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"The earth is round and flat at the same time. This is obvious. That it is round appears indisputable; that it is flat is our common experience, also indisputable...

A map can tell me how to find a place I have not seen but have often imagined. When I get there, following the map faithfully, the place is not the place of my imagination. Maps, growing ever more real, are much less true...

Fold up the maps and put away the globe. If someone else had charted it, let them. Start another drawing with whales at the bottom and cormorants at the top, and in between identify, if you can, the places you have not found yet on those other maps, the connections obvious only to you. Round and flat, only a very little has been discovered."

Jeannette Winterson
Abstract

This study presents an analysis of human encounter with place. It examines the personal and cultural importance of an attachment to place, focusing on the reciprocal relationship between cultural heritage and a sense of place. Place is constructed out of mutual meanings between people and their environment. The study begins with an in-depth look at the theory of place. In a series of heritage management case studies, the theory is applied in order to illustrate how meanings of place may be expressed. Place as a normative concept provides a role for resource managers in finding the meanings people associate with places, and in nurturing and enhancing these meanings. This involves the recognition of different values and 'stories' that are associated with place. Recognising these differences helps shift resource management away from the simplicity of grand narratives and totalizing discourses, towards a respect for intangible and multiple meanings in place.

To a certain extent an understanding of place is already informing both natural and cultural management decisions in New Zealand, although this may not be explicitly recognised. To approach cultural heritage management from the perspective of place, however, challenges the current directions that heritage management is taking in this country. The study proposes a way of taking up that challenge, and concludes that the importance of place should not be overlooked.
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This study grew out of a personal conviction that what people feel about the places where they live, matters. It began as an interest in why we strive to preserve cultural heritage; in why we feel a sense of loss when physical objects in our cities and countryside are damaged or destroyed; and in how we develop an attachment to the places where we live.

It has been something of a personal journey for me in many ways. As I grappled with ideas and theories which were new to me (and the analogy of losing the soap in the bath seems appropriate here), I came to understand more about my own relationship with the world around me, and my experiences as a person in place.

My standpoint is as a third-generation Pakeha New Zealander. I have not felt it 'my place' to try to write about Maori perceptions of place. This study therefore has a eurocentric bias. I do not think however that this needs too much apology. Increasingly, Pakehas are having to reassess their perceptions of nationality and culture, and their attitude towards the environment. I see this study as a part of that process, encouraging people to think about their places in ways which acknowledge the non-scientific, emotional and spiritual bond between themselves and the places they feel attached to.
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Chapter One - Introduction

We do not analyze our everyday lives - we are too busy living them. Our relationship with the environment in which we spend most of our time is carried out mainly at a subconscious level, in the realm of emotions, myths and memories. The fact that we live our lives within places or ‘in place’ means that those places have an impact on our personal and cultural wellbeing. This study explores the concept of place as our familiar human condition.

Place is the point at which human experience of the world occurs. All of our experiences have an integral contextual element: they ‘take place’ (Pocock, 1981:12). Although we spend our daily lives within a place we may not recognise its social and psychological importance to our identity and well-being. Our places are as familiar and unexamined as the word ‘place’ itself. Place is the taken-for-granted, the "inconspicuously familiar" site of our everyday existence (Relph, 1985:19). It is because of its integral part in our daily lives that understanding the concept of place is so important.

The context of this exploration is cultural heritage management in New Zealand. The reasons for this emphasis are several. My interest in place first arose out of investigations of the way New Zealand’s cultural heritage is currently being managed and the perceived motivations for doing so. Place and cultural heritage are both sites of cultural and individual identity, and the two concepts are further linked by the fact that place derives much of its meaning from a sense of continuity with the past. The idea that cultural heritage has a role in maintaining a ‘sense of place’ has been cited as one among many reasons for preserving the material relics of the past (Hall and McArthur, 1993:8).

It seemed to me that place, rather than being a subset of cultural heritage, offered a new way
of approaching cultural heritage management, and a new way of viewing the role of material cultural heritage in the human experience of the environment. Place implies a concern for ‘wholes’ (Berdoulay, 1989:24), and therefore offers a level of management which embraces the arbitrary division of natural and cultural heritage and the tension between preservation and development.

The motivation for restricting this exploration of place to its role in heritage conservation were also practical. Although not precluding the wider political and economic potential of the concept, applying it to a narrower field made the project manageable. To explore place in terms of cultural heritage meant dealing (although tentatively) with the concept of intangible and multiple meanings attached to physical objects.

**Methodology**

The fundamental research into place stems from secondary sources in and around the concept, of which there are many. The application of theory to New Zealand situations is based partly on secondary sources, partly on discussion with people working in heritage management or planning, and partly, as is fitting, on personal experience.

This study draws heavily on parts of phenomenological philosophy as a system for helping to explain the human creation of meaning out of experience. For phenomenologists, human knowing is not analogous to the act of a camera taking pictures of things (Stumpf, 1989:489). People actively, although mainly subconsciously, create meanings out of their encounters with things as they perceive them. There is no one ‘reality’; we base our actions on what we perceive to be reality. The ‘father’ of phenomenology, Edmund Husserl, emphasized the importance of the original, prescientific form of human experience: the realm of daily life.
The theoretical research for this study drew on many sources but has a bias towards phenomenologically-based writings. This does not mean to suggest that there are not other equally valid ways of theorizing about place. Phenomenological concern with the familiar realm of people's lives however, especially the encounter between people and the world or environment, provided me with an inspiring perspective from which to explore the intricate relationship between people and their places.

An essential feature in the development of the study is the experience of sharing ideas and sources of knowledge with four other research students. Although our areas of research were different, our methodologies and standpoints complemented one another and formed a very constructive study atmosphere.

**Aim and Scope of the Study**

The study is based on a firm belief in the importance of the intangible, 'illogical' and emotional dimensions of people's experience of life. The concept of 'place' is a perspective from which to explore these dimensions, which many other perspectives overlook or somehow obscure. The aim of the study is to show how people make meaning out of place, in a way that makes it relevant to those with the power to affect meanings held within a place, particularly resource managers and planners. The intention is not simply to define 'place' but to offer a starting point from which to learn more about meanings in particular places, and for exploring the perspective of place as a means of respecting and enriching people's everyday lives.

The scope of the study covers three main areas: firstly, the definition of place and a theoretical exploration of the dynamic relationship between people and place; secondly, an
exploration of the way in which qualitative expressions of place can be found; and thirdly, a more normative view of the role of resource managers and planners as ‘facilitating’ or ‘encouraging’ a positive sense of place.

This is an exploratory exercise at a conceptual level, and aims to open up a new perspective on the places in which we live. It is therefore more an invitation to think about and experiment with the concept, as opposed to a management ‘guidebook’. Place depends on more than the individuals and groups which live there. Its structure, and the options for preserving or changing that structure, are highly contingent on political and economic imperatives. While accepting that this is the case, in light of the restrictions of time and space this study does not examine in any depth the impacts of political and economic paradigms on place. It should be noted however that as most of the theoretical work on place used in the study, is undertaken within the context of free-market economics and Western-style democracy, there is more a danger of generalizations about place from that standpoint than there is of leaving political and economic factors out.

Outline

Chapter Two defines place and explores the psychological and cultural importance of the concept. In the subsequent chapters the aim is to explore the ramifications of choosing to look at the world anew, as it were, in approaching cultural heritage management issues at least partly in terms of place. A major theme is the extent to which an implicit understanding of place is already informing both natural and cultural management decisions without necessarily including any specific recognition of the concept. Chapter Three investigates the relationship between place and cultural heritage, and includes an overview of cultural heritage legislation in New Zealand. Chapter Four consists of two heritage-based case studies in order
to illustrate the expression of meanings in cultural heritage and place as expressed through 'contextual discourse'. Chapter Five has a more rural emphasis. It investigates the connections between landscape and place, drawing on another case study. Chapter Six analyses the trends in cultural heritage management in New Zealand today. The final chapter offers suggestions on how meanings in place can be ‘found’ and used to inform management decisions. It includes a discussion on the possible links between the importance of place and the goal of sustainability.
Chapter Two - Theory of Place

Introduction to Chapter

Place is more than simply where we happen to be. It is the site for our everyday lives, the "unexalted chronicle of the familiar" (Rogers, 1983:32), the place where we dwell and where our home is; and it therefore plays a vital part in our psychological and social wellbeing. This chapter defines 'place' and explores the concept as the location of individual and cultural meaning over time. This definition endows place with much more importance than it is generally given in resource management and planning in New Zealand (Perkins et al, 1993:11).

In traditional economically-centred definitions, place is seen simply as incidental background to the spatial distribution of social and economic activities (Agnew and Duncan, 1989:2). The discussions about place in this study are based on the assumption that place is too important to be restricted simply to economic definitions.

'Place' is derived from three highly integrated sources (Violich, 1985:131-132). The first is the character of the natural environment, for example natural topographic character and climate. These set the base for the nature of human so social and economic life, including settlement patterns and land use. The second source is the built environment as a social instrument: the ways in which land uses are related to each other, travel and communication patterns, public and private structures, and other physical evidence of human impact on the natural environment. The third source is individual and cultural identity and attachment stemming from intimate association with a place, the intangible meanings grounded in place. This last source is the most important, for it is the human connection with places that gives
them meaning and makes them 'place'. "Places exist only with reference to people, and the meaning of place can be revealed only in terms of human responses to the particular environment used as a framework for daily living" (Violich, 1985:114).

The chapter follows the following logic. It begins by asking the question, why look at 'place', and goes on to explore definitions of the concept. Place is a personal and experiential construct. It involves endowing our experiences or encounters with the world with meaning. Those meanings depend on personal experience, however they are largely contingent on our cultural contexts. Physical place and cultural context inform each other reciprocally over time. The final part of the chapter deals with the theoretical ramifications of this reciprocity, in a discussion of place as an autonomous entity or level of meaning.

Why ‘Place’: The Perception of Modern Placelessness

Interest in the place concept has greatly increased among social scientists over the last two decades, particularly in the fields of geography and sociology. This has come primarily from a growing emphasis on the cultural significance of everyday life (Entrikin, 1991:40). It also stems from a dissatisfaction with the industrial, technological and scientific 'rationality' which dominates our perception of the world, but which cannot satisfy our psychological need for a sense of history, connectedness and place (Goss, 1992:167). The feeling that 'something is missing' in modern capitalist society has led to "an emerging need to take seriously what is ignored or discarded" (Seamon and Mugerauer, 1985:1) in an attempt to find new ways of thinking about the world.

The perception that the modern individual is somehow 'placeless' is due to several factors. Technological control of the environment and the dominance of a consumer culture have led
to a mechanistic view of nature and society, thus obscuring the less tangible, nonquantifiable aspects of human life (Entrikin, 1991:26). Increased mobility and communication, coupled with the rapid transformation of places that we associate with modern societies, and the centralization of decision-making, have led to standardized landscapes or ‘interchangeable’ environments that destroy areal diversity and prevent an emotional connection with places (Entrikin, 1991:28, 57; Seamon, 1985:243).

