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This thesis explores the way in which New Zealand’s most recent national park was created from the perspective of the affected community, presenting a qualitative case study of the creation of Rakiura National Park as perceived by Stewart Islanders. It investigates their understandings and experience of the transition from being a community based on fishing and crayfishing to one focused on nature based tourism.

The strong link between conservation and tourism in New Zealand dates back to the creation of New Zealand’s first national park, Tongariro, in 1894. The creation of New Zealand’s 14th and latest national park, Rakiura (Stewart Island), in 2002 is a continuation of this relationship. Conservation and tourism have existed in a symbiotic relationship throughout their history on Stewart Island, with either one unable to exist without the other.

Supporting the primary qualitative data, the thesis incorporates historical research which provides the context within which the creation of the national park must be viewed. In presenting the findings, the concepts of ‘path dependency’ and Pawson and Le Heron’s (1996) ‘Geographic Restructuring Model’ have been employed to understand and explain the events that led to, and enabled, the creation of the National Park.

The creation of Rakiura National Park be contextualised within the historical ‘boom–bust’ pattern that industries on Stewart Island have generally followed. This pattern reflects the interplay of local attempts to derive a living and macro forces that continue to influence the viability of industries on Stewart Island. A number of resource extractive industries have been attempted on the Island over the last 200 years, nearly all of which have eventually failed. This has left the majority of the Island’s natural environment in the pristine condition; a prerequisite for a national park. ‘Pristine wilderness’ attributes are
widely recognised as New Zealand's main attraction for visitors. The conservation estate and natural environment have been used to great affect in promoting New Zealand as a tourism destination; central to this are the national parks. Within this tradition, Rakiura National Park has emerged as a drawcard for tourists, promising the economic reinvigoration of the Island; and the new National Park was therefore gazetted by the Govt in 2002.

While the new Rakiura National Park would therefore seem to represent a 'win-win' situation for Islanders and conservation, the reality is more complex and involves substantial costs as well as benefits. This thesis engages with the ways in which Islanders interpreted the process by which the park was created and considers their views on the likely consequences. This leads to a series of recommendations for the future management of the conservation process by central govt, highlighting the critical importance of preliminary engagement with affected communities.
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Chapter One: The Story of the Fight Over the Creation of Rakiura National Park

There is a strong historical relationship between conservation and tourism in New Zealand dating back to the 19th century, evident in the establishment of the National Parks. The importance of scenery and nature for attracting tourists was recognised by this time and was reflected by the lawmakers of the time establishing scenery protection legislation. However, the combination of tourism and conservation presents an uneasy paradox for communities on the fringes of affected areas, representing both economic opportunities and potential costs.

Regardless of the long connection of tourism with the establishment of conservation land in New Zealand, the role tourism has played in relation to conservation initiatives within the last twenty years has become more pronounced. Protected natural areas, and the iconic landforms contained therein, are increasingly being utilised to sell New Zealand as an international tourism destination, while the tourism generated by this marketing is now being used to ‘sell’ conservation initiatives to local communities.

The creation of national parks in New Zealand during this period has had a number of consequences for the local communities, especially in terms of a change in economic focus, from natural resource extractive industries to nature based tourism. This transition from extraction to conservation based tourism is accompanied by the culture that has developed around traditional natural resource extractive industries, such as fishing, logging and mining, that once sustained these communities.

With the economic restructuring that began in the 1980s, as well as increasing preoccupation with environmental concerns and the need for sustainable industry, many of these industries were forced to close. The consequence for the small peripheral communities that relied upon these resources has been the ‘locking up’ of their traditional sources of income by government representatives.

In 2002, the most recent National Park, Rakiura, was created by the New Zealand Government, comprising the majority of the land area of Stewart Island. This development was heralded as a victory for conservation and economics in the form of increased tourism. Yet the process by which the park was created has had powerful implications for the
Stewart Island community. This thesis presents a case study of the perceptions of the people of Stewart Island of the creation of New Zealand’s most recent national park. It examines the manner in which it was created; their experiences and understandings of their transition from fishing and crayfishing to nature-based tourism; and the effects of these changes upon their settlement and their lives.

This research is relevant to future conservation initiatives and developments that affect or involve neighbouring communities and their industries and aims to provide a means of mitigating issues and perceived, and real, negative effects of such developments and initiatives; such as the Department of Conservation’s aim to have 10 percent of New Zealand’s marine area protected by 2010 and the current High Country tenure review. To this end this thesis has adopted the concept of ‘path dependency’ from the field of economics to help make sense of the Rakiura National Park case study.

The concept of path dependency provides a means to examine the influence of past choices and decisions upon the present social, economic and physical conditions and situation. Through path dependency it is possible to trace the development of a particular area and thereby provide the context within which any conservation development or initiative is imbedded. By understanding the social, industrial and economic contextual aspects of an area, conservation planners and managers will be better prepared to engage with ‘host’ communities and have a deeper understanding of the particularities that may otherwise prove to be barriers to successful implementation of conservation initiatives and developments.

