where economic returns are a low priority. While indigenous plants often feature in these gardens, a wide range of exotics are utilised also, and particularly characteristic in the Dunedin area is a focus on the growing of rhododendrons. Aesthetic qualities and rarity are the primary selection criteria.

- The landscape of the Otago Peninsula

Thus we have a synopsis of the major discourses identified in this project. Two points need to be made at this juncture. The first relates to the objects of knowledge that these discourses construct. In certain instances I have referred to constructions of land, in others of landscape, and yet I am claiming that these discourses all contribute to the construction of landscape. Clearly I am imposing an external conception of ‘landscape’ onto the data.

This is unavoidable. I have focused on a biophysical reality I know as the Otago Peninsula. It is entirely consistent with the theoretical framework that I have utilised that different discourses will construct that reality differently. I am gathering these different realities together into the broadest possible conception of landscape as environment. This enables the incorporation of the discursive and the practical; land management and landscape management. To do this I am, in the best Foucaultian tradition, using the term ‘construct’ to mean, simultaneously, the abstract effect of

---

1 Foucault is renown for his use of puns and double entendre, an aspect of his work that those of us unable to read his work in its original language, French, miss.
discourse, the construction of knowledge, and the practical actions stimulated by those discourses, the physical construction of places and spaces.

Put another way, one person's 'land' is another person's 'landscape'. It is a central point of this thesis that different discourses can construct different discursive objects from the same underlying biophysical reality. These differing discourses stimulate different actions which are then interpreted through differing discourses again, stimulating further actions and so on. It could never be the case that these discursive constructions would be entirely equivalent. Unitary place and space does not exist between discourses, only within them.

The second point which needs to be made is a reiteration of the point I made in Chapter Two, that identifying the discourses that construct landscape is not adequate, in and of itself, to answer the primary research question, 'How is landscape made?'. This is the case for two reasons. Firstly, the objects which these different discourses construct are not discontinuous. The land that the agricultural discourse constructs is overlain by the land that the environmental discourse constructs, which is also, overlain by other discursive constructions. Thus, it is not the case that the landscape is a simple patchwork of different discursive constructions with different management regimes and consequently the discourses cannot be mapped onto the underlying biophysical reality in a meaningful way.

Secondly, not only are these discursive constructions not discontinuous, but they have dynamic interrelationships. When, for example, the highly individualistic agricultural discourse is overlain, in the same space, with the communalistic environmental discourse conflict and resistance occurs. The outcome of this resistance is a function of the relative power the discourses have in the system and an examination of this relative power is necessary to answer the primary research question.

Table 9.1 following summarises the major discourses, their key features and the expressions of these in the landscape.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mana Whenua²</td>
<td>Attachment to land by kin relationships – land as tupuna</td>
<td>The intent is to treat the land gently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility to the land is not extinguishable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative forms of legal ownership are used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to interact with significant landscapes is important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>Attachment to land is earned by hard work</td>
<td>Ongoing improvement is necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The land is constructed as an economic resource</td>
<td>Decisions are made to maximise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individualism and private property rights are supported</td>
<td>returns and minimise costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The focus is the farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Attachment to place is based on broad environmental qualities</td>
<td>The focus is holistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The land is constructed as biological potential</td>
<td>Action is taken to restore indigenous ecosystems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People are either agents of destruction or saviours</td>
<td>Education and lobbying are important activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-liberal</td>
<td>The land is constructed as economic potential</td>
<td>Market forces will allocate resources fairly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individualism and private property rights are paramount</td>
<td>Government should only mediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efficiency is a primary goal</td>
<td>private decisions on private land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market forces are the best way to allocate resources</td>
<td>Effects based planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on consumption not production</td>
<td>Spread of lifestyle blocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening</td>
<td>Land is infinitely malleable</td>
<td>Aesthetic qualities and/or rarity are key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domesticates space</td>
<td>Space is controlled and made liveable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Landscape is the repository of history</td>
<td>Community interests are advocated for on private land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picturesque</td>
<td>The land is constructed as scenery</td>
<td>Control of land use to maintain scenery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The subject is constructed as an observer</td>
<td>The inhabitant, or the user have no say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved nature provides the best scenery</td>
<td>Ecological health and scenic quality are conflated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.1: A summary of the main features of the major discourses in evidence in the case study.

9.2.2 What are the networks of power that are in operation in this landscape?

In Chapter Two I adopted a Foucaultian conception of power ‘as the name that one attributes to a complex strategical situation in a particular society’ (cited P38 this volume). I theorised that power and resistance were opposite sides of the same coin and that points of resistance between discourses were, at once, the points at which the

² Including Mana Whenua in this table is not meant to suggest that there is one Mana Whenua discourse. See Chapter Four for a discussion of this.
operation of power becomes clear and the point at which differing discourses are most easily identifiable. I concluded that, 'The flow of power through the networks determines which discursive constructions are actualised' (P41 this volume).

Throughout the text I have illustrated points of resistance descriptively and diagrammatically. However, these descriptions and diagrams have only dealt with pairs of discourses, and only illustrated resistance, not assessed the effects of power. It is now necessary to draw together the threads of this web of power and complete answering the research question.

It is clear that the discourses of Mana Whenua have gained in power and influence over the past twenty years in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The passing of the Treaty of Waitangi Act, the settlement of the Ngai Tahu claim and the institutionalisation of Māori concerns in the RMA91 have, together, acted to increase the power and influence of Māori nationally and on the Otago Peninsula.

This increase in institutional support for the discourses of Mana Whenua has also led to increasing support for Mana Whenua issues from other areas of Pākeha culture. Some Pākeha discourses, which construct their issues in terms of broader community concerns, have taken pains to include Māori, and their discourses, within their projects. Thus, the environmental discourse supports the involvement of Mana Whenua in decision making within their rohe. To this end, Te Runanga O Otakou is involved in projects such as the management of Okia Flat and in the re-establishment of pikao. In addition the Department of Conservation has a Kaupapa Atawhai Manager to facilitate consultation and to integrate environmental concerns. Similarly, Mana Whenua issues gain support from within the heritage industry, the concepts of land as history and land as tupuna having conceptual connections. However tensions exist. The idea of cultural harvest is anathema to the environmental discourse which is protectionist in outlook. The New Zealand Archaeological Association has statutory responsibility for the country's archaeological sites, and thus can act against the iwi whose past these sites actually represent.

The management of landscape from a picturesque perspective is also superficially sympathetic to some aspects of the discourses of Mana Whenua. Both take a broad
view of the landscape and both, for example, eschew building on top of hills. However, the reasons behind these similarities are widely different. In the first instance landscape as tupuna and landscape as scenery are very different constructions. Landscape as scenery should be protected and possibly improved. Landscape as tupuna requires nurturing and interaction, an interpersonal type relationship. In the second instance, the picturesque discourse eschews building on top of hills in order to help hide human activity and presence in the landscape. For Mana Whenua the issue is not the presence of people in the landscape which is a given, but the desire not to desecrate the tupuna by standing on their heads.

Thus, some complementarity in outcomes and some co-operation in process exist between Mana Whenua and certain Pākeha discourses. However, the amount of influence which Mana Whenua actually have on the networks of power on the Otago Peninsula is debatable. In part this is the result of their small numbers, and the small amount of land over which they exert particular influence. In part this is simply the consequence of colonisation, the overlaying of the Pākeha institutions effectively suppressing difference. In particular, the continued, unexamined and unchallenged dominance of the Pākeha conception of land ownership, with the rights and responsibilities it entails, present a continued and powerful obstacle to the expression of Māori sensibilities in the broader landscape. It is more that the presence of Mana Whenua is now felt and acknowledged, where once it was unseen and ignored.

While this indicates that Mana Whenua do wield more power than in the past, the maintenance of this power is still tentative and to some degree contingent on Pakeha consent. A high Māori birth rate, a rapid increase in the numbers of Māori gaining a tertiary education and the Treaty settlement process itself (Ngai Tahu are now the second largest landowner in the South Island bested only by the Crown) are all likely to act to bolster the power of Mana Whenua against Pakeha resistance. However, recent events in Aotearoa / New Zealand’s national political scene show Pākehā
discourses still hold ascendancy and the gains which Māori have made in the last thirty years have not been won without growing resentment from Pākeha.  