Entrikin (1991:83) suggests that place itself has not been ‘lost’, but rather that dominant and universalising paradigms have obscured our way of looking at the way we relate to the familiar world around us. The perception is that in the standardized landscapes and rapid development cycles that characterize modern life, meaning in place is being destroyed. Entrikin argues that meaning is both ‘lost’ and ‘gained’ in modern landscapes. What is being lost are certain types of meanings, one of the most obvious being "the sense of attachment that comes from the stability of meanings associated with places and landscapes". The construction of meaning out of experience in place is fundamental to human interaction with the world. The modern human mastery over the environment alters the meanings of this fundamental human-environment relationship, but does not diminish the importance and impact of it (Entrikin, 1991:43). Entrikin’s view of place, although important for understanding the concept, is less normative than many others, including the view of the author. One of the questions this study provokes is, just what sort of meanings are important to human and environmental well-being and should therefore be preserved and nurtured.

The recent interest in place coincides with changing perceptions about the role of planners and resource managers. The view that there is some objective, knowable reality ‘out there’ is being seriously challenged. So too has the dominance of particular paradigms that are applied across a whole range of situations, a form of ‘grand narrative’ or ‘totalizing discourse’. The
power of the grand narrative or totalizing discourse can be seen as part of the reason that the importance of place has been obscured. According to Cheney (1989:120), paradigms or theories of the world become totalizing discourses when they are taken out of their immediate setting and exported across a whole range of other situations. In forcing situations to comply to an unsuitable but dominating discourse, other meanings inherent in those situations become obscured or repressed. The effect is to assimilate the world to the narrative, rather than the other way around, leading to "confusion and bafflement" (Ibid:120).

New ideas about the role of planners and resource managers emphasise the need for avoiding totalizing discourses, in favour of allowing the meanings and narratives located in various situations to express themselves (Cheney, 1989; Entrikin, 1991). Michael, quoted by Milbrath, expresses this in the following quote:

"The planner is a storyteller and a teller of stories about storytelling...Technical information, the stuff of conventional planning...will almost never be sufficient to determine the course of action...The future is comprised only of fragmented conjectures and is full of surprises...

"Therefore, the task of the planner is to be an educator. The planner must tell the alternative stories in as rich detail as possible...Villains, then, become not those espousing contrary policies, but instead, those who don't share the learning opportunity, acting instead as if they/we did indeed know what to do and how to do it...Part of the planner's task as educator is to help others learn about the mythic nature of their social reality and about the ways they deal with it, including dealing with it through planning" (Milbrath, 1989:289-290, quoting Michael, 1983:265-266).

Defining Place

"Place is a difficult word" (Agnew and Duncan, 1989:1). It is a common word, used frequently, but often without realising its depth of meaning in our everyday lives. Serious theoretical study of the concept of place has increased greatly over the last two decades (Entrikin, 1991:40), and there is now a large body of social science literature defining place. Common to most, is the idea of place as human location and social interaction in space and
people develop out of their attempts to orient themselves in the field of social action. This is done in three main dimensions: space, time and meaning. The individual "situates" him/herself as located in physical space; as located in time (typically in our culture along a continuum of past, present and future); and as a social being, "attuned to the language, rules and conventions of social life" and to "a structure of meaning."

Tuan expresses the spatial dimension of place as "construed space": "What begins as undifferentiated space becomes place as we get to know it better and endow it with value" (Tuan, 1977:6). In other words, 'place' is experienced space, endowed with meaning by those who live there. The geographical sense of locale is informed by human values of everyday social routine and interaction within that locale (Agnew and Duncan, 1989:2).

Place refers not only to human beings as located in space, but also as part of a continuous process in time. Place is the site of the making of history (Pred, 1986:6), not simply a snapshot frozen in time. Meanings of experiences and perceptions of what is important are based on personal and cultural pasts; from "an accumulating response to a long and substantially built whole" (Tonkin, 1992:6). Place as part of a process through time is also manifested physically, as what Higdon (1985:ix) calls a "timescape", in which the past can be seen to be impinging on the present in very physical, visible forms. This adds a sense of continuity, and creates an impression of layers of meanings built up through cultural interaction within a place over time.

Place can exist at different scales. "At one extreme a favourite armchair is a place, at the other extreme the whole earth" (Tuan, 1977:149). Social science has often seen place as
synonymous with 'community' (Agnew, 1989:9) or with 'region' (Entrikin, 1989:30).

'Homeland' is an important type of place at the medium scale, whether at a city or countryside level, or at the larger scale of 'nation'. This attachment to the homeland appears to be a world-wide phenomenon: "The city or the land is viewed as mother, and it nourishes" (Tuan, 1977:149-154).

'Place' is often used interchangeably with the term 'landscape'. Cooper (1992), for example, talks of the more specific physical qualities of landscape in terms of ecological and archaeological description. She mentions "landscape icons", the obvious and special geographical features that dominate some landscapes, such as Rangitoto Island, Mount Taranaki and Mitre Peak. When she talks about the "something elses", the deeper cultural and emotional associations which people have with their own landscapes, she begins to use the word 'place': "places that have meaning because of cultural rather than natural qualities, places that are important for the human presence, places where something happened" (Ibid:2). Place is therefore a term which can embrace the cultural and emotional responses to the physical and ecological.

The most familiar place for most individuals is their home. The notion of dwelling is the most taken-for-granted aspect of human existence, and yet one of the most important (Lang, 1985:201). The home is the primary centre of human habitation and our "second body" (Ibid:201), from which we reach out into the world. It is the primary site for the creation of sense out of space, "the mysterious alliance between person and world" (Ibid:201).

'Home' is therefore a useful concept with which to begin a deeper exploration of place. To be at home is to dwell in or inhabit a place. It is more than to simply be somewhere or find oneself somewhere: "Inhabiting is an act of incorporation; it is a situation of active, essential
acquisition" (Ibid:202). A place is the strange become familiar to those who inhabit it, and the body, the home, and place form a "privileged unity of mutual implication" (Jager, 1985:215). The links between person and place, and between place and temporality, are made clear by Jager:

"It is here that human life becomes situated and centred...It is only as a situated life...that past, present and future can announce themselves...It is only as inhabiting, embodied beings that we find access to a world" (Ibid:215, original emphasis).

**Place and the Creation of Meaning**

There are certain levels at which planners and resource managers will be involved in changing or preserving aspects of people's 'places', at street, neighbourhood or city level to give some examples. These are overtly recognised as administrative segments. To describe them as places in the full sense of the word requires a recognition of the deep psychological and emotional connection of people to place which underlies the convenience and habit of dividing the world up into segments.

Place is often something we respond to subconsciously and it can be very difficult to strictly define our places or to express feelings we have about them. They are often so well known to us that we accept them for what they are without reflection. They are the "inconspicuously familiar" backgrounds to our everyday existence (Relph, 1985:19). This does not mean, however, that they are unimportant. The way people feel about the places to which they are emotionally and socially connected is a vital part of their sense of identity. 'Sense of identity' refers to the way people make sense out of the world as they encounter it, building up a picture of themselves as individuals and as social beings in the world.

As stated above, place has both physical and non-physical aspects (Violich, 1985:131-132).
Place has therefore two irreducible parts: "place as the relative location of objects in the world, and place as the meaningful context of human action" (Entrikin, 1991:10). To make sense of the concept of place, the importance of the non-physical or 'intangible' aspects must be recognised and nurtured.

To experience something implies more than passively encountering it. It involves endowing the experience with meaning (Rogers, 1983:35). The essence of place is therefore not its visible qualities so much as the various meanings these have been endowed with. In fact we do not really see places at all. Within the range of meanings furnished by an individual's cultural context, places are constructed in "personal memories and affections through repeated encounters and complex associations" (Entrikin, 1991:1), "time-deepened and memory-qualified" (Relph, 1985:26).

There are two aspects of this which are particularly relevant to place. Firstly, meaning comes out of the familiar. It is created by each person for herself or himself through personal experience of the world over time. Secondly, the types of meaning endowed by an individual to place are largely structured by the cultural context of that individual.

*Meaning out of the familiar*

In the modern world, which values the 'scientific' over the common-sense (Rogers, 1983:6), and the universal over the personal, it is easy to overlook the importance of the ordinary person's everyday experiences, and by implication the places in which those experiences occur. As a concept for describing the way we extract meaning and identity out of our immersion in the world, place is intimately concerned with what phenomenologist Natanson calls "the unexalted chronicle of the familiar" (Rogers, 1983:32, quoting Natanson).
Place is an experiential concept. "We are what we are largely as a result of our life’s experiences, all of which have an integral environmental context or setting: events ‘take place’" (Pocock, 1981:12). No experience is isolated or self-contained (Rogers, 1983:36). Experiences occur in a constant stream, and every new situation incorporates elements derived from previous encounters and the way they were interpreted (Ibid:36). The object of interpretation is to familiarise the situation via meaning structures and understandings already existing within an individual. Interpretation is said to be undertaken within a limited "interpretative scheme":

"It is a frame people use to assign meaning to the unknown or unfamiliar. Through interpretive schemes people ease the discomfort associated with unfamiliar or insufficiently known objects...Although every experience encompasses the atypical by virtue of its uniqueness, the individual suppresses its atypical elements in generating familiarity" (Ibid:39-40).

New encounters within a place are interpreted in terms of the existing realm of meanings of ‘place’. Natanson sums this up as follows:

"A pattern of intention and attitude, merged with memorial notes and sly expectancies, underlies even the most casual elements of experience. Nothing is presented to me which is pristinely stripped of association and implication, nor is anything received by me which enters my perceptual doors without ringing a bell that reverberates throughout my being" (Ibid:39, quoting Natanson:103).

Meaning and culture

These intentions and attitudes, memorial notes and expectancies, are built up over time out of the events of our personal biographies, but set within the constructs of our cultural context. The two, personal and cultural, are linked together in the construction of different ‘stories’ (Milbrath, 1989:289-290, quoting Michael, 1983:265-266). Often without being aware of it, people impose a ‘plot’ on the experiences and meanings of their daily existence, arranging their stories in a way that enables them to make sense of their lives. While some parts of these narratives are totally personal, we share much of those narratives with the people who
Anderson and Gale (1992:3) define culture as "maps of meaning". The word refers to shared codes of understanding, communication and practice that are constitutive of both social structure and real world topographies. Culture, therefore, is not just something 'out there' which we are born into and which will go on after we die. It is a continually (even if slowly) evolving process, and it is actively (re)produced by ourselves (Duncan, 1992:38). Their culture is not only something people learn, but also sustain, defend, resist and even create or reject. It is a process which is "temporal, dynamic, contested and reaffirmed" (Ibid:39).

**The Cultural Relevance of Place**

What does it mean to say that people of different cultures relate to places differently? Different cultural groups see and interpret the physical world in different ways. "It is not our human nature that is universal, but our capacity to create cultural realities, and then to act in terms of them" (Wallerstein, 1990:31, quoting Mintz). From childhood we absorb the interpretations of our own culture, acting upon them as a 'reality', while the 'realities' of other cultures may be largely invisible to us (Young, 1992:270).

The relationship between physical place and culture is dynamic. They inform and create each other. In the course of generating and reproducing cultural meanings, people construct spaces, places, landscapes, regions and environments (Anderson and Gale, 1992:4). Anderson and Gale refer to this process as the construction of geographies. Geographies, however, are not simply inert reflections of culture. "Just as cultures are constitutive of geographies, so are our geographies inherent to the culture-building process" (Ibid:4). Local geographies impact on cultures to produce local variation, just as there are variations through gender, class and
age (Agnew, 1992:53). Culture and geography reciprocally inform each-other over time.

**Place as an Autonomous Entity**

The discussion above refers to the reciprocity of geography or 'world' impacting on people as well as people creating the meanings which make up 'place'; that is, an interaction between the meanings created from human encounter with the world, and the 'world' they are generated from.