In the case of Stewart Island it is necessary to first understand the Island’s history of settlement and ‘boom and bust’ industry development. The future and present options for the Island and its community have been set through the history of settlement and development on the Island, creating path dependency that has inevitability influenced the present situation and the continued development of conservation and tourism on Stewart Island. This thesis provides a sociological historical narrative from which to examine the story of Stewart Island and Rakiura National Park.
Throughout this thesis Stewart Island is referred to as 'the Island.' Although the data collection preceded the gazettal of Rakiura National Park at the time of writing the National Park had been gazetted and therefore I refer to it as a National Park. While the main settlement of the Island is referred to as both Oban and Halfmoon Bay, throughout this thesis I use the more common name: Halfmoon Bay.\(^1\)

In the following section I present an overview of Stewart Island and some of its characteristics that are of direct relevance to this case study. I then introduce the Department of Conservation and provide a brief summary of its roles. Following this I present an overview of the case study, the methods employed during the field work and the analysis stages of this study.

### 1.1. Overview of Stewart Island

Stewart Island is situated to the south of the South Island of New Zealand, separated from the mainland by a 25km stretch of water. The 1,746km\(^2\) Island is home to a population of 384 people all of whom live on the north eastern coast, in and around the settlement of Halfmoon Bay. Fishing and crayfishing industries dominated the Island’s social, cultural and economic life from 1945 until the neo-liberal restructuring of the 1980s. This situation began to change with the introduction of a fishing quota management system, under the *Fisheries Act 1983*, as part of the restructuring that took place in New Zealand in the 1980s. This challenged the reliance on fishing and crayfishing, the economic mainstay of the Island and main source of employment and income for the Islanders, leading to a decline in the population of the Island, which in turn has initiated a flow-on of other social and economic effects. Responding to the challenges faced, some members of the Stewart Island community have seized the opportunity to expand one of the Island’s oldest industry’s, tourism. Tourism on the Island has always relied on the Island’s natural features and recreational opportunities. By creating a national park on the Island some members of the community believed that they would be able to attract more tourists, as ‘national parks’ are seen as a label or brand that is used to sell destinations and attract tourists.

\(^1\) I use the first person singular narrative throughout my thesis as opposed to the convention of the third person.
The Island has largely been untouched by industry, development and settlement, with 92 percent of the Island existing as conservation land. Before the gazettal of Rakiura National Park this land was comprised of 76 different parcels of conservation land, ranging from nature reserves, the highest protection status possible, through to scenic reserves. This land is Crown land managed by the Department of Conservation (DoC) on behalf of the people of New Zealand.

1.2. The Department of Conservation

DoC was created under the Conservation Act 1987, forming New Zealand's first government department solely concerned with conservation. DoC inherited the conservation roles of the New Zealand Forest Service, the Department of Lands and Survey, the New Zealand Wildlife Service, and the Ministry of Works amongst others. Previously these government agencies had dual conservation and development roles. The Ministry of Works for example managed 'wild and scenic rivers' but also had the responsibility for building dams and issuing water rights, a scenario described by environmentalists as “goats guarding cabbages” (Bührs and Bartlett 193:95-96).

The Department of Conservation's primary functions are:

- To manage all natural and historical resources allocated to it for conservation purposes;
- To advocate and promote the conservation of natural and historic resources, and to foster recreation and allow tourism consistent with its conservation priorities.

Conservation policy is developed at the national level to direct Regional Conservancy and Area Offices on the use and management of the conservation estate, including the 1995 Visitor Management Strategy, which sets out objectives for the management and development of tourism and recreation facilities and resources on conservation land. Other conservation legislation that has influence over the land includes the National Parks Act 1983 and the General Policy on National Parks 2005.
1.3. **National Parks Act 1980 and General Policy on National Parks 1983**

Section 4(1) of the National Parks Act (1998) sets out the purpose of national parks. These are to preserve in perpetuity, “for their intrinsic worth and for the benefit, use and enjoyment of the public, areas of New Zealand that contain scenery of such distinctive quality, ecological systems, or natural features so beautiful, unique or scientifically important that their preservation is in the national interest.” Chapter Three presents the natural features of Stewart Island that are considered to make 85 percent of the Island worthy of national park status under this Act.

In addition to the requirement to assess areas as to their suitability in terms of Section 4(1), a number of criteria are used to assess the suitability of areas suggested as new national parks. These criteria are stated in the General Policy for National Parks; Policy 7 – Selecting New Parks and Park Boundaries (See Appendix 1 for a full description).

1.4. **The Case Study: Methods Used And The Rationale Behind The Research**

The case study stemmed firstly from my interest in conservation, communities, and tourism; and, secondly, from my interest in the effects of macro-driven changes upon the micro-level and individuals. The research is qualitative, and builds on a substantive base of historical investigation of secondary sources with which to provide the foundational context upon which to build the contemporary analysis and discussion.