The agricultural discourse is still the most powerful land management discourse on the Otago Peninsula, and as Foucault’s theorisation of power and resistance predicts, the most vigorously resisted. Points of resistance are particularly notable between the agricultural and environmental discourses. The former discourse constructs land as an economic resource for exploitation, the latter as (damaged) biological potential, in need of healing. Further, the environmental discourse identifies many farming practices as damaging to the land and environment. The agricultural discourse is highly individualistic and focused on ‘the farm’ where the environmental discourse constructs a broad scale view of the environment and requires communal responsibility be taken for its care.

A key point of tension between the two discourses is over the management of remnant indigenous vegetation. Within the agricultural discourse bush remnants only have value as stock shelter, whereas, the environmental discourse values these remnants as habitat for indigenous flora and fauna. The environmental discourse identifies the use of bush as stock shelter as a threat to its continued existence, an assertion denied by the agricultural discourse which sees only human actions as potentially destructive. As the agricultural discourse’s only other constructions of remnant indigenous vegetation are as neutral or as detracting from efficient farming this would seem to be destined to remain a significant area of conflict. This is particularly the case as efforts continue to impose protection through the District Plan on significant natural ecosystems on private land.

---

3 In January 2004 the leader of the right wing National Party, Don Brash, made a ‘state of the nation’ address in which he called for an end to ‘special privileges’ for Maori within Aotearoa / New Zealand. This stimulated an outpouring of support for his ideas including calls to end the Treaty of Waitangi settlement process; calls to live as equals in the present not the past; and talk of apartheid.
The management of erosion has been another point of friction between the agricultural and environmental discourses. As the former discourse constructs land slippage as inevitable, management is localised and generally in response to slips or signs of impending slippage. The environmental discourse constructs land slippage as a consequence of land clearance and advocates strongly for tree planting as a means of control and prevention. The friction between these discourses seems to have become focused in the Peninsula Landcare Group (set up initially in response to land instability) and may have contributed to that group's demise. In this instance the agricultural discourse succeeded in resisting pressure from the environmental discourse to change practices.

Further evidence of the dominance of the agricultural discourse on the Otago Peninsula can be seen in its responses to other discourses. While the landowners may feel that they lost something in the conflict with the Otago Peninsula Walkers, my assessment of the actual reduction of public access onto private land suggests otherwise. Further, while the rules of the DDP were seen as an imposition, most were actually removed from the final District Plan. However, the retention of this dominance is a matter of relativity. As I have argued elsewhere, the agricultural discourse, both nationally and locally, is significantly diminished in power and influence from its past centrality in the life of Aotearoa/New Zealand. Thus the feelings of disempowerment and nostalgia for the past expressed to me by farmers on the Otago Peninsula have some real justification.

It is a deep irony that the diminishment of the power of the agricultural discourse has occurred, at least in part, as a consequence of the ascendancy of neo-liberalism in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The imposition of neo-liberal policies, particularly the removal of agricultural subsidies, has been a considerable challenge to farmers. In addition the reorientation of government focus away from primary production to a focus on the development of a 'knowledge economy' has also diminished the power of the agricultural discourse. The Resource Management Act has extended controls over activities on private land, a particular concern on the Otago Peninsula.
The irony lies, of course, in that the neo-liberal discourse is actually a natural ally to the agricultural discourse. Both are individualistic in orientation supporting the rights of the private property owner against the incursions of the public good. Both discourses construct the land as an economic resource and the efficient use of that, and other natural resources for economic benefit, are supported. It is, of course, a possibility that it is in this way that the neo-liberal discourse has gained some of its traction. It could be argued that the imposition of the neo-liberal agenda on the agricultural sector has, as the neo-liberal apologists intended, created a 'lean, mean, competitive machine', simultaneously diminishing the power of the agricultural discourse in a volumetric sense, but increasing its power in an energetic sense. This can be seen on the Otago Peninsula in the drive to establish a community board – a focused response to the challenges of the previous ten or so years.

However, while the power of the agricultural discourse on the Otago Peninsula has become more focused as a consequence of neo-liberalism it would seem likely that its position of dominance will not continue indefinitely. The increasing urbanisation of the Peninsula, to a large extent an effect of neo-liberalism also, is reflected in the increasing numbers of people living in the harbourside communities; the increasing numbers of lifestyle properties; and the increasing importance placed on the Peninsula as a recreational resource for Dunedin city dwellers and tourists. This trend is likely to continue, existing farms most probably being destined for dissolution into their constituent titles to become further lifestyle blocks. As the farms are broken up a more heterogeneous combination of discourses will become present, and the power of the agricultural discourse will become further diminished.

---

4 Lifestyle blocks are not associated with a specific discourse, some owners expressing a strong environmental discourse in their management, others a strong agricultural discourse and yet others the gardening discourse. However, as Swaffield and Fairweather (1998) have shown, 'lifestylers' tend to evince a pastoral idyll in their attitude to their land, and this is characterised as an urban view of rural life.
The rise of the environmental discourse on the Otago Peninsula has been inextricably entwined with this increasing urban influence. The effectiveness of the environmental lobby confirms the power of the environmental discourse. Intrusive industrial projects have been banished. Regional strategies have been altered to encompass environmental concerns. Extensive input has been made into the Dunedin District Plan and continuing involvement has been required to settle the policies regarding significant natural areas within the District. In addition the neo-liberal discourse, particularly as it is expressed in the District Plan process and behind that in the RMA91, also offers resistance to the environmental discourse.

As I have stressed, the environmental discourse constructs the environment in a broad scale, holistic manner. The RMA91, as a matter of national importance requires, 'The protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna' (S6(c) Emphasis mine). It also requires particular regard be taken of the 'Intrinsic values of ecosystems' but does not provide a definition of 'ecosystems'. Both of these provisions are local and specific, rather than broad scale and holistic. Further, the institution of effects based planning means that issues of environmental concern are assessed on a case by case basis. While national policy statements provided for in the RMA91 could provide a framework for proactive, holistic environmental planning, only one, the National Coastal Policy Statement, is extant thirteen years after the passing of the legislation.

In this way the RMA offers further resistance to the environmental discourse and supports it being focused onto delineated sites instead of broad scale environments such as the whole Peninsula. One consequence of this is the support offered to the landscape provisions within the District Plan as a vehicle for actualising an holistic view of the environment. Another consequence is the focusing of large amounts of resources and energy on promoting the environmental health of small sites, mostly in
private ownership. In this way Pākehā systems of land ownership both support the environmental discourse, and resist it simultaneously. However, strategic lobbying has influenced policies at the Regional level, as well as the District level, and the potential exists to exert a broader scale influence through Environment Court decisions.

A number of complex threads entangle together in the application of the picturesque as a landscape management tool. The effects based approach of the RMA91 produces a tension with environmental discourse’s holistic perspective. The conflation of scenic beauty with ecological health within the picturesque discourse enables its entanglement with the environmental discourse, gaining it some support from the environmental lobby. The RMA91 was passed into law at a time when the landscape architecture profession was developing in strength, and the profession met its passing with enthusiasm. Influence was exerted by the profession through the process of broad scale landscape assessment for policy and plan preparation. Given the naturalisation of the picturesque discourse within the practice of landscape architecture, the application of the picturesque in landscape planning under the RMA91 is unsurprising.

In a sense then, the landscape has become a container for some of the broad scale aspirations of the environmental discourse (and possibly the heritage discourse) as well as for the picturesque discourse, and the landscape architecture profession itself. The intensity of the resistance to this, particularly from the agricultural discourse, is unsurprising. The landscape becomes the battleground for the struggle between site

---

5 Swaffield (1999b) disputes this stating that ‘While landscape assessment (and the landscape architecture profession) appears to have been a primary focus of public criticism as the cause of problems in policy formation and plan preparation, landscape practitioners express concern that their role is typically limited to undertaking only the initial assessment’ (P7). This was not the case in Dunedin, the DCC’s staff landscape architect having central responsibility for writing the landscape section of the plan.
by site management and broad scale management; private property rights and the public good; Pakeha landownership and Mana Whenua concerns. It would seem that site by site management, and private property rights have been, by and large, the winner, and paradoxically perhaps, the neo-liberal emphasis on private enterprise combined with this has ensured that landscape architecture profession can continue to thrive on site by site advocacy.

The RMA91 presents a similar paradox to the heritage discourse as it does to the environmental. The RMA Amendment Act 2003 elevates the ‘Recognition and protection of the heritage value of sites, buildings, places or areas’ (S7(e) RMA91) to a Section 6 concern, ‘Matters of national importance’. Thus local and regional councils are expected to provide protection within their planning frameworks. That is, they are expected to support the public interest in protecting our historic heritage. However, at points of conflict, the essentially neo-liberal nature of the RMA91 comes to the fore.