The human meanings, stories or accounts of this encounter do not describe reality any more than scientific or economic models do. They establish what is "accountable" or meaningful in the setting in which they occur (Handel, 1982:38). One view of 'reality' cannot therefore be seen as 'the truth', for reality is different to different people at different moments in time. To understand human perception of place, "we do not need to know what is true in some final sense. Rather we need to know what is accountable or accepted as true" (Ibid:39).

For Berdoulay, however, the way in which place as 'world' impacts on an individual, and the meanings which are created out of that encounter, depend not only on the cultural and personal experiences of that individual, but also on the place itself. In this way, place is an objective entity as well as a subjectively perceived 'account' (Entrikin, 1991:3). "While ultimately societal processes are responsible for its production, nevertheless, meaning in the landscape (and thus in place) comes from its own organisation" (Berdoulay, 1989:131). Place is an "autonomous entity, capable of changing its constitutive organisation", and "an autonomous level of creation of meaning" generated from that organisation (Ibid:134, 131).

He explains this in discursive terms. Place is the meeting of many different 'texts' (or
stories) which, taken one by one, are the result of some separate logic (economic or cultural or biological for example), but which come together in place. This creates an 'intertext', "an organised ensemble of fragments of various texts", from which level meaning in place can be 'read' (Ibid:135).

This explanation is a more complex way of looking at the first of Anderson and Gale's relationships between culture and place, that of geographies as reflections of culture (1992:4). It does not go quite far enough to explain how this makes place capable of being an autonomous level of meaning. Berdoulay's idea, taken further, could be used to explain the reciprocal relationship, that is, the way in which geographies constitute culture.

Rogers explores meaning in terms of human interpretation of experiences to create the familiar out of the unfamiliar.¹ The familiar rests on recognising experiences either as the same as earlier, already interpreted, experiences (identity) or as similar to earlier experiences (type). Experience is always 'of (something)'. The familiarising of a new experience involves identifying it first as a 'type of something', for example as type of object or a type of feeling. This exercise Rogers calls "typification":

"In the results of typification I am able to recognise the boundaries of my world: even the strange is typically constituted and appropriated as a limit of the familiar" (40, quoting Natanson:140).

Familiarity establishes links with the past, and anticipations of what to expect in the immediate future. An experience is not an isolated event but occurs in a stream of experience. The immediate present is inseparable from the just-past and the immediate future (37). In this way, meaning refers beyond what is immediately given, generating "a system of expectations sedimented from prior experiences and directed towards future experiences" (26).

¹ The following discussion relies on Mary Rogers' Sociology, ethnomethodology, and experience (1983) and page numbers refer to this work.
This continuity leads to stability: "my world exhibits a stability that indefinitely validates my determinations and guarantees the fundamental familiarity of my experiences" (41).

So far this discussion of the links between experience, familiarity and stability over time refers to what is internal to human systems of meaning. The following discussion applies these same attributes to the idea of place as an autonomous level of meaning and organisation.

Changes constantly occur within a place, but are absorbed into its existing system of meaning without destroying that meaning. New ‘experiences’ or developments are rapidly familiarised into the existing organisation of a place. This organisation then reflects back into human interpretive schemes, a new experience but still firmly part of place. Through its own organisation a place is able to remain recognisable as a place for those who set their ‘stories’ within it.

Like human experience and meaning, elements of place modify, enrich, recover or disappear, but place as a whole is never entirely new. As with human typification, it seems possible that the logic of place "suppresses its atypical elements in generating familiarity" (40), thus creating stability over time. Place develops over time, always with elements of the past informing its present organisation, and with the expectation that elements of its present form will extend into the future.

The lifetimes of many of the physical elements of a place are often very long, but the meanings these contain and convey change more rapidly as human perception and interpretation changes. Other elements - seasonal or transient - have shorter ‘lives’ but are still part of the stability over time that place represents. Like culture, place changes, but
slowly enough and infrequently enough to enable the entity to sustain its roles as nexus of the immediate, the past and the future, and as a reliable source of cultural and individual identity.

Summary

Present-day concern for place reflects a quest for meaning. People are no longer satisfied with consumption as the only yardstick of quality of life, and desire a ‘place’ for emotion and wonder in the face of the meaningless complexity of modernity (Berdoulay, 1989:133). The growing recognition of the cultural and psychological importance of "this deep undramatic tie to locality" (Tuan, 1977:159) reflects the realisation of the need for "a continuity between the shifting phases of our life" (Higdon, 1985:134, quoting Knopf, 1979:270). From this perspective on place, the cultural and the natural need no longer be seen as possible competitors, since they are vital and mutually constructive parts of many human stories.

The quandary over preservation and development also takes on a new perspective. Place implies a concern for ‘wholes’ (Berdoulay, 1989:124), and therefore for viewing the interaction between development and preservation on a whole-place scale. ‘Management’ is more a matter of understanding and ‘facilitating’ the meanings that exist within a place. "The problem is then to introduce change such that the local meaning structure is respected. Obviously it has to evolve and, possibly, it may become totally new" (Berdoulay, 1989:133). Rather than viewing heritage management as salvaging a few material pieces of the past in the face of supposed continual change, the starting point is the place as it exists now, and the emphasis is on the changes that are occurring, and how they are likely to effect existing senses of place.

The following chapters argue that place should be one of the factors taken into account in the
management of cultural heritage, and that to do so with any serious commitment would challenge some of the major trends in heritage management as it is developing in this country.
Chapter Three - Place and Cultural Heritage

Introduction to Chapter

This chapter begins with an introduction to the concept of cultural heritage, and a brief outline of the institutional arrangements for cultural heritage management current in New Zealand. The reciprocal connections between place and cultural heritage are explored. Material cultural heritage is not just a piece of the past. It gains its value as heritage from its situation in space as well as time. Relics from the past give places a sense of continuity and permanence. Heritage management therefore has a strong impact on places.

Cultural Heritage: What Is It and Why Do We Need It?

"Heritage represents the things we want to keep" (Hall and McArthur, 1993:2). It is the things we value that we have inherited from the past, and can include the natural as well as the cultural, and intangible as well as physical things.

The division between natural and cultural is largely artificial. Values associated with natural areas such as national parks and wilderness are cultural values. "To retain an area as a national park is as much a cultural decision as to make the land available for grazing" (Hall and McArthur, 1993:4). While acknowledging the arbitrary nature of the category, cultural heritage management is a useful way of introducing place in a realm with which the concept is already associated.

Lowenthal (1985:xxii) identifies three modes of access to the past: memory, history and relics. "Memory and history both derive and gain emphasis from physical remains. Tangible
survivals provide a vivid immediacy that helps to assure us there really was a past" (Ibid:xxiii). Material cultural heritage refers to relics or physical remains from the past. Cultural heritage also includes non-material or intangible elements such as spiritual, symbolic or emotional values attached to the physical relics. Once again, the division is arbitrary. As with the concept of place, the physical manifestations of heritage are important only in as far as they are invested with human meanings relating to their status as 'heritage'.

Concern for the conservation of European heritage is a relatively recent phenomenon in New Zealand. Unlike Europe, we do not have a long tradition of saving the relics of the past. Indeed, it is only since World War II that great attention has been given to protecting the past, be it cultural or natural (Hall and McArthur, 1993:1).

The growing desire to preserve the material relics of our past stems from social and psychological pressures of great change. "[T]he rage to preserve is in part a reaction to anxieties generated by modernist amnesia. We preserve because the pace of change and development has attenuated a legacy integral to our identity and wellbeing" (Lowenthal, 1985:xxiv). In the face of uncertainty, people cling to the familiar,

"to things, places and memories that are reminders of a known past. The retention of such things removes some of the pain involved in contemplating an unknown, uncertain future. The notion of heritage is particularly powerful in this context" (Kirby, 1993:119).

By preserving cultural heritage we are maintaining our links with the past and thus our own sense of identity and continuance. The past provides us with the familiarity of recognition, the guidance of example, and the reaffirmation of belief and action. It may also provide respites or escapes from the pace and pressure of the here and now (Lowenthal, 1985:xx). Most importantly, awareness of the past locates and defines our identity:

"...heritage has assumed a role by which a wide range of groups and communities
within society are able to assert their identities within a broader national culture. Society, in turn, has grasped onto various symbols, icons, and mythologies in order to try and fashion a collective national identity" (Hall and McArthur, 1993:3).

Overview of Institutional Arrangements for Cultural Heritage Management

Cultural heritage legislation is concerned with the protection, preservation and conservation of physical relics associated with special historical and cultural meanings. There are three major pieces of legislation governing cultural heritage management in New Zealand: the Conservation Act (1987); the Historic Places Act (1993); and the Resource Management Act (1991). The Ministry of Cultural Affairs, established in 1991, has a limited overview role in heritage management.

Conservation Act (1987)

This Act set up the Department of Conservation (DOC), which has responsibility for managing natural and historic resources on its land. Historic resources managed by the Department include buildings, colonial industrial sites, and a wide range of archaeological sites. The Department also administers and funds the Historic Places Trust. The Department inherited its historic responsibilities from the old Forestry Department, and from the Lands and Survey Department, mainly in the form of 'historic reserves.' The mandate of the Reserves and National Parks Acts was to protect and manage these resources. The Conservation Act goes further in that it gives DOC the mandate to advocate the retention of historic resources.

DOC's primary interest is in the conservation of its natural resources. Historic resources appear to be at a much lower priority. According to David Butts, DOC's ability to manage heritage is hampered by inadequate funding and staffing. "There will need to be significant
increases in staff if the Department of Conservation is to meet its mandate to protect and preserve the historic resources on the Conservation Estate" (Butts, 1993:180). This seems to be the general feeling of Ian Hill, responsible for management of historic resources in the Department's Canterbury Conservancy. One percent of the Conservancy budget was allocated for historic resources this year and the prediction is for even less than that for the 1993/94 year (pers.comm., 16 September 1993).

Over the next five years each conservancy intends moving towards conservancy-wide historic strategies. This would include bringing historic resources into the overall Conservation Management Strategies, prioritising them, and ensuring they are listed in district plans.

The Department is also working towards management which reflects the principles of the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value, which was adopted in March this year by the New Zealand National Committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites. The Charter sets out principles to guide the conservation of places of cultural heritage value in New Zealand, and includes a broad definition of 'places':

"These areas, landscapes and features, buildings, structures and gardens, archaeological and traditional sites, and sacred places and monuments are treasures of distinctive value" (ICOMOS Charter, 1993).

*Historic Places Act (1993) and the Historic Places Trust*

The first Historic Places Act was passed in 1954. It set up the Historic Places Trust with limited preservation powers. The Trust is the only national body active in the field of heritage preservation. The first Act was replaced by the Historic Places Act (1980) which gave the Trust wider powers, particularly over buildings the Trust did not own (Comrie, 1988:7). The Act set up the Historic Places Trust Board of Trustees to administer the Trust.
It was criticised for its failure to set out preservation aims and goals, and for the fact that although it gave the Trust wider powers, the 1980 Act did not give the Trust the increased funds necessary to exercise them fully (Ibid:10-11).