My approach stems from the assumed inseparability of theory and method when conducting qualitative interviews, and was guided by the naturalistic research method developed by symbolic interactionists (Blumer 1969; Lofland and Lofland 1995; Tolich and Davidson 1999). Using this approach, qualitative research methods help to inform the researcher of the overarching concepts can be utilised to explain the community’s experience. This involved fieldwork which included participant observation, informal interviews, the keeping of a journal, and unstructured in-depth interviews. As this thesis is concerned with the meanings ascribed by members of the Stewart Island community to the
ongoing changes on their Island, these methods offered the type of rich data that can
describe and inform.

My research began with exploration of secondary sources. These included the Department
of Conservation (DoC) discussion document on the Rakiura National Park proposal and
subsequent report to the New Zealand Conservation Authority on public submissions;
analysis of media reports, the community, Stewart Island individuals and the national park
proposal; a National Radio New Zealand ‘Spectrum’ documentary on the community, their
lifestyle and their views of the proposed national park; and previous studies conducted on
the Island by government departments. In conjunction with this I reviewed literature on
social and ecological impacts associated national parks and associated tourism.

As the research is qualitative in its nature it must be noted that the research cannot be
separated away from the researcher and that the researcher has considerable influence over
the direction the research takes. It is necessary therefore to note that I am a male and at the
time of my fieldwork I was 31 years of age. I have a reasonably outgoing personality, have
played sport throughout my life and am able to comfortably engage strangers in
conversation.

My gender and physical appearance benefited my research in some aspects, providing me
access to the many public spaces that are male dominated, especially the South Seas Hotel
and the main wharf. In other aspects, however, this necessarily limited the data gained. For
instance, if I were a female researcher I may have gleaned somewhat different data, and it
is indisputable that the snowballing technique that I employed would have yielded a
different harvest of Stewart Island informants. Female members of the community may
have approached some aspects of their interviews in a different manner with a female
researcher, especially during the pre-and post-interview conversations.

My fieldwork began with two months on Stewart Island in late January 2001. I approached
the Island by sea on board the ferry, the Foveaux Express, and experienced first hand the
notorious weather and sea conditions of Foveaux Strait. During my fieldwork I conducted
25 interviews. Interviews were recorded on audio cassettes and transcribed verbatim as
close to the end of the interview as possible, the interviews varied in length between 30
minutes and 3 hours. As the population is only 384, and these people have to live work and socialise in a very small, isolated settlement where tensions can at times run high, my informants are given as much anonymity as possible within this thesis. I do not use pseudonyms or provide details on age, gender, occupation or length of time spent living on the Island. In a few places however anonymity has been waived, given the need to provide context to the quotes in these instances is crucial to provide the meaning ascribed to particular topics. Where this is the case, I requested permission from the interviewees.

On my first night on the Island, while staying in the Shearwater Inn (now Stewart Island Backpackers) I stumbled across a game of social volleyball at the community centre. This social game was dominated by males with only two of the eleven players being local females. I asked to join in and, following the game, was invited to after-match drinks at the hotel where I was introduced to a number of other local residents. This very beginning was reliant upon my being bold enough to ask to join in and also being confident enough to want to play volleyball, and resulted in my continued involvement in this twice weekly social game.

A further fortunate opportunity for participation in the community, again influenced by my particular circumstances and past experiences, emerged through my involvement in a Shakespearean production, *A Mid Summer Nights Dream*, staged on the Island by a Southland theatre company – Pyramid Theatre. One of the most active, prominent and influential members of the community was involved in this production and was also charged with finding locals to fill some of the minor parts. Upon my arrival to interview this individual, she humorously suggested that an appropriate quid pro quo for granting me an audience would be if I were to accept a minor part in the production, which sorely lacked sufficient male participants. Due to a background and interest in drama I felt confident to take this on, resulting in many new contacts that themselves then snowballed, leading for example, to a tour of the electricity generation plant, a trip out on a fishing boat and outings and social drinks with the local volunteer fire brigade.

On returning to Lincoln University I fully transcribed the interviews and then coded these into 56 themes and sub-themes that emerged from the data. These codes were then collapsed into fewer codes until the themes that appeared most important to me emerged.
must be noted that the interpretation given to that data reflects my personal characteristics, experiences, interests and ideas.

At this stage I again engaged in secondary sources of information including; a comprehensive review of historic accounts of the Island up until 1940; New Zealand Year Books and Appendices to the Journal of the House of Representatives; census data; tourism, conservation and geography literature; an anthropological study of crayfishing and the community on Stewart Island; people and parks literature from New Zealand; and case studies of small resource based New Zealand communities and their experiences of the 1980s restructuring.

Three concepts have been central in my examination and analysis of the community's experience of the national park proposal, and these provide the themes for later chapters. These are: 'geographical restructuring' (including 'political economy' as presented in Pawson and Le Heron 1996), 'path dependency' and aspects of the 'social impact assessment' process.