In the case of a property subject to a heritage protection order where that property cannot be sold and, under the terms of the heritage protection order, is incapable of ‘reasonable use’ then the Heritage Protection Authority (usually a Regional or City council) can be ordered to purchase the property. They have to pay the value of the property as it would be without the protection order and to pay costs and expenses to the Crown (S198 RMA91). The alternative is to remove the heritage protection order. Thus the RMA91, in the final instance, imposes the ‘market value’ concept onto heritage conservation.

Table 9.2 summarises the points of resistance and points of alliance between the discourses discussed.

---

6 Swaffield (1999b) notes that it has been opined that ‘negative publicity concerning problems in preparing district plans has ‘set back’ landscape advocacy and policy by ten years’.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse</th>
<th>Resistance</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Alliance</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mana Whenua</strong></td>
<td>Agriculture (exploitation)</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>Agriculture (management)</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental (protectionism)</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>Environmental (conservation)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neo-liberal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Picturesque Heritage</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agriculture</strong></td>
<td>Mana Whenua</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>Neo-liberal</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Mild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neo-liberal</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>Gardening</td>
<td>Mild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Picturesque</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td>Mana Whenua (‘cultural harvest’)</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>Mana Whenua (conservation)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Picturesque</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neo-liberal</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Mild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Picturesque</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Gardening</td>
<td>Mild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neo-liberal</strong></td>
<td>Agriculture (subsidies)</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Picturesque</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picturesque</strong></td>
<td>Agriculture (industry)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Mana Whenua</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neo-liberal</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Agriculture (pastoralism)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Picturesque</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Gardening</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage</strong></td>
<td>Mana Whenua</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>Mana Whenua</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Picturesque</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neo-liberal</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gardening</strong></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Mild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neo-liberal</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Picturesque</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.2: Summary of the resistances and alliances between the major discourses in evidence in the construction of the landscape of the Otago Peninsula. I have not commented on the impact of neo-liberalism on Mana Whenua as this is a topic is beyond the scope of this study.

The discussion of power thus far remains true to the theoretical proposition that power and discourse are inseparable. Further, despite the clear attribution of text (interview transcript) to individual people in the body of the work, done to emphasise that discourse occurs in social settings, I have retained the view that discourses are anonymously authored. However, an examination of the social setting makes it clear that certain individuals seem to have more power, in terms of their ability to influence events and outcomes, than others. In particular, two key players were prominent. (There were others, but these two best illustrate my argument so that it is unnecessary)

---

7 These measures of intensity of both resistance and alliance are highly subjective. See section 9.2.3 of this chapter for a discussion of the problems entailed in assessing the ‘power of power’.
to discuss them all.) One was involved in a number of groups and projects, primarily, to do with environmental issues. The other was a farmer who I never met (he declined to be interviewed) but who was named and discussed in so many other interviews and conversations for me to see him as a key player in the farming community on the Peninsula. (I understand it was he who barred my attendance at the Federated Farmers meeting mentioned in Chapter Three.) If power is a function of discourses and not people, how then can I explain this phenomenon? I suggest that there are two possible and interconnecting explanations for this apparent personal power, which do not demolish the claim that power is a function of discourse.

The first is that an individual may appear to exert power through the intensity of their expression of a particular discourse. This would be the case of the farmer. The stories I was told about him included: that he had assaulted an elderly man for mushrooming on his land; that he had cut off the water supply to a neighbouring property when he purchased the land with the spring; that he had shot out the windows of a car belonging to people he found trespassing on his farm; that he locked an Otago University landrover into one of his paddocks for a week for similar trespass; and that he was the 'biggest farmer' on the Peninsula (ie. he owned the largest amount of land). It matters little whether or not these tales are accurate in fact, what matters is the effect they have.8 The majority of these stories centre around the private property rights of the landowner, and the potential consequences of trespassing against them. The other, that he is the largest landowner on the Peninsula underlines his importance in sustaining the agricultural discourse. Thus in both respects he represents an extreme of the agricultural discourse on the Otago Peninsula and it can still be said that the power is a product of the discourse and not the individual.

In the second instance, an individual who is adept at expressing a number of conflicting discourses effectively may appear to exert personal power. This would be the case of the other person. He was not only involved in a number of organisations but was clearly held in high regard by people who gave voice to utterly conflicting discourses. The key to his influence and prominence, apart from his extreme personal

---

8 I was terrified at the prospect of interviewing this man, and greatly relieved when he declined!
energy, seems to be through his ability to communicate effectively using, or at least hearing, different discourses.

This is not to say that these two men do not have significant and interesting personalities. And it is certainly not denying the importance of the actions of individuals on the land in constructing landscape. It is simply to say that discourse theory is sufficiently robust to avoid digression into individual psychology. In fact this must be one of its strongest points as it enables the analysis of systems of power which are bigger and more expansive than individuals or groups, whilst gaining expression at the level of individuals. Indeed Foucault himself said:

...it is already one of the prime effects of power that certain bodies, certain gestures, certain discourses, certain desires, come to be identified and constituted as individuals. The individual, that is, is not the vis-à-vis of power; it is, I believe, one of its prime effects. The individual is an effect of power, and at the same time, or precisely to the extent to which it is that effect, it is the element of its articulation. The individual which power has constituted is at the same time its vehicle (Foucault 1976 in Gordon (ed) 1980 P98).

Hence it can be seen that the landscape of the Otago Peninsula is constructed through the interactions and changing distributions of power amongst a range of discourses which are articulated, embodied and enacted by individuals.

9.2.3 The efficacy of discourse as an analytic tool in landscape studies

In discussing the design and implementation of this research I noted that 'a case study, to claim validity, must be based on articulated theory, and it is the investigation of this theory that is its focus' (P58 this volume). There are three major theoretical strands in this work. The first is the idea that landscape is the product of the interaction of systems of discourses, with the discursive objects they construct and the actions they stimulate. Because these systems are constantly responding to changes in each other and the 'natural' changes in the underlying biophysical reality, the landscape is a dynamic, ever changing thing.

The second main theoretical strand is in the adoption of a Foucaultian conceptualisation of discourse as constitutive of all knowledge. This makes discourse the key to analysing the discourse-object-action triads, as only by understanding the
way that the discourse constructs the world do the actions it provokes make sense. I used a combination of Foucaultian markers of discourse (the nature of the object, subject positions) and Fairclough’s linguistic characteristics (vocabulary, metaphor, etc) to determine the boundaries of the discourses evident in the corpus.

The third strand is the use of a Foucaultian conception of power as a creative force which acts through discourse in webs and networks. Where discourses entangle and conflict, resistance occurs and power can be said to exist. I use this concept to explain the interrelationships between the discourse-object-action triads. Power enables the actualisation of certain discursive constructions and prevents the actualisation of others. Thus the ebbing and flowing of power through the webs of discourse produce the ‘dance of landscape.’

This dance can be seen on the Otago Peninsula. The replacement of forest by pasture as the agricultural discourse gained sway, only now to be replaced again by forest as the environmental discourse asserts itself; the reduction in the rural population as agricultural production demanded the consolidation of the small farms being followed, now, by the splitting of those larger farms into their constituent units as the neo-liberal discourse gains sway and the demand for ‘lifestyle’ properties increases; the displacement of wildlife and its current resurgence; the destruction of the old and unserviceable followed by the protection of relics that are left; the very movement of the soils themselves. So the dance of landscape continues.

The application and adaptation of these theoretical threads has a number of consequences. I have extended Kobayashi’s original conception of the dance of landscape into an even more dynamic and complex one, but one much more sensitive to the actual processes occurring in the landscape of Aotearoa / New Zealand. I have also extended the application of the concept of discourse. Working from the theoretical position that discourses are most clear at points of resistance, I ‘stitched together pieces’ evident at those points, which other authors have left separate (Baxter 2001). I did this on the presumption that discourses would have internal consistency. Thus I have been prepared to apply the concept to a wider and more amorphous corpus of data that landscape researchers have been willing to do before. I think this extension has been vindicated in practice, and that the discourses so defined are
convincing. A major risk of a methodology such as this is that my own perspectives might shape the data, in interview, and the result, through analysis. However, triangulation with independently written materials supports my analysis.