The 1980 Act was repealed by the Historic Places Act 1993. The purpose of the Act was to "promote the identification, protection, preservation, and conservation of the historic and cultural heritage of New Zealand". Section 4(2) states that in achieving the purpose of the Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it shall recognise:

"(a) The principle that historic places have lasting value in their own right and provide evidence of the origins of New Zealand’s distinct society; and
(b) The principle that the identification, protection, preservation, and conservation of New Zealand’s historical and cultural heritage should - (i) Take account of all relevant cultural values, knowledge, and disciplines; and (ii) Take account of material of cultural heritage value and involve the least possible alteration or loss of it; and (iii) Safeguard the options of present and future generations; and (iv) Be fully researched, documented, and recorded, where culturally appropriate; and
(c) The relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga."

The Act sets up the Maori Heritage Council (S.84) to oversee the activities of the Trust in relation to the protection of waahi tapu and historic places of Maori interest to ensure that the Trust meets the needs of Maori in a culturally sensitive manner. It also substantially increases the fines for intentionally destroying, damaging or modifying any recognised historic place or waahi tapu.

The Trust has always worked closely with local councils. With the passing of the Resource Management Act (1991), this relationship has become more important. Councils are also taking their heritage management responsibilities more seriously. Pam Wilson at the Canterbury office of the Historic Places Trust sees the relationship as a partnership with local
Resource Management Act (1991)

The purpose of the RMA is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. Sustainable management is defined as managing the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources in a way that enables people and communities "to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being" (S.5 (2)). The concept of sustainable management includes the concept of managing for future as well as present generations.

The Act makes specific provisions for cultural heritage management. Under matters of national importance, Section 6 states the need to recognise and provide for:

"(b) The protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development;...

"(e) The relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu and other taonga."

Those institutions operating under the Act shall have particular regard to the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values (S.7(e)), that is, "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" (S.2).

According to Butts (1993:180), this Act will be increasingly influential in the protection and management of cultural heritage resources. He sees the Act encouraging the Historic Places Trust to focus on the identification and registration of sites and buildings, while protection and ongoing management becomes the responsibility of territorial authorities.

The Act potentially provides strong legislative protection for historic resources through the
use of heritage orders. It establishes the authority by which an interested body can become a 'heritage protection authority', and take the responsibility for protecting a natural or human-made feature or area that has heritage significance. The application for a protection order is lodged with the local authority, and follows the same process as that for the notification of resource consents. If the application is successful the heritage order is noted in the district plan, and the regional policy statement and plan is amended accordingly.

Under the Act, the Historic Places Trust is defined as a heritage protection authority and may apply for heritage orders to be noted in the appropriate district plans. Other groups who can apply to become a heritage protection authority include district councils, government departments, for example the Department of Conservation, and any body corporate having an interest in the protection of a place.

Heritage orders are provisions in district plans, but regional councils also have a role in heritage protection. The Second Schedule, Part 1, 4(c) defines this role in terms of "regional significance". If an area, feature, site or place is of regional significance, or if its protection is affected by activities of a regional scale, then regional councils are to provide policies, rules and guidelines to ensure heritage protection (Nicholls, 1992:viii).

Section 189 outlines a wide range of places which may merit protection by a heritage order:

"(1) A heritage protection authority may give notice to a territorial authority of its requirement for a heritage order for the purpose of protecting -
(a) Any place of special interest, character, intrinsic or amenity value or visual appeal, or of special significance to the tangata whenua for spiritual, cultural, or historical reasons...
(2) For the purposes of this section, a place may be of special interest by having special cultural, architectural, historical, scientific, ecological, or other interest."
Ministry of Cultural Affairs

The Ministry of Cultural Affairs was established in 1991 to provide advice to the government on cultural matters and to administer grants disbursed through Vote: Cultural Affairs (Ministry of Cultural Affairs (MCA), 1992:5). The Ministry takes over responsibility for functions formerly undertaken by the Arts and Cultural Heritage Division of the Department of Internal Affairs, and currently has a staff of eleven.

A major goal for the Ministry is the "improved management of New Zealand’s cultural heritage" (MCA, 1992:3). It is responsible for the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa and has an interest in the museological sector as a whole. Its responsibilities do not include the administration of the Historic Places Trust. The Ministry does, however, have an overview role of cultural management in general (pers.comm., Ingram, 1993).

A major project the Ministry is currently working on is the development of a ‘cultural framework’. "This will provide a means of identifying the constituent elements of the sector and their interrelationships. It will provide the basis on which to establish priorities and develop policy perspectives" (MCA, 1992:4). Part of this work involves developing a definition of ‘cultural heritage’ (pers.comm., Ingram, 1993).

Heritage Legislation and Place

The word ‘place’ is used liberally in heritage management legislation. An ‘historic place’ under the Historic Places Act 1993 is defined as:

"(i) any land (including an archaeological site); or
(ii) any building or structure (including part of a building or structure); or
(iii) any combination of land and a building or structure, -
that forms part of the historical and cultural heritage of New Zealand..."
According to Pam Wilson of the Historic Places Trust, the fact that the Trust includes 'place' in its title is due more to the fact that the term was a linguistic 'catchall,' than to any special understanding of the concept (pers.comm., Wilson, 1993). This in itself is interesting. 'Place' holds much broader connotations in people's minds than 'site' or 'building', and could therefore be considered a versatile term from which to begin an exploration of meanings contained in cultural heritage.

Although the RMA does not specifically define place, it is referred to directly in S.7 (e): "Recognition and protection of the heritage values of sites, buildings, places, or areas." The definition of a place of special interest in S.189, relating to heritage orders, include a very wide interpretation of what makes a place worth protecting (as quoted above). Ecological attributes are among those listed along with other more traditional categories of cultural heritage. Its inclusion helps break down perceptions of a firm boundary between cultural and natural heritage.

Heritage legislation has tended to focus on tangible heritage rather than intangible traditions and concepts (Hall and McArthur, 1993:9). The Resource Management Act (1991), however, refers to intrinsic values and to Maori spiritual values and traditional associations with places and with taonga. These intangible attributes of place have a greater scope for recognition under the Resource Management Act. At the very least, people are becoming more familiar with their usage.

Cultural heritage management in New Zealand is concerned with the preservation, conservation and protection of things defined as important for cultural and historical associations. The Conservation Act (1987) defines these three concepts. Conservation is defined as: "the preservation and protection of natural and historic resources for the purpose
of maintaining their intrinsic values, providing for their appreciation and recreational enjoyment by the public, and safeguarding the options of future generations" (S.2). Preservation is defined only in terms of maintaining intrinsic values, "so far as is practicable", while protection means the maintenance of the resource in its current state, but includes (a) its restoration to some former state; and (b) its augmentation, enhancement, or expansion".

These definitions illustrate the perceived piecemeal view of places in heritage protection legislation. Preservation and development are at opposite ends of the management spectrum. One object can be 'saved' while around it other objects which are not defined as heritage can be completely destroyed and replaced.

There are two ways of dealing with cultural heritage management through the legislation: through proactive methods and through reactive methods (pers.comm., Kirby, 1993). Reactive management occurs when a site is already under threat of demolition before the public become involved in a last minute effort to save it. Heritage protection orders for example are last resort measures for protecting places which are on the verge of damage or destruction. Once a heritage order application has been notified, nothing may be done to that place which would nullify the effect of the order (S.194). The process is expensive, however, and the implications of Section 198 of the Resource Management Act are a further disincentive to apply for protection orders. Section 198 refers to the compulsory acquisition of land by the heritage protection authority. Any owner of an interest in land which is subject to a heritage order may seek a ruling from the Planning Tribunal obliging the heritage protection authority to either withdraw the order or purchase the land under the Public Works Act (1981). The Planning Tribunal can make such a ruling if the owner can prove that the heritage order has prevented the sale of the land or will render the land incapable of reasonable use. This is a risk which will cause many potential heritage protection authorities
to think twice (pers.comm., Wilson, 1993).

Place and Cultural Heritage

"...people in houses...live in the middle of their legacies and presents, and each piece of furniture is a memento...they have kept everything. The past is a luxury of ownership.

Where then should I keep mine? One cannot put one’s past in one’s pocket; one must have a house in which to keep it" (Satre, in Lummis, 1987:154).

We keep our relics from the past within place. The cultural and historic meanings attached to those physical remains add to the layers of meanings in place, just as the relics themselves add to the physical structure of places, giving them a sense of continuity and permanence.

One of the most important reasons for keeping material cultural heritage is to maintain a sense of place. The relationship between place and cultural heritage is mutually supportive. It involves the overlapping of two related but different spheres. One reason among many for preserving physical heritage is to maintain a 'sense of place'; and place often includes relics of the past identified as 'heritage'.

Cultural heritage is an aspect of place that people are able to relate to quite readily. It is one of the more visible aspects and recognisable as the site of meaning related to history and cultural identity. Place adds another level of meaning to heritage, that of its relationship to people as part of the everyday and familiar. The destruction of heritage means losing a great deal of the connection between past and present that is an important feature of stability and meaning in place.

The previous chapter outlined a theory that places can adapt and retain their meaning autonomously, and that meanings in place are contingent on familiarity. It may seem irrelevant therefore to talk of facilitating or encouraging a sense of place, when place can
‘manage itself’ as it were, and when once inhabitants become familiar with a change, it becomes a part of the meaning structure of a place. Present concern, however, arises from a fear that changes are occurring too fast for places to be able to maintain their meanings; that some people’s ‘stories’ are being ignored and their places destroyed; and that modern capitalist society has discarded tradition and is now suffering as much from a loss of connection to the past and a lack of roots, as from uncertainty about the future. In the face of the perceived meaningless complexity of modern life, people are searching for new meanings. Part of this quest is reflected in the discovery or rediscovery of place (Berdoulay, 1989:133), and in the logic for preserving material cultural heritage.

Hall and McArthur (1993:2) define cultural heritage as a matter of choice. Heritage, as stated above, is that which we want to keep. A place contains not only the things we value as heritage and have therefore chosen to keep, but also things which we have simply ‘ended up with’, and things which may have limited or negative meanings (Relph, 1985:27).

People ‘create places’ for themselves out of their interaction with their environment as a natural psychological process. Their ability to do so in a positive way can be hampered by changes that are given negative meanings, and can be enhanced by uncovering the meanings people have of place, and by subsequent planning to ensure these meanings are maintained and nurtured (Violich, 1985:131).

**Summary**

Concepts of identity and community are built at least partly on human experience of place. Feelings of continuity and familiarity are integral to all three concepts. An important reciprocity exists between cultural heritage and place. Beginning with an understanding of
meaning in place can give new insights into the personal and cultural importance of
preserving objects of cultural heritage. The sense of continuity and of connection with the
past that is located in relics adds a vital dimension to place as a process over time. The
existence of those relics and the meanings they hold are in turn dependent on their situation
in place.

There is no specific legislative imperative to consider the importance of a sense of place as it
has been defined in this study. The word is frequently used in heritage management
legislation, however, which provides an opportunity for practical development of the idea.
The first step to doing so is to find out what meanings people associate with objects of
‘heritage’, and how these meanings relate to an overall sense of place. This is discussed in
the following chapter.
Introduction to Chapter

Accommodating the meanings place holds for the people who live there presupposes some way of finding those meanings. "It is not enough to reveal sense of place as a generalized quality of a chosen environment. One must be able to understand the sources of a particular sense of place..." (Violich, 1985:131). The trick is to 'find' or discover the meanings people hold in relation to various parts of their 'place,' and their conceptualization of the place as a whole. One way to begin this process is through 'contextual discourse' or narratives of meaning. This chapter examines this idea and develops in two case studies: the proposed visitors' centre extension onto Christchurch Cathedral; and the Ponsonby Plan in Auckland.