1.5. The Experience of Boom- Bust Cycles

Pawson and Le Heron (1996) employ the concept of 'political economy' in their geography of the 1980s 'restructuring' in New Zealand. 'Political economy' has been widely used in the contemporary literature that examines the effects of larger political and economic change on local people and places (Horn 2002:44). The 'political economy' perspective sees economic change and development in the context of wider political, cultural and social environments and has been utilised in attempts to understand the connections between state, economy, society and the environment. Pawson and Le Heron's (1996:6) 'Geographic Restructuring' model recognises that change can be driven from any geographical level, be it international, national, regional or local. This provides a useful framework for understanding Stewart Island and the Rakiura National Park proposal.
Pawson and Le Heron’s (1996) model emphasises six interrelated themes (emphasis in original):

1. Periods of restructuring are times of intensified change in a broader capitalist historical context.

2. Change in the organisations, industries and regions of a nation springs potentially from influences originating at all geographic scales.

3. Change is always a composite of the intersections of economic, cultural and environmental processes.

4. All processes are mediated by various kinds of regulatory arrangements prevailing over different territorial units.

5. The character of change in organisations, industries and regions comes from the particular mix and interactions of processes and regulatory structures operating within a nation.

6. The particular crisis conditions that lead to restructuring in each nation will differ (Le Heron and Pawson 1996:6).

This model and the concept of political economy, in conjunction with qualitative data, provide useful tools for examining conservation initiatives that involve local communities. Each of these six themes became apparent during the investigation of the nexus of politics, economics, conservation, tourism, the local community and their settlement on Stewart Island. The model employs an historical perspective to understand the present: what has gone before shapes what is possible today, and the choices that may be available tomorrow. This approach proved very useful in understanding the community’s reaction to the Rakiura National Park proposal and the experiences that have shaped their worldviews.

1.6. ‘Path dependency’

A second helpful concept is ‘path dependency,’ which refers to a chain of related events in a given context or place. Although the concept is not useful as a predictive tool it is a useful way to analyse and explain development and change; or as described by Raadschelders (1998:576) to analyse “causality in retrospect.” Although emerging in
economics, path dependency has become a useful tool to analyse policy, institutional arrangements and as a narrative in historical sociology – as it is used here. One of its attractions is that it provides the opportunity for dynamic analysis, for time is considered to be an independent variable in the explanation of change and development; in contrast with comparative static explanations of change and development where time (if considered at all) is simply a dependent variable (Kay 2003:4). In relation to conservation initiatives and developments, path dependency can thus be seen to provide the tool to connect temporally distant factors.

Mahoney (2000:510) asserts that path dependency analysis requires at least three defining features, each of which can be seen to be present in the case of Stewart Island and Rakiura National Park. Firstly, path dependent analysis involves the examination of causal processes. These processes are highly sensitive to events that take place in the early stages of a historical sequence, as Pierson (2000, cited in Mahoney 2000:510) notes, “earlier parts of a sequence matter much more than later parts… although it may have been of greater consequence if the timing had of been different.” In other words the initial choices shape and constrain the current choices, further to which the order in which events occur also makes a difference, with the timing of things occurring within a sequence affecting how the sequence plays out.

Secondly, in a path dependent sequence, early historical events are contingent occurrences that are unexplainable on the basis of prior events or initial conditions. Goldstein (1998) notes, “path dependence is a property of a system such that the outcome over a period of time is not determined by any particular set of initial conditions. Rather, a system that exhibits path dependency is one in which outcomes are related stochastically to initial conditions.” Initial choice, in this instance, is therefore not considered to be limited, nor the direction of choice initially linear in relation to initial conditions, but open to influence dependent upon that choice and subsequent choices.

The third feature of path dependency Mahoney (2000:511) describes is one where, “once contingent events take place, path dependent sequences are marked by relatively deterministic causal patterns what can be thought of as ‘inertia’. In a reactive sequence (such as Stewart Island follows), this inertia involves reaction and counter-reaction
mechanisms that give an event sequence an 'inherent logic' in that one event naturally leads to another event. Further to this, Kay (2003:2) asserts that “a process is path dependent if initial moves in one direction elicit further moves in the same direction” as we shall see is the case with Stewart Island and the history of both conservation and tourism on the Island.

1.7. Social Assessment - the investigation of Boom-Bust Cycles at the Periphery

The geographic restructuring model presented above focuses on the effects of change at different geographical scales driven by the boom-bust cycles of capitalism and responses at each geographic scale to these processes. Another approach to the experience of local economies providing a further pertinent framework is developed through the field of social assessment. “Social assessment is a process for research, planning and management of change arising from policies and projects. It is focused on individuals, groups, communities and sectors of society affected by change. The process uses social analysis, monitoring and methods of public involvement” (Taylor, Bryan and Goodrich 1996:1). This thesis is not a social assessment per se, but it can be considered to involve some key facets of the social assessment process.