Further to these three fundamental theoretical extensions are a number of more subtle and specific implications of the use of discourse to study landscape. Before discussing these it is necessary to reiterate some of the other main theoretical points on which this thesis is based. Firstly, it operates on a combination of ontological realism and epistemological relativism. That is, it is accepted that there is a biophysical reality to the world but it is also understood that our knowledge of it is discursively constructed. This discursively constructed knowledge is bounded by the cultural archive(s) from which it arises, and to which it contributes. This means that the study of how landscape is constructed is an explicit investigation of human culture. The advantage of this approach is that it immediately puts all constructions of landscape onto an even footing in the sense that different constructions within a culture, and the different constructions of different cultures, are not right or wrong; accurate or spurious; simply different.

It has been argued that an effect of this epistemological relativism is that 'anything goes'; that there is no locus from which evaluations can be made; that assessments and judgements become meaningless. I do not agree. Firstly, actions justified within a particular discursive system can always be assessed in the terms of that discursive system. One would not expect to assess research in quantum physics by the same criteria as research in English literature (though there may be some criteria in common). Thus it is possible to assess actions within a particular discursive system effectively, but it requires a clear understanding of the internal logic of the discourse. Secondly, actions are, in fact, constantly made within one discursive system and assessed from another. Developing explicit understandings of the discourses in operation in complex situations allows the true position of the evaluator to be clarified. That is, instead of making claims to 'objectivity' it is more useful to say 'from within discourse X, action Y makes no sense'. In other words, it enables and promotes the adoption of reflexivity much as I have used in undertaking this research.
This reinforces that ways of seeing are not absolute – what we see is not an objective reality but an epistemologic field. This is the case for what we literally see, as the discussion of the picturesque discourse should illustrate, but also for that which we see metaphorically. These ways of seeing and understanding have histories, and these can be traced. Thus we can come to understand the ways in which people see and experience their worlds in a much deeper way than by just listing opinions or points of view.

The key point of this is that places and spaces constructed by different discourses are irreducible to one another, and are not discontinuous. Understanding this, and understanding the different discourses and the constructions they produce, provides us with an excellent means for analysing environmental conflicts. Once the irreducibility of these spaces and places is acknowledged the potential, and clear necessity, exists for negotiation and compromise.

Key to assisting this process of negotiation and compromise is the recognition, also clarified by the application of this understanding of discourse, of the ways people can talk past one another. That particular words may have different meanings or significances to different people is a fairly simple observation. The understanding that these variations in meaning are part of larger discursive systems can help to clarify the underlying grounds of disagreement. For example, differences in the construction of 'gorse' between the environmental and agricultural discourses relate, fundamentally, to the different constructions each makes of the underlying land.

In Chapter Two, I made a major theoretical challenge to earlier landscape studies which utilised concepts of discourse which saw narratives and texts occurring within discourses. This research has substantiated my position. I have discussed a number of examples where a single narrative drew upon several discourses. A major consequence of this is to further destabilise the use of linguistic metaphors in landscape studies. Whilst I continue to acknowledge my intellectual debt to these studies, I do not think that the suggestion that one can read a vernacular landscape as
a text is any longer tenable. As I have demonstrated clearly, a vernacular landscape can be the product of numerous interacting discourses. Each of these discourses needs to be understood on its own terms, and the dynamic interactions between them fathomed, before the construction of the landscape can be contemplated.

A weakness in this study relates to the analysis of networks of power. As I made the point in Chapter Three, for all his theorising about discourse Foucault offered little in terms of methodological direction for the analysis of discourse. The same could be said about his theorising about power. He did, however, say that:

I would say that we should direct our researches on the nature of power not towards the juridical edifice of sovereignty, the State apparatuses and the ideologies which accompany them, but towards domination and the material operators of power, towards forms of subjection and the inflections and utilisations of their localised systems, and towards strategic apparatuses. We must eschew the model of Leviathan in the study of power. We must escape from the limited field of juridical sovereignty and State institutions, and instead base our analysis of power on the study of the techniques and tactics of domination (Foucault 1976 in Gordon (ed) 1980 P102)

I have assessed power in several ways. The initial and clearly theorised point is that, as power and resistance are opposite sides of the same coin, discourses are at their most clear at these places of resistance. Thus the sites of power within the network are reasonably easily identified. However, the volume of power; the strength of power; the power of power, remains vague and speculative.

While being clear that it is not possible to directly map discourses onto the land, I have argued that trends in the areas of land under management regimes related to specific discourses reflect changes in the relative power of discourses. I have argued that influence upon policy indicates increasing power. I have also argued that legislative support (for Māori and regarding heritage issues for example) indicates changes in the power of those discourses. Further, I have argued that individuals can express and embody power. While I stand by these means of assessing the power of discourses there is something irritatingly amorphous about them.

9 The current landscape of Aotearoa / New Zealand is relatively new and dynamic. Landscape may exist, for example the padi field landscapes of South East Asia, which are relatively static and the product of few discourses.
A discourse is relatively easily defined by the objects and subject positions it creates; by the vocabulary it uses; and by other linguistic features. Power, however, remains a unquantifiable force; something one really only experiences when one is in opposition to it. It might be possible to add a linguistic perspective to this and hypothesise that the vocabulary of more powerful discourses will be more likely adopted into the less powerful ones. Indeed my analysis of the neo-liberal discourse suggests this. However, this does not address my need to understand power in a volumetric sort of a way. Perhaps I need take consolation from the words of Foucault himself when he said:

> The role for theory today seems to me to be just this: not to reformulate the global systematic theory which holds everything in place, but to analyse the specificity of mechanisms of power, to locate the connections and extensions, to build little by little a strategic knowledge [savoir]. (Foucault cited in Delsing 1991 P62)

This project contributes to a strategic knowledge about both the Otago Peninsula, and the discursive construction of landscape. This new knowledge has a number of implications which I discuss in the following section.

**Part Two: Why is this new understanding important?**

### 9.3 Implications for landscape management and landscape architecture

As I stated in Chapter One, and in the introduction to this chapter, an important aspect of undertaking research is the consideration of the implications of the new knowledge. I have examined the theoretical implications for the future study of landscape in the previous sections of this chapter. I now turn to a more practical perspective and examine some of the implications of this study for landscape management policy and practice, and for the practice of landscape architecture as a profession and a discipline.

#### 9.3.1 Implications for landscape management

As I have demonstrated, the process of the construction of landscape is the result of the complex interactions of differing discursive constructions and the actions which
they stimulate, mediated by networks of power. Perhaps, then, the primary implication for landscape management is that it is necessary to recognise this in the preparation of policy and in the process of planning. Fundamental to this is the necessity to ensure community involvement in all levels of the process of plan preparation from the initial assessment of the issues to the development of rules and strategies. (See the next section of this chapter for a discussion of the role of landscape architecture in this.) As landscape is not a unitary object, neither can the strategies used to manage it be justifiably based upon a unitary perspective. The opinions of all concerned parties must be drawn upon and considered, or, put another way, the range of contributing discourses need to be clarified and negotiated.

Further, as the landscape is not a unitary object but a cultural construction, there is no absolute standard that can be applied to evaluate its quality or the quality of its management. This has a number of consequences. Firstly, it is clear that decisions about landscape management must be the products of negotiation, both to determine goals and the strategies for their attainment. Secondly, as human decisions on management are contingent on the discursive constructions underlying them and upon negotiation between discourses, it is clear that this is both a political process and one in which what seems to be best practice will constantly change. Thirdly, it requires that practice be reflexive. As environmental goals are established as the result of quintessentially political processes, not only must there be means available to assess their achievement but the ability to change the goals themselves must be built into the system.

A further significant implication of this study is the recognition that as ‘landscape’ is a cultural construction the distinction between ‘natural’ and ‘cultural’ landscapes dissolves. There is a strong tendency in Aotearoa/New Zealand to divide the environment into ‘natural’ – the bush, the wilderness, the national parks – and the ‘cultural’ which encompasses the rest. The ‘natural’ environment attracts protectionist practices and human access is managed as we do not really belong there.10 The ‘cultural’ environment, particularly the agricultural landscape, on the

---

10 It is the case that the ecosystems of Aotearoa/New Zealand evolved free of human influence until the arrival of the kiore two thousand years ago. However, I am referring to a conceptual split between nature and culture, the natural and the human.
other hand, is dominated by discourses which eschew the importance or appropriateness of 'nature', particularly indigenous nature, within its bounds. Understanding that these distinctions are cultural constructs allows us to recognise that there is nothing inherent in the distinction between cultural and natural landscapes and enables us, potentially, to find new ways of relating to both. (See Meurk and Swaffield 2000).