Narratives of Meaning: Contextual Discourse

Place is a context that includes natural elements, and human constructions, both material and symbolic (Entrikin, 1991:6). From a scientific or 'objective' viewpoint, the only meaning of place is that of the location of one object in relation to others (Ibid:10). For others, place is entirely subjective, and has meaning only in relation to an individual’s or group’s goals and concerns (Ibid:5). Yet place can be seen to have an autonomous level of meaning, or at least to be capable of maintaining its internal organisation (Berdoulay, 1989:134). It is therefore not entirely subjective either, but has its own 'reality'. This dualism is what Entrikin (1991:3) refers to as the "betweenness" of place: between the objective and the totally subjective. For Entrikin, place consists of two irreducible parts, "place as the relative location of objects in the world, and place as the meaningful context of human action" (Ibid:10). To 'manage' a place therefore involves managing its physical components or the meanings it
holds, while at the same time realising that people may have different meanings invested in those components, and that these meanings change over time.

In order to build up a picture of a place, a manager or planner relies upon forms of analysis "that lie between the centred and decentred view", which Entrikin describes as "narrative-like syntheses" (Entrikin, 1991:3). Maugerauer also looks to language to find meanings. "The entire fabric of a people's meaningful world - the total environment - comes along with the whole of that people's language" (Maugerauer, 1985:59). He advocates the development of research into "languagescape" (Ibid:67), in order to learn new ways of finding the meanings in the everyday and familiar. The way to 'find' places, therefore, is to listen to the 'stories' or 'accounts' of those who live within them, and allow the meanings which emerge from them to reflect in the physical management of places.

To use language in this way is not an attempt to find any supposed 'one true story'; rather, as expressed by Cheney (1989:119), "the stories and narratives which emerge in various physical, cultural and linguistic settings give expression to human 'being-in-the-world' in various ways". Cheney advocates the use of this "contextual discourse" (Ibid:120) as an alternative to current totalizing and colonizing discourses constructed by dominating sectors of society. He uses the image of language which percolates upward through the context the words are expressing, as opposed to external language being superimposed onto situations. Rather than forcing the world to assimilate to it, as totalizing language does, contextual discourse assimilates language to the situation. "Contextual discourse is not fundamentally concerned with issues of overall coherence. Or, rather, the kind of overall coherence for which it strives is different: a mosaic of language which serves as a tool of many purposes at once" (Ibid:120-121).
The practical application of discovering meanings through discourse has already been illustrated in studies in New Zealand. Recent work by Quigg, using a case study of fifteen huts managed by the West Coast Conservancy of the Department of Conservation, attempts to determine the meanings associated with back country huts (Quigg, 1993:2). A substantial part of her work involved discussion with users, in order to access meanings from experience as opposed to developing a hut management strategy based only on externally designated meanings (Ibid:8;12).

Case Studies

The potential destruction of heritage and attempts to conserve it are one situation in which people are forced to recognise and to articulate emotional attachment to both the physical relic and the various levels of meaning it holds, including its part in place. The connection with heritage conservation is often one of the primary sites of expression about the importance of place. The following two case studies look at language which has emerged from just such situations, in relation to heritage management and which can be described as expressions of place.

Christchurch Cathedral Visitors' Centre, 1992

One simple example of 'finding' place through language is via an analysis of letters-to-the-editor relating to a suitable topic (Berdoulay, 1989:136). The following is a brief case study using this method. The case is the controversial decision by the Chapter of the Christchurch Cathedral to build a visitors' centre on the northern side of the Cathedral. This case is local, has generated much public response and explicitly links heritage to place. In reading the letters-to-the-editor in the Christchurch Press it becomes obvious that for many people the Cathedral is much more than a functional, discrete building. It is a site of meaning relating
to historical and cultural roots and personal identity, a symbol of 'community', and an important part of the local and the familiar.

In September 1992 the Cathedral Chapter announced a competition to design a visitors' centre for the Cathedral. The centre was to contain display, retail and exhibition space and a meeting area where light refreshments could be served (Press, 29.9.1992:1). The rationale for a centre was to provide facilities for the 300,000 visitors to the Cathedral yearly, and to provide a more welcoming place for those making use of church and mission services. The winning design was published in early December. It involved a two-storey cluster of buildings linked to the northern side of the Cathedral by a glass vault.

The design provoked instant public outcry. As with landscape (Simpson et al, 1987:19), 'place' represents part of the commons, regardless of private land ownership. The Anglican Church may own the Cathedral and the land it is on, but to many people, both these things belong to the city and to the people of Christchurch themselves.

The Church was well aware of this. The Dean of Canterbury, the Reverend John Bluck, said when the competition was announced that the designers would have to work with "an icon of the city's past and have to respect the tradition of the building at all costs" (Press, 29.9.1992:1). He recognised that "...this is a debate about the function of a church - particularly a Cathedral...Is it a shrine? A museum? A place only for certain groups of people? Or is it a place which stands in the middle of the city to give an unqualified welcome to all who come to it?" (Ibid, 11.12.1992:13).

For many people the Cathedral is an important part of Christchurch's foundation and history. Histories of the building of the Cathedral are written with a strong sense of its religious and
historical importance for a new city in what was for the settlers a new land. The Cathedral was designed by an English architect, Sir George Gilbert Scott. The foundation stone was laid in 1864 and, under local architect B.W. Mountford, was finally completed in 1908 (Turner, 1981:7).

Building the Cathedral was seen as a triumphant act on the part of the pioneers. Cattel describes the building as: "A most important landmark in Christchurch...a fitting tribute to the enthusiasm and perseverance of the Canterbury colonists" (Cattel, 1985:7). The link between the Cathedral and city is very important: "the early settlers...overcame an eight year economic depression and earthquake damage to the spire to see their gift to the city completed" (Turner, 1981:7). The spire, described at the time as "the most beautiful ornament the City could possess" (Edwards et al, 1987:6), is used for sightseeing and from the balconies "one can view the city from its very heart" (Turner, 1981:7).

The Cathedral as a Living Religious Building

For those who worship at the Cathedral or view it as a place of worship and therefore experience it as the 'familiar' in religious terms, the visitors' centre represented the present and future directions of the Church. There was a feeling that in order for the Cathedral to function as a church it must be able to change and grow:

* "Any building is the concern of those who use it. The Cathedral is surely no exception, despite its central position...Perhaps it is time the critics of the Dean and Chapter stopped regarding the Cathedral as an architectural museum, and began to see it as a living building" (17.12.1992:12).

* In Church history there are often major additions over time: "Each generation claimed the right to use the latest building styles and technologies" (17.12.1992:12).

* "It is difficult to understand how freeing space in the Cathedral to enable the growth of the Cathedral's ministry to continue can damage our heritage" (6.1.1993:12).
"I have worshipped at the Cathedral for 30 years...and have seen the development from what was to me a beautiful, but remote, place to a place of warmth and community...The building is not a museum piece to be venerated, but rather a centre that needs appropriate facilities to meet the demands of service in the nineties" (12.1.1993:12).

**Aesthetic and Architectural Meanings**

For some the problem with the centre was one of design. It was inappropriate because it was too obtrusive, too modern or too close to the War Memorial:

* The branch chairman of the New Zealand Institute of Architects, Alick Bellerby, was one of the first to declare that the design did not flatter the Cathedral "and used design forms inappropriate to the central city" (4.12.1992:7). He stated that the Cathedral was "the central image of Christchurch for residents and tourists."

* "Oh my God, what are we about to have inflicted upon our beautiful Cathedral on the north side?" (8.12.1992:12)

* The design is not "an organic grafting on in the Gothic tradition; it is more like a foreign growth that any responsible surgeon would urgently excise...An overlarge building in that location will also obscure 'The Press' and Government Buildings, one of the most impressive inner-city vistas in Christchurch" (Editorial, 12.12.1992:24).

**Cultural and Historic Meanings**

For others the idea of building a visitors' centre at all was totally unacceptable. It was historically and culturally inappropriate:

* "The ultimate tragedy of any extension to the Cathedral is surely one of a travesty of history...The Cathedral is not the home of the Anglican Church. It is a temple to all those settlers who put spade to ground on which we Cantabrians now walk" (9.12.1992:18).

* "The design chosen...is neither honouring or adding to our cultural sensitivity, and our Canterbury heritage relating to Europe is completely rubbed out" (12.12.1992:24).

* The Chapter has no right to alter the "original historic concept" (6.1.1993:12).
The Cathedral as the Familiar

Those for whom the Cathedral held meaning as a familiar place included not only those who worshipped or worked at the Cathedral, but also those who felt the Cathedral to be an essential part of their lives but who do not feel any religious attachment to it. Other terms which could be used to describe these meanings include ‘identity’ and ‘community’ meanings.

The significance of the building as a ‘religious place’ is also important. Even those who believe themselves to be totally secular attach special cultural significance to a religious building which perhaps goes beyond what they would feel for other heritage items.


* "When the premium site in the city was set aside for a cathedral, its custodians were given a dual responsibility: to the Anglican communion and to the city at large...[P]laced on the very axis of the city as it is, the Chapter appears to have abdicated responsibility to its fellow citizens" (8.12.1992:12).

* "All prominent buildings belong to some extent to the community as well as to the individual owners, and none more so in Christchurch than the Cathedral." It is "a building of merit, quite apart from the cherished place it has earned in the affection of Christchurch people" (Editorial, 12.12.1992: 24).

* "This is the most public and focal point of the city...Please don’t build this potential embarrassment to the city" (23.12.1992:16).

Negative Meanings of the Visitors’ Centre

An interesting aspect of the letters is the general outrage at what was seen as the commercial motivation for the visitors’ centre. Bluck had no qualms about the tourist potential of the Cathedral, which already earns half its budget from tourism. "We have to recognise tourism is part of the city, and I’m happy with providing facilities for tourists as long as the other functions of the Cathedral are not crowded out" (29.9.1992:1). Others did not agree. They saw the Cathedral as a source of meaning for the people who lived in Christchurch, and as something apart from the drive of commercial development:
"What is very disturbing is that the Very Reverend John Bluck, the City Council and the Historic Places Trust appear to acquiesce, be submissive, be commercially minded or strangely supportive of such a ludicrous intrusion on the sanctity of the Cathedral. It is apparent the objective has a cheap, stupid, commercial base..." (8.12.1992:12).

"The planned Christchurch Cathedral visitors' centre has a Disney Theme Park character more suited to a commercial enterprise..." (16.12.1992:1).

"...a Cathedral (temple of God) lives by the bread and wine of faith, and constructs its reality around this concept. A Cathedral that needs the fruits of a fickle tourist dollar to survive" is not serving its purpose: "the Cathedral is not there to entertain the world, but to stand for something far and beyond that" (16.12.1992:20).

"'Cathedral Square', 'Cathedral City' are not just words to this community. The building is precious to us without commercial appendages!" (23.12.1992:16)

"Is the mighty dollar fogging a benign brain?" (2.1.1993:20)

**Concluding Points**

It is acknowledged that only a certain range of people are likely to write letters to the newspaper so the range of opinions being reflected is quite narrow. To other inhabitants of the city, the Cathedral may hold less powerful associations (a urinal in the weekends), or negative ones (as a place for suicide attempts). While these associations may diminish its prominence as a heritage building or a religious icon, they do not reduce the significance of the Cathedral as part of a sense of place. A place incorporates both positive and negative meanings; the familiar, the sacred and the profane.