Taylor et al employ a world system perspective to consider the dynamics between places. In world-system terms, New Zealand's economy is distinctly peripheral and Stewart Island could be described as 'the periphery of the periphery'. Taylor, Bryan and Goodrich (1996:55), in their book on social assessment, consider the relationship between the central or 'core' regions or economies and peripheral regions, by applying some of “the lessons from development theory to the social-environmental dialectic.” Development theory defines 'underdevelopment' as “the condition that comes through the systematic exploitation of peripheral regions by core economies” (Taylor et al 1996:55). By analysing core-periphery relationships it is possible to specify the winners and losers, determined by which set of values and goals will dominate any conflicts of interest. Although normally applied across political boundaries between states it is particularly useful in understanding different rates of development within political boundaries (Taylor et al 1995:55). This idea
is of use when analysing development of infrastructure and services on Stewart Island, as is considered in Chapters Four and Seven.

Taylor et al (1995; 2000; 2001) have conducted a considerable amount of research into resource-based activities which produce unwanted externalities and/or social costs of development at the periphery from whence the raw materials are obtained. Included in this is a series of studies of resource-based communities throughout New Zealand by Taylor Baines and Associates (2000). A review of three of these case studies, those focused on fishing communities, is presented in Chapter Two. These provide further examples of the micro (local) experience of changes at the macro (national/international) scale and how these changes have been experienced by local communities.

1.8. The Restructuring of the 1980s and Institutional Reform

The 1970s and beginning of the 1980s was a tempestuous time for New Zealand. The economy was rapidly diversifying, with increasing urgency following the entry of the UK into the EEC in 1973, while the successive oil shocks imposed privations leading to dissatisfaction with political management. The 1980s saw the economic policies move away from being based on Keynesian principles which emphasised economic protectionism, government support and an emphasis on social welfare; to a neo-liberal economy that was increasingly restructured and re-regulated through corporatisation, privatisation and deregulation (Baragwanath 2003).

Although the restructuring began before 1984, it was in this year that the Fourth Labour government came to power and radical and frenzied transformation of the New Zealand state sector began. Although Labour’s election manifesto contained many promises for change, including proposals in the area of environmental administration, it was widely assumed in New Zealand that these changes would be more cosmetic (Powrie 1997:47) than structural. With political pressure coming from both environmental groups and economic interests, however, New Zealand underwent revolutionary changes in the 1980s (Pawson and Le Heron 1996). For communities living on the periphery of New Zealand, such as Stewart Island, the restructuring begun in the 1980s has had considerable effect.
These changes have stamped their impression economically, politically and socially on the Island and its inhabitants and are at the heart of the concerns of Stewart Island people in relation to the National Park and tourism. This period provides the essential backdrop against which the most recent change -- the Gazettal of the Island as 'Rakiura National Park' -- must be understood.

This background and history provides the lens through which to view the most recent reactive and counter-reactive sequence that Stewart Island exhibits and which has ultimately led to Rakiura National Park.

1.9. Thesis Structure

Chapter Two presents a review of tourism literature, including New Zealand case studies related to local communities and National Park's, local communities and changes effected by the 1980s restructuring, and local communities and tourism.

Chapter Three contains a physical description of the Island, its flora, fauna and the current human population and their settlement. This shows how the natural features of the Island fulfil the criteria set out in Section 4(1) of the National Parks Act 1980 and the General Policy for National Parks 1983 and that their preservation is in the national interest. It also introduces the people of Stewart Island and their settlement.

Chapter Four provides a history of human settlement on the Island, beginning with the Waitaha (an early Maori tribe of the South Island) and progressing through European contact and occupation. It maps out European settlement in relation to industry developments on the Island, tracing the rise and fall of each. The chapter illustrates how initial choices made in relation to industry then shaped the possible future choices open to Stewart Island. Implicit in this is the 'boom – bust' cycle of industries on Stewart Island that have been driven largely by various factors at a larger geographic scale. These cycles have shaped the community and available choices at given times and have driven the need for new industry development.
Chapter Five considers the linkages between tourism and conservation on the Island. It builds upon the previous chapter by connecting the Island’s nature features and resources with conservation, tourism and the economic and market conditions at larger geographical scales, highlighting how conditions on the Island were influenced by conditions at the regional, national and international levels. It shows how in the first instance preservation of the Island’s forests was largely a result of the national recognition of natural resource wastage and of an international recession, and then of the recognition of the economic potential of tourism as tourist visits to the Island increased. It tracks conservation in relation to external and internal conditions on Stewart Island, and how these conditions have either facilitated or blocked conservation initiatives.

Chapter Six examines the national park proposal and compares it with an earlier Crown land administration review that occurred in the late 1970s (Purey-Cust & McClymont 1978) and early 1980s (Queen Elizabeth II National Trust 1980). Using the local economic and social conditions at these times to highlight how external factors have driven change in local conditions, resulting in change of attitude to a change to national park status and to tourism. Within this the public consultation process is examined from the viewpoint of community members, documenting the attempts at negotiating conditions with the DoC.