Specifically, with regard to Mana Whenua, this study indicates the importance of understanding the different (discursive) relationships of Māori and Pākehā with their environments. The impact of the imposition of Pakeha systems of landownership with its attendant rights and responsibilities cuts across the more holistic view of Māori. To some extent this is addressed by the requirements of the RMA91 to consult with Mana Whenua (First Schedule, Part I S3(1(d)), and by S6(e) and S8. However, the lack of understanding in the broader Pākehā community holds the potential to confound these provisions, as has been illustrated.

The understanding of the agricultural discourse gained by this study has a number of practical implications. Firstly, the underlying construction of the land as an economic resource, particularly combined with multigenerational investment in that land and a highly individualistic construction of the farmer and their rights, makes the application of controls over the use of that land difficult. As there is a high degree of resistance to the disciplining effects of the public interest it seems wise to be extremely strategic in determining priorities for management, and also to be proactive in order to avoid the resistance of the discourse defining the issues rather than the community as a whole.

Secondly, the construction of bush, within the agricultural discourse, has particular implications for moves to protect and enhance indigenous biodiversity11. Compliance with protectionist strategies is only likely to be achieved where the negative impacts

11 The government of Aotearoa / New Zealand ratified the international Convention on Biological Diversity in 1993. The New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy was launched in February 2000. The purpose of the Strategy is to establish a strategic framework for action, to conserve and sustainably use and manage New Zealand’s biodiversity. The primary focus is on New Zealand’s indigenous biodiversity, but the conservation of the genetic resources of our important introduced species is also addressed. (http://www.biodiversity.govt.nz/picture/doing/hzbs/summary.html downloaded 29/5/04)
of protection on the landowner are minimised. Thus assistance with the costs of fencing; rates relief on areas of land which are protected ecosystems; assistance with pest control; and assistance to provide alternative shelter for stock are all options which should be explored with landowners when the removal of stock from areas of land is considered desirable. These types of assistance (other than rates relief) are potentially available now, but are largely available from organisations (Forest and Bird, DoC, STOP) which are strongly identified with the environmental discourse. Thus they are unlikely to be accessed by proponents of the agricultural discourse. Further they all, along with the Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust and Nga Whenua Rahui¹², require the landowner to initiate the process. Thus it seems necessary to centralise these functions in a controlling authority. While locating this function in the DCC is also problematic, it does seem the best candidate as it is the authority charged with the protection of indigenous ecosystems in its area.

A primary implication of the environmental discourse on land management is its holistic construction of the environment. As this leads to attempts to influence land management practices on (others) private land it is necessary to manage the process of interaction, particularly with the agricultural discourse, with care.

While the holistic construction of the environment within the environmental discourse demonstrates a strong connection with the discourses of ecology and other life sciences not considered here, there is also a strong connection with the picturesque discourse. The conflation of scenic quality with environmental health within the picturesque discourse is only a part of this. The two discourses have similar holistic constructions of the environment/landscape and both justify the imposition of controls over activities on private land for the public good. Further, given the picturesque as a naturalised way of seeing, it is unsurprising that the two discourses are often closely intertwined. This is problematic when compliance with the picturesque discourse (for example, screening buildings from view) is assumed to be complying with the environmental discourse, because of the use of indigenous trees. This study has

¹² These organisations assist landowners to put protective covenants in place on ecosystems and landscape features. However, they do not offer any financial assistance other than the legal costs of registering the covenant, assistance with developing management plans, and monitoring.
provided further means for teasing these apart, a necessary requirement for assessing the quality of environmental outcomes within both discourses.

Thus the construction of landscape can be understood by the examination of the contributing discourses. However, it is not my intention to simply disembowel the landscape and leave its viscera scattered for examination. While understanding the construction of landscape requires the teasing apart of the constituent discourses, it is still the landscape which is the focus. As Olwig has said:

...the scenic landscape masks the landscape of common historical places, the political landscape. The historically constituted landscape/country as place has been ‘done in’ and spirited away behind the curtains. The space of scenery has thus appropriated the place of a people. A visual image of place as thing, of landscape as scene, has thus appropriated the socially defined place of people in the political landscape (Olwig 2002 P220 Emphasis in original).

To understand the landscape, one must understand the people and the complex of discourses they express. By recognising the complexities of the construction of landscape, and the quintessentially political nature of this process, the management of landscape can become a more humane process. Thus, the primary implication of this study is, therefore, in the possibility it offers of putting place and people back into the picture. Key in this process will be the practice of landscape architecture.

9.3.2 Implications for the practice and discipline of Landscape Architecture

The potential implications of this study for the practice and discipline of Landscape Architecture are many. As Swaffield (pers com) has commented, adopting a social constructionist view of landscape potentially enables the integration of the widely various disciplines which contribute to Landscape Architecture. Soil Science and Fine Art; Ecology and Anthropology; Engineering and Environmental Law, can all be seen to adopt and utilise differing discourses and subsequently different constructions of landscape. That the landscape is not reducible to a unitary object should be entirely clear from the content of this project. As with the case study then, this awareness

---

13 The working title for this project was ‘Otago Peninsula: People and Place’.
14 This pun is entirely intentional.
15 These ideas were originally put to the Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture conference in 2002, but the paper is not included in the proceedings.
enables and requires negotiation and compromise, rather than a stand off argument about which is the 'right' approach. This observation extends into all the realms of landscape architecture, including design, an area I have not considered at all in this project.

My focus here has been on the vernacular, non-designed, landscape and as a result I want to concentrate my observations on its management and the role of the landscape architecture profession within this. This means focusing primarily on the practice of landscape assessment, and secondarily on the (usually subsequent) development of landscape management strategies.

- **Landscape assessment**

In Chapter Eight I illustrated the role of the picturesque discourse within the assessment and management of the Otago Peninsula landscape. I have three major concerns about this which this study brings to light. The first is the naturalised state of the picturesque discourse evident within the landscape assessment and the consequent production of rules and guidelines. There is nothing wrong, *per se*, with using picturesque criteria to assess landscape quality, or to base management decisions on. Picturesque landscape assessment measures nothing more than the picturesque qualities of the landscape in question, and the management of landscapes for the maintenance and enhancement of these qualities will only incidentally impact any other constructions. What has been shown to be problematic in this case study is that it has been assumed to be the only way, and thus its values and precepts are not open to scrutiny. In Bowring's words:

> An explicit exposition of picturesque principles, outlining their origins and enduring appeal, would more directly address the issue of amenity in a legislative context. This would allow the presentation of other, alternative means of assessing amenity that may be more appropriate in particular cultural or topographic settings, and avoid the conflation of culture and nature (Bowring 1997 Pp125-126).

That the picturesque way of seeing is only one way of seeing and therefore only one means of assessing scenic and landscape quality is something which both the landscape architecture profession, and the broader planning community, needs to come to grips with.
This raises the second concern which is the presumption that management of the landscape for scenic quality somehow promotes its ecological health. The conflation of picturesque quality with ecological health, the two key aspects of the ‘clean, green’ image Aotearoa / New Zealand promotes so vigorously, enables a sense that the important aspects of environmental quality in the country have been addressed. (Witness the willingness of the DCC and the Dunedin community to tolerate rules protecting the ‘landscape’ of the Otago Peninsula, but not the indigenous ecosystems there). I suggest that this indicates a lack of reflection and theoretical rigour within the profession which leaves it open to the criticism of superficiality. Indeed, it also leaves the profession open to criticism on the basis that it fails to live up to its own stated environmental objective:

The New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects (NZILA) is committed to protecting and enhancing the landscape. To achieve this objective the NZILA encourages members to take a leadership role in promoting sustainable and innovative landscape and resource management policies and practices (http://www.nzila.co.nz/nzila_pdf/Environment%20Policy.pdf downloaded 5/6/04)

This work has shown that the landscape is the product of the interaction and resistance between numbers of different discursive constructions of the underlying biophysical reality. I would argue that coming to a complex understanding of these processes, and developing assessment procedures which reflect this complexity would indeed indicate a willingness to take a ‘leadership role in promoting sustainable and innovative landscape and resource management’.

The key issue which this project raises for the practice of landscape architecture, however, is the problematic nature of the expert landscape assessment. While the assessment discussed in this research was undertaken in 1992, Swaffield’s survey of landscape assessment practices in Aotearoa / New Zealand reported in Landscape Review in 1999, found that still the ‘valuation of the landscape is dominated by a qualitative, expert approach’ (Swaffield 1999b P6). This he sees as problematic:

Given the apparent political loss of confidence in landscape assessments due to a belief that inappropriate landscape designations and policies are being imposed on communities and landowners, the question of community involvement in the assessment process is a central issue (ibid P12).