The Cathedral and its immediate surrounds can be defined as a 'heritage place' within the larger place of the square and the city. The fact that it has specific historical, cultural and religious meanings makes it easier for the emotional and experiential responses to it as a place to be recognised and voiced.
The word ‘community’ is a very familiar term in resource management and planning. Communities are geographic entities however. They grow out of a connection with places and are often identified by the name of the place to which they belong. The following example looks at the close connection between community and place. This is not simply a semantic quibble. To see community development exercises as closely related to people’s experiences of place would give new insights into the relationship between people and the physical environment in which they live.

The Ponsonby Plan was designed and written by the Ponsonby Urban Design Working Group (PUDWiP). The Working Group saw their task as a community-based one. The project was sparked off by public concern over the rapid and apparently arbitrary changes to the fabric of parts of Auckland City in the mid 1980s. Members of the community wanted to have some control over changes in their place (PUDWiP, 1988:1). They formed the Working Party to find out what the community valued about Ponsonby, and to ensure that those values were communicated to local decision-makers.

Community values were determined through a questionnaire distributed to all households in the Ponsonby Ward (5000 households). Seminars, ‘specialist’ study groups, area meetings and a workshop were also used to gather information from the community (De Lambert and Woodhouse, 1987:15). The study explicitly recognises some of the defining attributes of place, including the familiar aspects of the area for the people who live there, the search for what features hold what meanings for those people, and the importance of dealing with development parallel to preservation within a place. De Lambert and Woodhouse (1987:15), two members of the working party, expand on this last point:

"PUDWiP isn’t about saving Ponsonby, it’s about making development recognise what’s important about the character of Ponsonby and the community’s needs, and ensuring
these things are incorporated into development. We know we can't stop development, we don't even want to."

Summary

Language which emerges from within place can help identify and locate meanings. The more difficult task is to know how to use that knowledge. Until policy-makers recognise the equal validity of qualitative information with quantitative data, such information may continue to be undervalued in resource management planning.
Introduction to Chapter

The only conceivable replacement for the term 'landscape', according to Bourassa (1991:9), would be 'place'. The reverse is also true: the concept closest to place is that of landscape. 'Landscape' is a term that is becoming more familiar at local and regional government level, particularly in response to its inclusion in the Resource Management Act (see Nicholls, 1992). Councils are beginning to consider their responsibilities to landscape under the Act (pers.comm., de Lambert, 1993) and are becoming familiar with the word. At its narrowest, 'landscape' may still be perceived simply as 'scenery' (Nicholls, 1992:26), but the broader cultural and psychological implications of the term are becoming recognised. This chapter explores the relationship between 'landscape' and 'place'. It then investigates two very brief case studies where 'landscape' could be replaced by the word 'place'. What may be perceived by some as 'unsatisfactory' or mundane landscapes may be very satisfactory and integral places.

Place and Landscape

Terms such as 'cultural landscape' (Mark, 1993:53) and 'symbolic landscape' (Brown, 1993:132), emphasise the human experiential dimensions of landscape. Academic discussion on the terms ranges from using the two virtually interchangeably, to definite statements of their differences. Although he considers that it is possible to exchange the one word for the other in some circumstances, Bourassa (1991:9) makes the point that it is hardly possible to understand all place experiences as landscape experiences. For Relph, landscapes remain more remote and indeterminate than places: "They cannot be embraced, nor touched, nor
walked around. As we move, so the landscape moves, always there, in sight but out of reach” (Relph, 1985:23). Place is more fundamental and its most meaningful aspects are constructed in our memories and affections. Place implies a lack of judgement or choice. Relph (Ibid:27) quotes Heidegger (1962) on this. "Before any choice there is this ‘place’, where the foundations of earthly existence and human condition establish themselves". To Relph, geographical experience beings in places and reaches out from there to landscapes and regions.

Part of the difference between the two terms derives from the artistic and aesthetic dimensions of landscape. This in turns gives landscape its visual bias, to the exclusion of other senses (Bourassa, 1991:8). While visual appearance is obviously a feature in all places (Ibid:9), the concept is better able to encompass other senses - auditory, olfactory and tactile senses, and even proprioceptive senses such as the muscular sensation while climbing steps (Ibid:8) - which are all relevant in our experience of a place.

Sense of smell, as an example, has a particularly important role to play in our encounters with places. Smells have a powerful ability to evoke memories and emotions (Carlson, 1987:154), two important factors in the personal experience of place. Our sense of smell plays an important role in our recognition of the familiar. Years later we still recognise smells that have associations with our childhood, and we often recognise that something is familiar without even realising that the memory is triggered off by smell (pers.comm., Wesseling, 1993).

The aesthetic concepts of ‘beauty’ and ‘ugliness’ play an important part in professional landscape analysis. As defined by Nicholls (1992) they offer insights into place, particularly as regards the question of how to allow development and change within a place, while still
maintaining its positive and familiar meanings. After stressing the fact that there is no community consensus on what 'beauty' means, Nicholls discusses the concept as at least partly embedded in the familiar. "We respond more positively to things we know and have grown with...We also find beauty in things which are familiar to us. These are more meaningful and coherent. We also like to have control over changes to the landscape" (Nicholls, 1992:35). 'Ugliness' is by contrast an expression of incongruity. "It is something which does not fit and is seen to be 'abnormal'" (Ibid:34). Undesired landscape change can be defined as 'ugliness' (Ibid:35). Thus for Nicholls, the issues are who decides what change occurs and how fast it should proceed (Ibid:35).

Without embarking upon a major debate over the relative applicability of either term, it is important to consider the impressions conveyed by using one word instead of the other. 'Landscape' does have a visual bias and in popular perception may imply a remote and purely aesthetic setting, with some form of set rules for determining what is high quality landscape and what is not. Place, on other hand, is a much more flexible term with associations of being in place or of place, as opposed to remote or externally viewed connotations.

The degree to which 'landscape' and 'place' are interchangeable depends ultimately on the way in which each is used. The point where landscape meets place most completely is where landscape is defined as everyday experience - the manifestation of being-in-the-world and of culture (Relph, 1985:23). Bourassa's definition of landscape emphasises this. For him, landscape is inextricably intertwined with our everyday, practical lives: "Landscape demands an aesthetics of everyday experience - that it, an aesthetics of engagement rather than the philosophers' aesthetics of detachment" (Bourassa, 1991:xiv).
What some may perceived as 'unsatisfactory', mundane or unattractive landscapes may be very important places to those who live in them. This point is illustrated by the example of the Department of Conservation's plans to revegetate Motutapu Island in Auckland's Hauraki Gulf.

Motutapu Island is a long low island lying behind Rangitoto Island and linked by a causeway. Once forested, it was one of the earliest sites of human occupation in New Zealand. It is the ancestral home to Arawa and Tainui people. The island was covered in ash by the formation and repeated eruptions of Rangitoto, making its soils fertile and ideal for human occupation. It had already been mostly cleared of forest by the time Europeans arrived and began to use it for farming. It is still a farm today, occupied by a ranger and the farm family and staff. Rangitoto by contrast has been slowly reforesting itself after the last eruption some 200 years ago, and is characterised by "a remarkable, very young and rapidly evolving ecosystem comprising coastal forest dominated by pohutakawa" (DOC, 1992a:53).

According to DOC, "Rangitoto has a high public profile and is readily identified as a symbol of Auckland" (DOC, 1992b:1). Motutapu however has a different relationship with the city. There are some very impressive views of Auckland from the higher points and ridgelines of the island. From other vantage points, looking out into the Gulf, the island gives the impression of being very remote. It is a popular camping site in summer and is visited by thousands of 'boaties' each year, but, according to DOC:

"Despite its long and varied record of human habitation and activities, its considerable historic legacy and natural resources and its close proximity to New Zealand's most populated city, there would be few in the wider community with an awareness of, or attachment to, Motutapu" (DOC, 1992b:1).
The revegetation concept for Motutapu Island involves a long-term planting process over 50 years. The goal is to replace up to two-thirds of the island with indigenous forest and wetlands. The Auckland community and local iwi are to be involved in the planting and sponsorship will be sought from local businesses. One of the aims of the project is to produce an "enhanced island landscape" as seen from Auckland and the inner Hauraki Gulf (Ibid:3).

An interesting feature of the revegetation programme is the decision to retain the farm, despite its apparent incongruity with indigenous forests. The rationale for this is based on the feelings people already have for Motutapu. The contrast between Rangitoto, dark, tall and forested, and Motutapu behind it, gently sloping, low and grass-green, is familiar and aesthetically pleasing to many. The present farming use also reflects the history of the island, a very different and human one than on Rangitoto. Once planting is finished, the farm will be much smaller than now, but will occupy the elevated central portion of the island, thus retaining "the rolling pastured landform which is so much a part of Motutapu's present character. The contrast between open space and planted areas will enhance the overall visual quality of the landscape" (Ibid:21).

The retention of the farm on the island illustrates a cultural contradiction about landscapes in this country. The "rolling pastured landform" is to be partly retained, despite the fact that the Department is going to so much trouble and expense to change that landform over most of the island. There is a tension between what is an appropriate and what is a beautiful landscape. DOC describes the existing landscape in terms that imply how 'unsatisfactory' it is: "Motutapu is characterised by a somewhat bland pastoral landscape..." (DOC, June 1992:7). The Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (RFBPS), who have been much involved in the scheme, criticised the Department for trying to cater to too many values. The
Society wants ecological restoration to be the primary goal, and could see no justification for retaining the farm in a country dominated by pastoral landscapes (RFBPS, 1992:2-4).

This contradiction helps to explain why so much of the work that has been done on place is very urban-based, and why the previous two examples were firmly urban in nature. Not only are urban areas obviously very closely connected with people and therefore more readily characterised as place, but New Zealanders have a tendency to class ‘natural’ landscapes as native forest, while having come to feel that there is something unsatisfactory about their rural landscapes.

These landscapes often represent domination of both land and the original inhabitants, destruction of the forests, over-fertilization, runoff and erosion. Cooper sees the average rural scene as "impoverished landscapes":

"...the millions of hectares of ordinary farmland - denuded of their forest cover, stifled in introduced pasture grass species, strangled by exotic weeds, drenched in artificial fertilizers, the sterile squared-off production paddocks typical of much of the southern Hawkes Bay, Canterbury or the Hauraki Plains...Most of our pastoral scenery can still be summed up in Lady Barker’s immortal words: ‘mud, mutton and monotony’" (Cooper, 1992:5-6).

There seems to be a difficulty in expressing emotional feeling for ‘ordinary’ rural landscapes or in dealing with the fact that for many people these landscapes have meanings other than the history and economy of pastoral New Zealand, meanings which include a sense of place for those who experience these landscapes as part of the ‘familiar’.

*The Landscape of the Port Hills*

In considering the relationship between the Port Hills and Christchurch City, the Christchurch City Council’s 1992 landscape study opens with a statement which could be considered an
expression of the importance of the hills to the city's 'sense of place':

"The Port Hills are the most significant land form apparent from the city...Because of this they are probably the only major feature of the city that is encountered everyday, by nearly everyone, everywhere" (Briggs and Craig, 1992:i).

From an ecological point of view, the hills are not representative of New Zealand's indigenous landscape, and nor are they particularly fertile. They are mostly bare of trees, some parts are badly eroded, and the vegetation is predominantly grasslands for pastoral farming, which is by no means unique in New Zealand. Apart from the fact that they are an impressive contrast to the plains around them, the Port Hills could be described as an 'unsatisfactory landscape' in Cooper's or Parks' terms.