Chapter Seven examines how the cycle of boom and bust has impacted on the Island in relation to employment, income, business opportunities, housing and community composition. This provides the basis to then examine how the development of Rakiura National Park and associated tourism are the next ‘boom’ phase in the cycle. It examines how change in the economic fortunes and focus of the Island, driven by change at higher geographic scales, produces change in employment, income levels, community composition, and housing.

Chapter Eight is the conclusion, bringing the strands of the discussion together. It provides recommendations on the initiation of conservation projects that involve or affect local communities. Finally, it discusses the potential of tourism to sustain the community on Stewart Island, and potential barriers and pitfalls that may happen at international, national or regional levels that threaten the industry and the Island community in the future.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

This chapter presents literature to situate the case study theoretically and geographically, linking it to similar studies that have been conducted in New Zealand. As context is central to both the approaches of ‘path dependency’ and ‘geographic restructuring’ the focus of this thesis remains as much as possible upon the Stewart Island experience, rather than upon generic models and theories developed in distant locations. Although some of the literature presented here is international, the case studies are solely from New Zealand. The approach used implies that context is critical to understanding a particular case study and therefore international experiences, although interesting, do not add to this study as their contextual basis is situated within a completely different set of variables.

The function of this chapter is to explain concepts that have been considered during both the research and analysis stages of this thesis; and to provide a range of similar case studies with which to compare the results. Accounts of history remain central to this thesis, which is based upon the understandings of change as viewed by the people of Stewart Island. These provide an important dimension to the analysis of the interview data, placing the series of social and economic changes within a temporal sequence. Supplementing the literature presented in this chapter is the historical literature presented in chapters three, four, five and six. This provides essential context from which to analyse and understand the results and to provide the basis of the historical sociological narrative.

Scholars of tourism analysing island communities argue that islands often face a number of structural barriers to successful tourism due to their isolation, peripheral locations as well as their small land area and populations. Also islands are characterised by their limited resource base, tiny domestic market, limited infrastructure and difficult accessibility (Ioannides, Apostolopoulos and Sonners 2001). Further qualities of an island include their small scale, weak economies, separateness, difference in terms of politics, climate, geography, biodiversity and environment, their vulnerability to the vagaries of the market and hence, dependency. In an island context, it is difficult to discuss any aspect of tourism without involving most aspects of the community’s economic, cultural and social life (Conlin and Baum 1995:7). The factors that cause the most problems are those that are related to their finite physical size and resource capacity to withstand large numbers of visitors.
Island tourism is normally based upon the island’s natural attractions and cultural heritage (Macleod 2004). Therefore the environment plays an important role in the tourism industry because it attracts demand and is also impacted by the production of tourist services. The interactions of tourism and the environment have been considered, among others, by Green and Hunter (1992) and Green et al. (1990). In general, the definition of the tourist product includes a set of environmental attributes which are defined within the boundaries of a given territory. Tourism can be considered as a dynamic industry which evolves from the initial stages, in which the environment is pristine and well preserved, to the developed stages, in which most of the impacts can be appreciated by tourists and the local population.

Central to any discussion about tourism effects is the struggle for control of land and other resources that often underlies the development of the local economy (Greenberg and Park 1994). Local and central governments will often promote tourism based upon the perceived benefits of tourism as a stimulus industry for development (Howell 1994). The rationale behind this is that it is believed that as more people come to an area or destination they create the demand for more businesses and goods; which then leads to growth in the employment sector resulting in growth of the population – both as permanent residents and temporary visitors; which in turn leads to increased demand for infrastructure and services (Fritz 1982).

Much of the tourism destination literature builds on previous theories and models. For the purpose of this thesis I start with Cohen’s (1972) attempt to categorise tourists into four character types: drifter, explorer, individual mass, and organised mass. The drifters and explorers are constantly searching for new destinations and are not interested in ancillary services such as comfortable accommodation. The last two character types, however, like to stay in an environmental bubble, and place a high premium on comfortable and relatively inexpensive accommodation. As the type of tourist to the destination changes through time the characteristics of the destination also change; Cohen’s model, therefore, implies that as a destination attracts differing personality types, its growth process is likely to change.
Butler’s (1980) ‘tourist destination lifecycle’ (see Figure 1) makes explicit the link between the number, and type, of tourists and six stages of development of the tourist destination. Butler’s six stages include emergence, involvement, growth, consolidation, maturity and/or stagnation followed by decline or rejuvenation. The concept is analogous to the product lifecycle in marketing literature whereby a new product is launched, achieves acceptance and growth until competitors gain market share, and innovation or repositioning is necessary to stave off sales and profit declines (Haywood, 1986).
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**Figure 1: Tourism Destination Lifecycle Model (Butler 1980)**

Butler (1980) argues that as the number of tourists increases there is greater participation on the part of the community; leading to greater development of the destination in terms of services and infrastructure. However, at a particular stage of the cycle when the number of tourists reaches a critical point, Butler (1980) believes that the community and the destination reach a point where attitudes towards tourism change as the undesirable effects of increased tourist numbers and growth diminish the quality of both life and the environment.