The willingness to continue utilising this expert approach to landscape assessment rests, he concludes, for many landscape architects, upon a:
...paradigm that assumes landscape qualities and values are largely objective, that is they reside in an independently observable landscape rather than in the way we perceive and conceive of landscape (ibid P13).

This research undermines such a paradigm completely, and thus must undermine the continuation of this practice.

Landscape assessments take two fundamental forms; site by site assessments and those which are used as a base on which to build policy. It is this latter form on which I focus here. These are the broad scale assessments such as the one on which the DDP was based and which I critiqued in Chapter Eight. As these types of assessments are to be used as a basis for the management of broad scale landscapes, I would argue that community consultation must always be a central component in them. How else might the varying constructions of landscape be identified? However, this leaves us with a question as to how conflicting constructions might be reconciled, and what the role of the landscape architect might be in this process.

To this end it is necessary to stress that landscape architecture is primarily a design profession and that as such a major strength of its membership is the ability to envision the effects of change on the landscape. Its multidisciplinarity provides another major strength which the profession can bring to bear on broad scale landscape assessment. Thus the profession has two key skills; the ready ability to understand the many constructions of landscape; and the ability to envision the future impacts of the differing landscape management priorities they may require. These are not, alone, enough to clarify the role of the profession here however and to do that I turn to the planning profession itself.

Hayward defines deliberative planning as:

...a broad school of planners who are interested in promoting inclusive, democratic discussion about a variety of planning issues and urban problems. These planners seek to develop plans through a process of un-coerced public debate (Hayward 2000 P16).

She continues:

...deliberative planning theorists advocate flexible, local-level or deregulated planning approaches (as do neo-liberal theorists but), the deliberative vision inspires a collaborative approach to decision-making in which citizens come together to develop collective responses, rather than promotion of individual aspirations in public debate (ibid P18).
Thus an adoption of a process such as this to landscape assessment would see the identification of issues and responses arising from the communities of interest, rather than imposed from outside. Key to this process is the role of the planner.

In deliberative planning, the planner assists the community to reach some understanding about what actions to take to address concerns which have been raised in discussion. However the planner acts as more than a mediator, facilitator, or referee in community debate. In deliberative planning the planner is an agent for resistance and change seeking to emancipate the powerless (ibid P18).

I suggest that the landscape architect is a perfect candidate to fill this role in the process of, what might be thus called, deliberative landscape planning.

The issues of concern must come from the community. The landscape architect is in a perfect position to elicit those concerns, translate them into potential actions and to illustrate the potential outcomes of those actions. In this way the issues and the policies may be formed. The knowledge of the multiplicity of the constructions of landscape, the multidisciplinarity of the profession in practice, enables the landscape architect to advocate on behalf of discourses which might be missing from the local mix; propose alternatives and compromises; and all the time to assist the community in envisioning the impacts of their decisions. In this way landscape assessment and planning are effectively blended through the process of community involvement.

Of course the major challenge then becomes defining and delimiting 'community'. Should it be restricted to those who live in and own the landscape in question? What about those who view it, visit it, and use it? Then there are those who make their living from the landscape who, in the case of tourism operators for example, may themselves reside in distant landscapes. I would venture to suggest that, for the purposes of landscape assessment this community can be located at the intersection of two different conceptions of community. The first is the commonsense conception of 'all the people living in a specific locality' (Oxford Compact English Dictionary P196). Those living in the landscape in question usually the owners of the land, should have the most say in its management, those in close proximity somewhat less and so on.

The second community is not spatially delimited but is, what I am calling, a community of passion. Arler (2000) has argued that the assessment of landscapes
should be based on the opinions of the 'connoisseurs' of those landscapes. He defines this connoisseur as:

...a person, who knows the qualities in a certain area well, who is capable of identifying them, and, at least to a certain extent, of weighing them against each other on a scale of importance (P293).

These connoisseurs are not, in his schema, a small or elite group. He continues:

If it is believed that the farmers, or the landscape architects, or the geographers, or the landscape ecologists, or the historians, or the landscape art critics, can claim an exclusive right to make all decisions with reference to their status as the one and only group of true connoisseurs, the idea of connoisseurship has obviously been misused. It has been misunderstood too...The variety of connoisseurship is the very reason why discussions and public deliberations are so important: the acquaintance with different connoisseurs can open our eyes to qualities we have not been aware of before...Differences and disagreements should not worry us...On the contrary: they broaden the horizon and force us to qualify our own thoughts and experiences...Disagreement is no reason for treating the different positions as mere expressions of non-rational private preferences...Dialogue is a much more interesting alternative (P295).

I consider that what unites these connoisseurs, like the lovers of fine wine, is the passion they hold for the object. Thus these connoisseurs, these lovers of the place, are the intersecting community, the opinions of which should be accessed in the process of assessment. The intersecting communities of passion enable a system of priorities to be established which is represented in Fig 9.1.

Fig 9.1: Hierarchies of the 'community' of landscape lovers

Group 1 represents the key players, the most important people to consult and the point at which the overlay of the community of place and the community of passion are
most congruent. Group 2 would include those with a strong passion for the place but who do not live there. This might include close residents; community groups, visitors and so on. This group also warrants close involvement in the defining of issues and priorities. Group 3 would include those with a significant interest in the landscape but who do not fall into either of the prior two groups. And the fourth group, the displaced and distant lovers, would include people who, whilst living far from the place, still hold it dear. Thus it is possible to create a hierarchy of connoisseurs whose opinions should be elicited in the process of landscape assessment.

While passion is not something often associated with the dour Scots who settled the Otago Peninsula, I would argue that this volume is full of stories of passion. The regard for the tupuna; the respect for the industry of the ancestors; the love of nature; even neo-liberal consumerism, are all expressions of passion and of passionate attachment. Effectively I selected some of the connoisseurs of the Otago Peninsula to interview for this study. The discourses which they have expressed are the varieties of connoisseurship which Arler refers to, and which must become part of the dialogue of deliberative landscape planning.

I critiqued the site by site assessment of proposals for change, often on the Otago Peninsula and elsewhere, housing developments, in Chapter Eight. In this type of assessment the criteria of the plan are the benchmarks against which the assessments are made. If the plan has been arrived at through the process I have suggested, then the use of an expert approach to this sort of assessment is less problematic. However, as any new proposal represents an alternative which may not have been considered in the preparation of the plan, I would suggest that some wider consultation may still be necessary to ensure that the landscape architect effectively negotiates the discourses within the community.

• The discipline

This study has a number of implications for the discipline of Landscape Architecture and for the training of landscape architects. Firstly, as I have suggested earlier, a major implication is the possibility of the further integration of the many contributing disciplines within Landscape Architecture. This possibility is a consequence of the
recognition of the landscape as socially constructed, and that these different approaches to it are different discursive systems. This would facilitate the development of greater degrees of reflexivity in academic practitioners, in research and in teaching, and enable greater degrees of theoretical rigour to be instilled in the practitioners they train.

However, further integration alone is insufficient. A reorientation of emphasis is needed. As landscape is a social construction it is necessary for practitioners to understand it as such. This requires a greater emphasis be placed on the contribution which the Social Sciences, particularly Anthropology, Sociology, Cultural Geography and History, can make to the understanding of landscape.

Finally, as the approach to landscape assessment and planning above indicates, skills in group facilitation, and forms of social science research as well as the more central and traditional skills would be necessary. This possibly suggests that landscape planning and management, including assessment, could become a specialty within Landscape Architecture programmes.

Part Three: Conclusions and recommendations for further study

9.4 Recommendations for further study

The potential for further study of the landscape utilising discourse as the fundamental frame of reference is, of course, limitless. However, beginning with this study as a stepping off point, and my personal interests as a limiting frame, a number of substantial projects can be suggested.

This study applied a particular theoretical framework in a case study of a very particular and easily delineated place. The application of that theoretical framework to a very different place within Aotearoa / New Zealand would both offer a further test to the theoretical framework, and enrich the broader understanding of the construction of landscape in Aotearoa / New Zealand.
Aotearoa / New Zealand was the last of the major British Colonies to be settled. The discursive analysis of comparable sites within earlier colonies – particularly Ireland, USA, Canada, and Australia – could deepen our understanding of the processes involved in the transportation of the original European discourses and the adaptation of those discourses to the new environments. Further, the comparison between contemporary situations in these ex-colonies would give a fascinating insight into the cultural construction of landscape as it has evolved in these different settings.

In addition to projects such as these which aim to broaden the application of the discursive study of the construction of landscape, this approach offers the possibility of deepening our understanding of the construction of landscape within Aotearoa / New Zealand. To this end a number of projects offer great potential.