This is certainly not how they are viewed by the Christchurch City Council, nor, in the Council's opinion, by the people of Christchurch (Ibid:1). While recognising the importance of protecting the remnants of native vegetation on the hills, Briggs and Craig base their study around the need to keep the hills in their present state; that is, as a familiar part of the lives of the people who live in and around Christchurch City. Pastoral farming, even where it has become uneconomic, is to be maintained, and forestry is to be discouraged, so as to retain the existing rural character of the hills. The hills are not just a backdrop to the city. They are used for recreation, agriculture and horticulture, housing, and as a landmark for orienting oneself in the city. This gives the hills multiple meanings in the day-to-day lives of those who experience them as part of their 'place'.

Summary

To a certain extent 'landscape' and 'place' are interchangeable terms. However, with its visual bias, and academic and professional background, landscape is perceived as the more
limited concept. This is important. Landscape policies are not adequate substitutes for meaningful investigations into what constitutes a sense of place.
Chapter Six - ‘Placing’ New Zealand

Introduction to Chapter

Having explored the importance of language in expressing meanings in place in an earlier chapter, this chapter looks firstly at the importance of naming places, in the context of European colonization of New Zealand. Colonization layers new meanings over existing ones, or ‘re-places’ meanings. In considering the current relationship between place and heritage management in New Zealand, the phenomenon of cultural/heritage tourism is examined as a form of re-colonization itself.

Replacing Meanings: The Example of Waahi Tapu

We have explored the concept of imparting meaning to place through experiencing it within one’s own particular biographical and cultural interpretive scheme. A place holds meaning different meanings to different people, and to different cultures. New meanings are laid over old ones much in the same way as new physical features are built on the sites of old ones. This can be seen as both constructive and destructive, at the same time. Something new and vital is constructed, but something else has been at least partially erased or ‘replaced’.

So much of New Zealand has been altered and so many places ‘replaced’, that this is something of which New Zealanders are now acutely conscious. There is concern that things are changing too quickly; that parts of places which still had meaning to some groups are being replaced; and that what they are being replaced with has no meaning or the ‘wrong’ sort of meaning. How are meanings replaced, and what happens to ‘place’ as this process occurs?
Part of this replacement occurs in the landscape we use to label and describe things. Words, including names, are not merely labels. They are "the evocation of what things are and how they are related to other things in the web of particular lives and places" (Mugerauer, 1985:59). When European immigrants arrived in New Zealand, a first step towards 'ownership', and towards making their own places, was to rename the land. Pawson sees this as the first step in creating a "new iconography of the landscape", with the naming being an act of dominion over the land (Pawson, 1992:23). The bigger towns at least lost most Maori names for place and landscape features.

The renaming was not simply a negative act of domination. It was also a step toward creating a home in a new country. Names which meant so much to the Maori living there did not mean anything to new settlers. They preferred the names brought with them from their homes, a thread of connection to past places and roots which provided at least one familiar base from which to build anew. Even when Maori place names were kept, the meanings ascribed to them by the European settlers would be very different from their original meanings. The symbolic renaming of places, however, did distance settler society from the meanings and the 'ownership' of Maori people.

The replacement of meaning can have physical ramifications. What determines how something is managed, or whether it is kept or destroyed, is the meaning that thing holds for those with the power to manage, keep or destroy.

The way in which meanings dictate management is illustrated by the way in Maori waahi tapu have been defined and managed. Maori tribes have often been associated with the same area of the country for hundreds of years and over that time historic and spiritual connections with that area or place have created identity and meaning in natural features, burial places,
battlefields, villages and cultivations. "Out of this are created waahi tapu - sites sacred by their historic and spiritual association. A product of the wairua and mauri of people and events of the past" (Challenger, 1988:8).

The Maori view of such places is that they must be preserved. In traditional times the desecration of a waahi tapu by an enemy was a terrible act justly deserving utu (revenge) (Add, 1988:31). "Failure to observe the tapu is to injure the wairua and defile the past" (Challenger, 1988:8).

Maori waahi tapu are now managed by the Historic Places Trust in close conjunction with the Department of Conservation. Under the old Historic Places Act 1980, waahi tapu were defined as 'traditional sites': "a place or site that is important by reason of its historical significance or spiritual or emotional association with the Maori people..." (S.2). For management purposes these were treated as archaeological sites. There are an estimated 60,000 pre- and post-European sites in New Zealand. A clue to the way in which they are viewed by European New Zealanders can be found in the 1980 Act, which includes as part of the attributes of an archaeological site, that "which is or may be able through investigation by archaeological techniques to provide scientific, cultural, or historical evidence as to the exploration, occupation, settlement or development of New Zealand" (S.2).

Archaeological site management in New Zealand has been dominated by the "Pakeha bureaucratic administrative tradition" (Add, 1988:31), complemented by the Pakeha academic tradition and ‘interested amateurs’, also Pakeha. The basic premise of the archaeologists is that architectural sites are a resource which should be ‘used’ to produce scientific information (Add, 1988:31). Sites are preserved because at some future date they may be excavated and interpreted to reveal facts about the way Maori people lived. "For non-Maori interest groups,
the archaeological site is akin to a commodity which can be traded for some sort of scientific or other return" (Adds, 1988:31). Over the meanings ascribed to their places by Maori are layered the meanings ascribed by Pakeha archaeology. These new meanings greatly effect the way in which waahi tapu are physically treated.

Out of such meanings new stories are created and new histories discovered. Archaeologists use scientific 'facts' to create their stories of how Maori people lived in the past. In other words, European scientists represent Maori people back to themselves. Often their view of 'reality' is very different from Maori world views:

"It is an unfortunate fact of history that the nature of the results of archaeological research usually threaten the Maori world view. This is because the 'scientific' answers...are often at odds with, or take no account of, the accepted Maori traditions relating to a site or the area around a site. Often archaeological research 'tramples' on the knowledge and mana of the Maori people who are the kaitiaki of the waahi tapu" (Adds, 1988:32).

To some, the new meanings attributed to an object or a site not only change what happens to it, but change the composition of the object itself. Gerald McMasters, a Plains Cree Indian artist, spoke at a recent conference about the way in which objects themselves are changed by the effects of successive layers of meaning (McMasters, 1993).

In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when it was assumed by European settlers in America that American Indian culture was doomed to extinction, great collecting sprees were undertaken to gather Indian sacred and traditional objects. At first this collecting was seen as an end in itself, but as ideas changed it came to be thought that these objects should be displayed in a way which gave them new meaning. These museum displays would tell the history of pre-contact Indian culture, as interpreted and represented by European ethnologists and museum curators. Simultaneously, the economic value of these objects began to rise meteorically and many were sold and scattered around the world.
McMasters talks about the significance of these histories of meaning to the objects themselves. The mainstream Western view is that "objects don't mean; people mean". These objects however have been wrapped in layer after layer of meaning throughout their lives. They are interpreted, displayed, commodified and now disputed over as the original owners try to reacquire objects whose original meanings even they are no longer sure of. For McMasters and other Indians, the objects, although vital for the reconstruction of their culture and their lives, have new meanings layered over the original ones and are thus subtly changed.

This may be hard for secular Western cultures to grasp, but it is an important concept which links back to earlier discussion about place as an autonomous level of meaning. Objects, like places, can be seen not only as reflections of cultural beliefs and values, but also as having a meaning in their own right which in turn affects the formation of cultures.

As for the meanings which existed for Maori people in their waahi tapu, however much they may have been altered they are not lost as long as they are held in cultural memory. Adds expresses it thus: "This intensity associated with waahi tapu has never been lost, merely inundated in an expanding Pakeha dominated cultural milieu" (1988:31).

It seems that in the new Historic Places Act 1993 they have been rediscovered to some degree. The term 'waahi tapu' is used in the Act, defined as "a place sacred to Maori in the traditional, spiritual, religious, visual, or mythological sense" (S.2). Although the definition of an archaeological site retains the "investigation by archaeological methods" clause, the purpose and principles of the Act include stipulations that all relevant cultural values, knowledge and disciplines be taken account of in managing cultural heritage, and that research be undertaken "where culturally appropriate" (S.4(b)(i),(iv)). The sensitivities in the legislation will be reinforced under the aegis of the newly formed Maori Heritage Council.
Earlier in this chapter, the term 'power' was used to describe the process whereby some sectors of society are able to define and decide the dominant meaning and fate of heritage and of place. It may seem a cliche to say that place is not neutral, but this is something which can be overlooked in some definitions of place. People ascribe different meanings to places and the things within it, but the physical way in which that place is constituted, which we have agreed is very important for meaning, also conveys different meanings. What is kept, what is built, and where either occurs, is determined by those with the power to develop and to make decisions. In a city or town for example, the form of places is often determined by planners, architects, engineers, developers and entrepreneurs. Jacobs makes the point clearly:

"...it is important not simply to know that environment is meaningful but to know who is communicating through the environment, to what audience and to what purposes. Townscapes and urban localities must be seen as part of a discursive communicative realm..." (1992:197).

According to Jacobs, there has been a rise in conservation mentality in both popular opinion and in planning ideology and practice (1992:195), which for many people represents a triumph over the dehumanising, destructive aspects of modernization:

"Heritage, particularly conservation of the historic built environment, has been seen as a counter-force to cycles of capital accumulation expressed in new redevelopment; an example of cultural values (as opposed to economic values) shaping the urban scene" (Jacobs, 1992:195).

Jacobs points out, however, that it is dangerous to see this preservation as somehow apart from normal power and capital-accumulating processes, and that it is simplistic to see preservation as unquestionably positive. She warns of the "hegemonic potential" in heritage preservation, which can prove to be simply yet another vehicle for the status and power of the dominant sectors of society (Ibid:196).
In phenomena such as gentrification and heritage tourism it can be seen that heritage means money: "The past has become part of the processes of production and consumption associated with capital accumulation. The past has become commodified" (Ibid, 1992:194).

Paradoxically, preservation can become the force of change, as happens when old areas of a town become valued as heritage and are 'gentrified' for the upper-income market. As this new, wealthy population moves in, the poorer inhabitants are forced to move elsewhere, and the character of the neighbourhood changes.

This commodification process raises an important issue. If people have been investing heritage with meanings related to its perceived position as a "counterforce" to development, and as a source of identity and continuity in a rapidly changing world, then this is an added 'value' in that heritage. Perhaps this perception of old things 'saved' makes heritage items a special bastion of anti-modernism within our places. When these items are managed as if they are just the same as any other commodity, those values are lost. People may be left feeling displaced after all, even while the heritage item is left standing, if commercial values become the dominant meaning for that heritage.

Tourism as a Totalizing Discourse

It is tourism which has the greatest potential to commodify cultural heritage in New Zealand to the extent that many of its other meanings, including its role in 'place', are obliterated.

Tourism is becoming increasingly important in New Zealand's economy. Heritage tourism is seen as a way to offset the 'costs' of preserving cultural heritage. The economic imperative reverberates through the Corporate Plan of the Ministry of Cultural Affairs, in aims such as the promotion of New Zealand's cultural identity both in New Zealand and overseas, and
increased foreign exchange earnings from cultural industries (MCA, 1992:3).

Tourism is an important part of Hall and McArthur's interpretation of heritage management. Their thesis is that much of New Zealand's heritage is poorly interpreted and managed, with a resultant loss in the quality of the heritage (Hall and McArthur, 1992:ix). People experience heritage sites by going there and so will naturally have an impact on that site. The idea is to manage it so that the visitor or tourist has a 'quality experience' in a sustainable manner.