Butler’s theory emphasises the dynamic, market-driven thrust of tourism development and argues that successful destinations pass through a regular sequence of growth stages that parallel the S-shaped logistic curve. Progress along the development continuum involves increasing industry institutionalisation, facility scale, visitor saturation and cumulative ecological impact (Dann and Cohen, 1991; Butler, 1991).
Kellar (1984) develops a tourism growth model that runs parallel to Butler's (1980) tourist area cycle of evolution model, the tourism typologies developed by Cohen (1972) and to Kellar's (1984) hierarchies of control and capital input models. Kellar (1987) argues that these models all present the evolution of a tourist destination from a point of discovery to one of local control, followed by a period of institutionism and, finally, a time of crisis, when numbers and development reach the point in Butler's (1980) model where the destination will either rejuvenate, stagnate or decline.

It highlights recognisable phases of tourism destination growth and development mirrored in the other models mentioned above. Kellar (1987) argues that initial tourism development in a peripheral region, such as Stewart Island, will start as small scale enterprises that involve local entrepreneurs who recognise the potential profits to be derived from meeting the needs (at this stage of the tourist typology defined as explorers and drifters) of the current clients base; there is little local government involvement at this stage. If the tourism trade proves profitable at this stage and the destination generates a reputation via word of mouth and the media, then it will mature through time and generate larger numbers of tourists to the area.

It is at a particular point that the number of tourists reaches a level beyond the capabilities and capacity of local decision making and infrastructure – at the same time the local injections of capital and the provision of infrastructure will no longer suffice. At this point the local capacity to absorb an increase in tourist numbers without major adaptations and infrastructure improvements is exceeded (Kellar 1987). Once this situation is reached it is believed that regional government will step in, however, Kellar also notes that the development issues may surpass the ability of the regional government level due to the demand level rising beyond the capabilities of the authority to provide adequate infrastructure upgrades. At this point the regional authority may then turn to central government for help. Indeed, as discussed in Chapter seven, this is now the case on Stewart Island.

Kellar (1987) presents two strategies to approach tourism development, the first being local control over decision making and the second being limiting development by limiting
capacity. Local control over decision making requires the area to have the expertise necessary for managerial and administrative staff – without this expertise the decision making is then reliant upon outside expertise which generally leads to periphery – core conflict. Limited development is a strategy that confines development to a scale of growth which can be financed and operated by resources, capital and the labour force available within the periphery (Kellar 1987:27). Kellar (1987:23) notes that “some developments will stop at the stage of local control. This is usually due either to the fact that the national… tourism institutions did not judge the periphery marketable and profitable enough to invest in, or to the fact that a deliberate policy has been set by government to limit development.”

In contrast, Haywood (1986) put forward a possible method to identify when a region or destination moves from one stage of the life cycle to the next using the percentage change in the number of visitors. He proposed that a persistent decline in arrivals, of around one half of one standard deviation, could indicate that the destination is in the decline phase, while a persistent increase of a similar magnitude could delineate the development period. Similarly, the stagnation stage would be evidenced by a decline in arrivals of between one half of one standard deviation and zero, while the consolidation period would be demarcated by zero growth, and growth of less than one half of one standard deviation.

One of the main drawbacks of Haywood’s (1986) approach is that it requires data on the destination from the exploration through to the decline stage. However, not every destination is likely to have undergone all the stages, or have data for the entire life cycle. Doxy (1975) studied residents’ attitudes to tourism and developed a model that describes how attitudes towards tourism of the residents of a tourist destination changes through time, matching the level of development of the destination and the increase in tourist numbers as being from one of euphoria through apathy, irritation and antagonism. Doxy (1975) argued that this sequence is predictable through time given increasing numbers of tourist and associated tourist development of the destination.

Several theorists have long argued that the attitudes of residents within destination communities are heterogeneous, both with respect to tourism generally and with respect to specific development projects or paths (Mason and Cheyne 2000; Pearce, Moscardo and Ross 1996; Tomljenovic and Faulkner 2000). Furthermore, tourism development may
create social conflicts at the destination community due to the socio-cultural differences, economic welfare, and purchasing power gaps between the host community and tourists. In brief, it was found that host communities' attitudes and perceptions toward development and tourists fluctuate continuously between the negative and positive (King, Pizam and Milman 1993; Pizam 1978). In this regard, most conclusions on the impacts of tourism development are that economic impacts are perceived as mostly positive while socio-cultural, legal, and environmental impacts, in many cases, are viewed as negative and in some cases neutral.