The impact of the neo-liberal economic turn, and the neo-liberal discourse, on the society of Aotearoa / New Zealand has been far greater over the past twenty years than this thesis could recognise effectively. A detailed study of the impacts of the neo-liberal discourse upon the landscape of this country, over the past twenty years and particularly since the passing of the RMA91, is a project begging for completion. Further, a study of the impact of the neo-liberal discourse on the environmental movement would be extremely interesting, both to see how the environmental movement has responded to neo-liberalism, and how it has adapted to it. A study of the Native Forest Action Council16 would be a possible way to undertake this, and perhaps, for comparison, another group such as Save the Otago Peninsula, which has been in existence for a similar length of time.

Swaffield has suggested an ethnographic study of landscape architectural practice in Aotearoa / New Zealand as a way of assessing the future options of the landscape architecture profession (Swaffield 1999c P187). The addition of the use of discourse analysis would further enrich a study such as this, enabling the connection of practices within the profession to the external discursive systems from which they arise

---

16 The Native Forest Action Council was started in 1975 as a coming together of groups opposing the logging on indigenous forests. In 1988 the organisation broadened its focus to address wider environmental issues and changed its name to the Maruia Society. In 1999 the Mariua Society became the Ecologic Foundation, and in 2002 its director, Guy Salmon, stood in the General Election as the environmental spokesperson for the right wing National party.
Bowring's study of the picturesque as exemplified in the writings of the profession is a perfect example of such a connection.

9.5 Conclusion

In closing I want to return to the very beginning, to the frontispiece of this volume, the painting 'Setting' by Mark Strang. I am certain that many readers will have found this painting, and its inclusion here, puzzling. However, others will have recognised its significance immediately. This painting is a water colour of the landscape of the Otago Peninsula. The top panel is of the view, looking north from Yellow Head, of the Portobello Peninsula and the islands which extend across the harbour. The centre panel is of the iconic Harbour Cone, Hereweka. The bottom panel is a more abstract representation of Harbour Cone. The purpose of its inclusion is to underline the point that there are many ways of experiencing the landscape, and some of these ways are not immediately recognisable or familiar to everyone. The purpose of this study has been to both acknowledge those different ways of experiencing the landscape, and to deepen our understanding of them.

Thus to conclude this section, this chapter, this thesis, suffice it to say, that in the final analysis, the landscape is a complex thing. This thesis presents the results of a major discursive analysis of a significant landscape of Aotearoa / New Zealand. That analysis supports the contention that landscape is a product of the complex interaction of a number of discourse-object-action triads. It is a successful example of a case study in that it provides an extension of its theoretical basis, while providing a compelling case in its empirical material. Further, it provides a clear basis for the undertaking of further research to further enrichen our understanding of the social construction of landscape.
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Topographical Map of the Otago Peninsula
(Not to scale)
INFORMATION

You are invited to participate as a subject in a project entitled “Otago Peninsula: People and Place”. This project is being undertaken by Marion Read as the research study for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

The aim of this project is to further our understanding of the changes to the Peninsula produced by European settlement and the relationship of those changes to modern day land management practices.

Your participation in this project will involve undertaking an interview, and a tour of your property if appropriate. In some instances there may be a need for a follow up interview. This should not require more than three hours of your time in total, and this could be spread over a number of days or weeks.

The results of the project may be published, but you may be assured of the complete confidentiality of data gathered in this investigation. The identity of participants will not be made public without their consents. Given the small size of the Peninsula community, if it should be necessary, the identity of participants will be masked, in addition to the use of pseudonyms. To ensure confidentiality interviews and other information will be coded.

The project is being carried out by Marion Read, who can be contacted at (03) 325-3804. The project supervisor is Professor Simon Swaffield who can be contacted at (03) 325-3804 Ex 8442. Marion will be pleased to discuss any concerns you have about the project.

CONSENT FORM

I have read and understood the description of the above-named project. On this basis I agree to participate as a subject in the project, and I consent to publication of the results of the project with the understanding that my anonymity will be preserved. I understand that I may at any time withdraw from the project, including the withdrawal of any information I have provided.

I wish /do not wish to have an opportunity to read the transcript of all interviews I participate in before they are used in the project.

Signed: Dated:
Interview Face Sheet

Code: ____________ Date: _______________________________________________________________________

Name(s): __________________________________________________________________________________

Address: ___________________________________________________________________________________

Postal Address: ______________________________________________________________________________

Phone Number(s): ____________________________________________________________________________

Email Address: _______________________________________________________________________________

Gender: M F

Age: 10 / 15  16 / 20  21 / 25  26 / 30  31 / 35  36 / 40

41 / 45  46 / 50  51 / 55  56 / 60  61 / 65  66 / 70

71 / 75  76+

Ethnic Identification: _________________________________________________________________________

Occupation(s): ______________________________________________________________________________

Consent form completed: Y

Transcript requested: Y / N

Source of contact: _____________________________________________________________________________

Other: ______________________________________________________________________________________
Dear .......

I am a postgraduate student of Lincoln University undertaking a research project on the Otago Peninsula for a PhD. The project aims to examine contemporary land management practices and strategies. Fundamentally, I am interested in how we live in this land and the values our actions on the land express. I am focusing on the Peninsula as I grew up in Dunedin and wish to know more about the place that I took for granted for so many years of my life.

In practical terms my study includes interviewing residents of the Peninsula. I am interested in finding out what you see as the important issues in land management, about the practices you employ, and in gaining some understanding of the values with which you approach the land.

I would be very pleased if you would consent to being interviewed. Interviews take about an hour, and are relaxed and unstructured affairs. I transcribe the interviews verbatim, and if you wish you may have a copy. The interviews are confidential and the data taken from them will be kept anonymous. Thus any information that I am given which I use in my thesis or in other papers I might write will be identified either by pseudonyms or by codes, not by real names. For your information I have enclosed a copy of the consent form that I am using and which I require all interviewees to sign.

Should you wish some verification of myself or my project please contact Professor Simon Swafield at Lincoln University on 03 325 2811.

Please do not feel that you should respond to this letter. I will telephone you in a few days to find out your response.