Hall and McArthur's recommendations also reflect the growing economic pressure on conservation. While admitting that it is the social significance of heritage that first arouses interest in some form of protection, they state that economics is often the decisive factor in deciding whether or not that actually happens: "One of the main justifications for preserving heritage, especially from the point of view of government and the private sector, is the value of heritage for recreation and tourism" (Ibid, p.4). Heritage can be big business. 'User-pays' philosophy and the growing importance of cultural/heritage tourism in New Zealand also point to the need to consider visitor management strategies.

An emphasis on managing cultural heritage for tourism raises two important issues. The first relates to what version of past and present is to be presented to those tourists and, by implication, to New Zealanders themselves. The second issue is the effect on place of an emphasis on managing for the visitor.

The Creation of New Zealand Culture

One of the goals of the Ministry of Cultural Affairs is the "[p]romotion of New Zealand's cultural identity both in New Zealand and overseas" (MCA, 1992:3). This raises the obvious questions of what New Zealand's cultural identity actually is, and who is going to be representing that identity to whom.
This is a concern in other 'post-colonial' countries. Heritage and cultural tourism are also big business in Canada. Harp expresses the concern of many in that country that promotion for tourism is a hegemonic project, involving the state representing Canada to the world (and to itself) as an harmonious multicultural society (Harp, 1993). Cultures are seen as 'assets'; as 'other'; and as 'spice' to liven up 'ordinary' (ie white European) culture. Multiculturalism itself is a policy pursued in part because it is good for tourism business. For example, Canada's tourism promotion board held a conference devoted to marketing ethnocultural communities, entitled 'Multiculturalism Means Business'.

Cultural/heritage tourism can be seen therefore as a means of communicating 'culture' in its narrowest definition. There is concern over what is being communicated, and over who has the right to represent other groups and cultures. Particular sectors of a dominant culture represent another culture to the world and to the nation, and of course back to members of that culture themselves (Morris, 1993).

Tourism not only represents us to ourselves; it retells our history. Reinterpretation of the past is a continuous and healthy cultural and societal process. "Realising that the past is not just what happened back then but is also a set of subsequent constructions, we discard the outgrown perspectives and anachronistic behaviour of an inflexible legacy, and learn that remaking that legacy is not only inevitable but salutary" (Lowenthal, 1985:xxiv). It is difficult for settler societies to construct a national history, and history is playing a very important role for all people in New Zealand at the present time, as we try to construct bearable yet 'genuine' pasts out of the consequences of colonialism.

As we seek to redefine our identity as individuals, community, culture and nation, what effect will cultural and heritage tourism have on those redefinitions? Will we rediscover ourselves
only in terms of what is marketable to overseas visitors? Will our cultures and our past be altered in ways that are no longer constructive and useful to us, but defined in terms of what tourists expect to find when they come to a place?

**Managing for the Visitor?**

Managing heritage for the sake of respecting and preserving the part it plays in maintaining a sense of place means managing it for the many stories it nourishes; that is, for those who obtain part of their personal and cultural identity from it. This is a management aim fundamentally different from the tourism imperative. The emphasis is on what is familiar to those who see a place as ‘their place’, rather than being on the ‘exotic’ for the sake of the visitor. Visitors come and go, but the place keeps its ‘soul’ as it were through the people who are part of it. The visitor can perhaps feel the ‘sense of place’ at an archaeological site or in a street of 1920s buildings, and may respect the integrity of the place or even experience profound reactions towards it. The place, however, will remain when the visitor has returned to her or his own places; it is independent of the itinerant.

In complete contrast to this, Hall and McArthur stress the aim of heritage management should be visitor management. Providing a high-quality visitor experience and controlling the behaviour of visitors will "ensure that the values of the heritage resource are maintained" (Hall and McArthur, 1992:13). In deciding that management for the visitor should be the guiding ethos, several assumptions are being made. While visitor experience may be the main form of human-heritage interface at an isolated archaeological site or in a museum, this is not the case in urban areas or in areas where there is a local population. In such areas the interface is local, the artificial boundary between preservation and development is constantly being threatened, and a heritage building or site is surrounded by dynamic political and social forces. In these situations, an emphasis on the visitor overlooks the significance of the people
who live with and around any heritage item; and it is in such situations that the concept of
enhancing or facilitating the meanings in 'place' may offer a different, more culturally-driven
ethos for management.

**Summary**

This chapter reaffirms the concept that there are 'positive' and 'negative' meanings deriving
from any place. The normative aspects of the concept of place advocate the encouragement
and enhancement of positive meanings in place. This requires not only the means of finding
what these are, but also the political will to make such an exercise possible. The obscuring
of the stories of certain groups, or the replacement of one totalizing discourse (for example, a
scientific paradigm) with another, tourism, is the opposite of encouraging a sense of place as
defined within this study.
Chapter Seven - Conclusion

To attempt to 'manage' or 'plan' for place is to deny the autonomous and personal/cultural origins of place. Better terms include 'encouraging', 'facilitating' and 'nurturing.' Those involved in planning and resource management, however, are among those most likely to be involved in the preserving or changing of places. This project has been aimed at introducing the concept of place to those people, and examining it in a way that not only highlights its importance, but also discusses place as a practicable and necessary level of thought and action for planning and resource management.

Several major points can be extracted from the discussion. The first is the fact that thinking about development and preservation, cultural and natural environments, in terms of place requires a high degree of reflexivity. It requires thinking very hard about how people live, how they construct patterns and meanings out of their interaction with the world, and most importantly how they live their everyday lives - the place and condition in which they spend most of their lives.

To encourage a positive sense of place requires a re-examination of what is important to people and why. From this it follows that there must be some way of finding out what things mean to different people. In this project the importance of contextual discourse rather than an imposed totalizing discourse has been stressed. Place comes from those who live there, not from a series of outside determinants or rules of analysis.

Place is always constructed out of mutual meaning between place and person, but these meanings are not necessarily 'good' or positive meanings (Relph, 1985:27). A healthy and positive connection between place and people plays an important part in individual and
cultural/social wellbeing. The final major point concerns place as a normative concept, where the ‘active’ role for a manager or planner is that of encouraging positive meanings. Bourassa (1991:117) defines the issue as one of deciding whether proposed change within a place (or landscape) will be "culturally disintegrative" or "culturally vitalizing". For him, this is a question of "fit": the relationship between new forms and existing cultural values. This does not mean freezing places as they are now in order to preserve their meanings. What it does mean however is considering carefully how changes react to existing meanings in one way or another (Ibid:118).

The days of single solutions and ‘blueprint planning’ are numbered. There is instead a growing appreciation for incrementalism and "muddling through"(Bourassa, 1991:135). Inspiring and encouraging ‘positive places’ does not require setting goals or directions for the future. It centres around realising and celebrating what Bourassa calls the "messy vitality" of places (Ibid:135). Because it is the complete place we experience and respond to, not just separate objects within it, it also involves a concern for ‘wholes’; the individual developments and changes which occur within a place effect the meaning of the whole.

While thinking of place as something normative and a field for political action, it is important to note that even ‘facilitating’ or ‘encouraging’ place is a form of manipulation which may lead in turn to certain meanings becoming ‘totalizing discourses’ of a new theme. To what extent can or should we take control of place? This is an ethical question (pers.comm., Keith Morrison, 1993), and one which must be considered alongside attempts to understand the relationship between people and places.
There are three elements which play a major role in defining positive meanings for place:

*Continuity/stability over time.* This is particularly relevant in the relationship between the defining and preservation of cultural heritage, and economic development. As discussed earlier, Nicholls sees ideas of beauty as at least partly connected with feeling of stability and continuity (ref). Costonis also develops this line of argument, in what he calls a cultural stability-identity theory of aesthetics (Costonis, 1982; in Bourassa, 1991:65). Part of the reason we perceive an old building or long-lived tree as ‘beautiful’ and worth preserving is, in Costonis’ view, a reflection of the fact that aesthetic values are reflections of groups’ desires to maintain stability and protect their identities. This extends beyond the immediate sensory or physical environment, to the meanings ascribed through personal experience and cultural/group patterns or rules (Bourassa, 1991:92).

*Contrast and definition.* In talking of cities, Bourassa points out that urban form must be bounded and defined if it is to serve as a repository for human meaning. He calls the definition process "place creation" or "enclave creation": "the bounded urban fragment" (Bourassa, 1991:139) which is recognisably differentiated from other places around it. This aspect of place has been partially recognised by the Christchurch City Council in their study of open space in the central city. They focus on the identity aspects which make Christchurch City firstly a city (as differentiated from suburban or rural places), and secondly a unique city, different from all other cities (Craig and Doeksen, 1992). Entrikin uses the term ‘specificity’ as related to concepts of uniqueness and the idiographic. Places are specific because each one is fused with meaning and cultural significance (Entrikin, 1991:16).

"Uniqueness thus becomes a function of the quality of experience rather than a description of a world (ie a place or a region) that is completely external to the knowing subject" (Ibid:18).
Control over change. An active involvement with one's physical environment is an important basis for experiencing place and maintaining positive associations and meanings (Seamon, 1985:240). "The suggestion is that active human effort in relation to the physical environment is an integral step in a successful completion of the dwelling process" (Ibid:240). As Seamon points out, however, many people are without a role in building, repairing or improving their environment, and are without the power to influence changes going on around them.

These three elements in combination provide a starting point for the positive 'creation' of place.

Sustainability and Place: Learning to Dwell

Personal and cultural attachment to a place increases the likelihood that people will care for and want to nourish the aspects of that place which have positive meanings to them. Place as a concept forms a basis from which to move towards more environmentally sustainable ways of life, beginning in a connection with, and responsibility for, one's own place.

Furthermore, as discussed above, the Resource Management Act 1991 makes reference to the term 'place' and may therefore be a useful 'handle' for policies which reflect the concept. Heritage management is increasingly coming under the umbrella of the Act (Butts, 1993:p?). The aim of the Act being sustainable management, the importance of the idea of sustainability is increased in any discussion which looks at natural and cultural 'resources', or which deals with planning and resource management issues.

2 I am indebted to Keith Morrison (Natural Resources Engineering Department, Lincoln University) for first alerting me to the links between the two concepts.
Seamon's term for developing and enhancing a positive and nurturing sense of place, "learning to dwell" (1985:227), can be used as a metaphor for the relationship between sustainability and place. Dwelling, in his definition, involves a lifestyle of regularity, repetition and cyclicity, grounded in an atmosphere of care and concern for places, things, and people.

"A pure form of dwelling is probably never possible in practice, but this fact does not dilute its significance for daily life. Dwelling can be seen as an aim to strive for, and one need is for people to become more self-consciously aware of their degree and mode of dwelling and to seek ways in which they might better dwell" (Seamon, 1985:227).

'Learning to dwell' is an overtly cultural concept. It may therefore be more accessible and more 'user-friendly' than strictly ecological arguments for sustainability.

A Final Word

Some of the concepts contained in this project may seem difficult to grasp, or too far removed from political and economic life to be in any sense practical. However, just as our inability to express some emotions and concepts does not make them irrelevant or less important, so it is with ideas about how human beings live. Simply because they seem awkward or 'illogical' does not stop them having major impacts in our lives. Where we live is more than where we happen to be. It is where we build our lives from, and forms part of our emotion and cultural wellbeing, our identity, connection with the past, and it is our home. The meanings we invest in our places are more than merely incidental to political and economic rationales. The events of human existence occur within place; places and people must be understood together.
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