Yours faithfully

Marion Read
PhD Candidate
Ph 03 389 9377, Email: reason@clear.net.nz
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Number</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Ethnic Identity</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26/30</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Past Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46/50</td>
<td>New Zealander</td>
<td>Community group</td>
<td>Past Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46/50</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Past Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46/50</td>
<td>Kiwi</td>
<td>Small holder</td>
<td>Peninsular Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lesley</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56/60</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Small holder</td>
<td>Peninsular Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wiremu</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>66/70</td>
<td>Maori/European</td>
<td>Tangata whenua</td>
<td>Peninsular Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66/70</td>
<td>New Zealander</td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>Peninsular Peninsula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>71/75</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Small holder</td>
<td>Peninsular Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chas</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>76+</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td>Peninsular Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td>Peninsular Peninsula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46/50</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Small holder</td>
<td>Peninsular Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61/65</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>Peninsular Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>76+</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>Peninsular Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76+</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>Peninsular Peninsula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Evan</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51/55</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Community group</td>
<td>Past Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36/40</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Peninsular Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56/60</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>Community group</td>
<td>Peninsular Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46/50</td>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>Tangata whenua</td>
<td>Peninsular Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td>Community group</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>71/75</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>Peninsular Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lynette</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56/60</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Peninsular Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Maxine</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76+</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Private resident</td>
<td>Peninsular Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56/60</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td>Peninsular Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bess</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td>Peninsular Peninsula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51/55</td>
<td>New Zealander</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td>Peninsular Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46/50</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td>Peninsular Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46/50</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td>Peninsular Peninsula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51/55</td>
<td>New Zealander</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td>Peninsular Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31/35</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Peninsular Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katerina</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26/30</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Number</td>
<td>Pseudonym</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41/45</td>
<td>Kiwi</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rosemary</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41/45</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51/55</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Community group</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56/60</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Small holder</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>76+</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56/60</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David D</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26/30</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36/40</td>
<td>New Zealander</td>
<td>Tangata whenua</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roy</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36/40</td>
<td>New Zealander</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61/65</td>
<td>New Zealander</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46/50</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>John A</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46/50</td>
<td>New Zealander</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51/55</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>66/70</td>
<td>New Zealander</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41/45</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>Small holder</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Jill</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66/70</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51/55</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Small holder</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>66/70</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Small holder</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Graeme</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36/40</td>
<td>New Zealander</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Andrew E</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46/50</td>
<td>New Zealander</td>
<td>Small holder</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Neville</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51/55</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td>Small holder</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51/55</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td>Small holder</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51/55</td>
<td>New Zealander</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61/65</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Gavin</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41/45</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>71/75</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Euan</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41/45</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Small holder</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46/50</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Fred F</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51/55</td>
<td>New Zealander</td>
<td>Community group</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56/60</td>
<td>New Zealander</td>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26/30</td>
<td>New Zealander</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36/40</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Number</td>
<td>Pseudonym</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41/45</td>
<td>New Zealander</td>
<td>Cribbie</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51/55</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Maryanna</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51/55</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>David S</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41/45</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Robert N</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>76+</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>Cribbie</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>Cribbie</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Jacqui</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41/45</td>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>John K</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51/55</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Ethnic identity is as reported by the respondent.
\(^2\) Status refers to my motivation for interviewing the respondent.
\(^3\) 'Past Peninsula' refers to people who lived on the Peninsula prior to interview. For the purposes of this list I have included the city suburbs of Waverly and Vauxhall as part of the Peninsula. This would not be the general consensus, the Peninsula usually being considered to begin at the northern edge of the city's suburbs.
Appendix 2: Provisions in the RMA that recognise Maori interests in natural resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part II: Purpose and Principles</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part I: Purpose and Principles</td>
<td>s 5(2)</td>
<td>• &quot;sustainable management&quot; means managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s 6(e)</td>
<td>• In achieving the purpose of the RMA, all persons exercising functions and powers under it in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources shall recognise and provide for the following matters of national importance: the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wahi tapu and other taonga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s 7(a), (e)</td>
<td>• In achieving the purpose of the RMA, all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall have particular regard to kaitiakitanga and the heritage value of sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s 8</td>
<td>• In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part III: Duties and Restrictions under this Act</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part III: Duties and Restrictions under this Act</td>
<td>s 14(3)(c)</td>
<td>- Restrictions relating to water: A person is not prohibited by subsection (1) of this section from taking, using, damming, or diverting any water, heat, or energy if in the case of geothermal water, the water, heat, or energy is taken or used in accordance with tikanga Maori for the communal benefit of the tangata whenua of the area and does not have an adverse effect on the environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part IV: Functions, Powers, and Duties of Central and Local Government</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part IV: Functions, Powers, and Duties of Central and Local Government</td>
<td>s 33(l), (2)</td>
<td>A local authority that has functions, powers, or duties under the RMA may transfer any one or more of those functions, powers, or duties to another public authority in accordance with this section. For the purposes of this section, &quot;public authority&quot; includes any iwi authority. A local authority may not transfer the approval of a policy statement or plan or any changes to a policy statement or plan; the issuing of, or the making of a recommendation on, a requirement for a designation or a heritage order under Part VIII; or this power of transfer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Iwi and Local Government Interaction under the Resource Management Act: Examples of Good Practice
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s 39(2)(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>In relation to hearings, in determining an appropriate procedure for the purposes of subsection (1) of this section, a local authority, a consent authority, or a person given authority to conduct hearings shall recognise tikanga Maori where appropriate, and receive evidence written or spoken in Maori and the Maori Language Act 1987 shall apply accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part V: Standards Policy Statements and Plans</td>
<td>s 45(2)(h)</td>
<td>In determining whether it is desirable to prepare, a national policy statement, the Minister for the Environment may have regard to anything which, is significant in terms of s8 (Treaty of Waitangi).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s 58(b)</td>
<td>A New Zealand coastal policy statement, prepared and recommended by the Minister of Conservation, may state policies about the protection of the characteristics of the coastal environment of special value to the tangata whenua including wahi tapu, tauranga waka, mahinga maataitai, and taonga raranga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s 61(2)(a)(ii), (iii)</td>
<td>When preparing or changing a regional policy statement, the regional council shall have regard to any relevant planning document recognised by an iwi authority affected by the regional policy statement, and any regulations relating to ensuring sustainability, or the conservation, management or sustainability of fisheries resources (including regulations or bylaws relating to taiapure, mahinga mataitai, or other non-commercial Maori customary fishing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s 62(l)(b)</td>
<td>A regional policy statement shall make provision for such of the matters set out in Part I of the Second Schedule (and such of the matters set out in Part II of that Schedule as are of regional significance) that are appropriate to the circumstances of the region, and shall state matters of resource management significance to iwi authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Schedule, Part 1, cl 4(c)</td>
<td>Part I of Second Schedule says, in relation to regions, policy statements and plans may provide for any matter relating to the management of any actual or potential effects of any use, development, or protection described in clauses I or 2 on natural physical, or cultural heritage sites and values, including landscape, land forms, historic places, and wahi tapu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Schedule, Part 11, cl 2(c)</td>
<td>Part 11 of the Second Schedule says, in relation to districts, policy statements and plans may provide for any matter relating to the management of any actual or potential effects of any use, development, or protection described in clause I of this Part, including on natural, physical, or cultural heritage sites and values, including landscape, land forms, historic places, and wahi tapu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s 64(l)</td>
<td>There shall at all times be, for all the coastal marine area of a region, one or more regional coastal plans prepared in the manner set out in the First Schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Schedule</td>
<td>cl 2(2)</td>
<td>A proposed regional coastal plan shall be prepared by the regional council concerned in consultation with the Minister of Conservation and iwi authorities of the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Schedule</td>
<td>cl 3(l)(d)</td>
<td>During the preparation of a proposed policy statement or plan, the local authority concerned shall consult the tangata whenua of the area who may be so affected, through iwi authorities and tribal runanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Schedule</td>
<td>cl 5(4)(0)</td>
<td>A local authority shall provide one copy of its proposed policy statement or plan without charge to the tangata whenua of the area, through iwi authorities and tribal runanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Schedule</td>
<td>cl 20(4)(D)</td>
<td>The local authority shall provide one copy of its operative policy statement or plan without charge to the tangata whenua of the area, through iwi authorities and tribal runanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s 61@@(3)(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Without limiting the power of a regional council to prepare a regional plan at any time, a regional council shall consider the desirability of preparing a regional plan whenever any significant concerns of tangata whenua for their cultural heritage in relation to natural and physical resources arise or are likely to arise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s 66(2)(c)(ii), (iii)</td>
<td></td>
<td>When preparing or changing any regional plan, the regional council shall have regard to relevant planning document recognised by an iwi authority affected by the regional plan, and regulations relating to ensuring sustainability, or the conservation, management or sustainability of fisheries resources (including regulations or bylaws relating to taiapure, mahinga mataitai, or other non-commercial Maori customary fishing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s 67(l)</td>
<td></td>
<td>A regional plan may make provision for such of the matters set out in Part I of the Second Schedule as are appropriate to the circumstances of the region (see above for Part I of Second Schedule)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s 74(2)(b)(ii)</td>
<td></td>
<td>When preparing or changing a district plan, a territorial authority shall have regard to any relevant planning document recognised by an iwi authority affected by the district plan and regulations relating to ensuring sustainability, or the conservation, management or sustainability of fisheries resources (including regulations or bylaws relating to taiapure, mahinga mataitai, or other non-commercial Maori customary fishing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 Clause 25 of the Resource Management Amendment Bill 1999 amends section 66 of the principal Act to ensure that the regional council must take iwi planning documents into account instead of having regard to them.

22 Clause 28 of the Resource Management Amendment Bill 1999 amends section 74 of the principal Act to ensure that a territorial authority takes iwi planning documents into account instead of having regard to them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part VI:</td>
<td>s 75(l)</td>
<td>A district plan shall make provision for such of the matters set out in Part 11 of the Second Schedule as are appropriate to the circumstances of the district (see above for Part 11 of Second Schedule)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Consents</td>
<td>s 93(l)(c)(ii), s 93(l)(f)</td>
<td>Once a consent authority is satisfied that it has received adequate information, it shall ensure that notice of every application for a resource consent made to it in accordance with this Act is served on the New Zealand Historic Places Trust if the application affects any historic place, historic area, wahi tapu, or wahi tapu area registered under the Historic Places Act 1993; and served on iwi authorities as it considers appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s 104</td>
<td>A consent authority's consideration of an application for a resource consent and any submissions received is subject to Part 11 of the RMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s 140(2)(h)</td>
<td>The Minister may call in applications for resource consents of national significance, such as where the applications are relevant to the Treaty of Waitangi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The RMA must be read subject to the requirements of the Ngai Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998. See Part 12 and the "Statutory Acknowledgements" in the Schedules, in particular ss 205-229

Iwi and Local Government Interaction under the Resource Management Act 1991: Examples of Good Practice