In the last two decades, researchers also started examining the factors that are likely to influence these perceived impacts and subsequent support for development. Among the factors studied and identified were community attachment or length of residence (Lankford 1994), levels of participation in recreation (Keogh 1990), level of knowledge about tourism and the local economy (Pizam and Milman 1986), personal economic reliance on tourism (Liu and Var 1986), proximity to the tourist zone or contact with tourists (Sheldon and Var 1984), socio-demographic characteristics (Williams and Lawson 2001), political and demographic position in society (Mansfeld 1992), type and form of tourism (Ritchie 1988), and level of contact with tourists (Akis et al 1996).

Factors that have been shown to influence residents' perceptions and attitudes include the type and extent of host-guest interaction, importance of the industry to the community, extent of individuals' reliance on the industry, and the overall level of tourism development in the community (Murphy 1985). Beyond these general factors, some specific ones include native-born status in the community (Canan and Hennessy 1989; Um and Crompton 1987), length of residency in the community (Liu and Var 1986), the extent of tourism concentration in the community (Pizam 1978), economic reliance on the industry (Madrigal 1993), and distance of residence from the central tourism zone (Belisle and Hoy 1980).

Several studies found that residents benefiting from tourism have a higher level of support for it and thus report more positive impacts (Husbands 1989; Madrigal 1993; Lankford and Howard 1994). However, King, Pizam and Milman (1993) pointed out that those people with personal benefits from tourism are also more likely than others to report negative
impacts. In other words, perceptions of positive benefits are significantly related to personal benefits from tourism, but they themselves do not completely explain the perceived negative impacts (Pearce, Moscardo and Ross 1996). Dogan (1989) emphasised that tourism from developed countries has negative socio-cultural impacts such as the decline in traditions, materialisation, increase in crime rates, social conflicts, crowding, environmental deterioration, and dependency on the industrial countries on the part of members of the developing world. Moreover, Dogan claimed that tourism development and presence of tourists has changed the socio-cultural structure and diversified previously homogenous host communities.

Since tourism relies heavily upon the goodwill of the local residents, their support is essential for its development, successful operation, and sustainability (Jurowski 1997). Once a community becomes a destination, the quality of life of the local residents is affected by the consequences of this development. These include an increased number of people, increased use of roads, and various economic and employment-based effects. The success of any tourism project is threatened to the extent that the development is planned and constructed without the knowledge and support of the host population. While success in this industry depends upon attractions and services, it requires the hospitality of local residents. A host's anger, apathy, or mistrust will ultimately be conveyed to the tourists and is likely to result in their reluctance to visit places where they feel unwelcome (Fridgen 1991). Understanding local reaction and the factors that influence these attitudes is essential in achieving the goal of favourable support for tourism development. These perspectives help to make sense of some of the developments that have occurred on Stewart Island. However, they also emphasise its distinctiveness and highlight how specific context is often of greater relevance to case studies than generalised theories and models.

2.1. Case Studies

This section presents several case studies from within New Zealand that relate to communities and restructuring, tourism reliant communities and national parks and neighbouring communities. The purpose of this is to place my research within the broader New Zealand based case study research of people, parks and tourism.
Taylor, Baines and Associates (2000) produced a compendium of 13 case studies of what they termed “Resource Community Formation and Change”. These case studies focused on providing a stronger conceptual and empirical basis for social assessment and resource planning in New Zealand, especially in rural communities that depend directly on primary production or the processing of natural resource. Of interest to this study are three of the case studies of the fishing communities of Moeraki, Havelock, and in particular, Riverton. Riverton is of particular interest given its close proximity to Stewart Island on the opposite side of Foveaux Strait.

These case studies utilised a variety of research methods including a historical review of documents associated with the communities, analysis of census data and qualitative interviews. The effects of the 1980s restructuring are investigated in relation to the economic mainstay of these communities, namely fishing. In the case of both Riverton and Moeraki the downturn in employment and income opportunities from the fishing industry has seen new people move to the area and tourism has emerged as an important contributor to the local economy.

Eijgelaar and van Poelgeest (2001) investigated the socio-economic impacts of the designation of Te Wahipounamu – South West New Zealand World Heritage Area on the neighbouring communities of Haast and Tuatapere. They set out to discover what qualitative and quantitative changes had taken place in the two communities as a result of the designation of the World Heritage Area. They believe their result indicated the contribution of the World Heritage Area to the local economy was low, and even perceived as nil. Instead they believe that other factors such as location, national tourism growth and funding have been the cause of tourism growth in the World Heritage Area.

They found that in Haast there were considerable benefits from tourism and World Heritage designation, in part due to its location on the main tourism route and also to the funding that had been provided by central government. Tuatapere in contrast is still facing a gradual population decline that began as a result of the 1980s restructuring.
McCleave (2004) studied the people - park relationships that existed between the residents of Golden Bay and Karamea and Kahurangi National Park. The objective of her study was to describe and analyse the people - park relationship by examining three aspects of the relations: 1. lifestyle, place attachment and recreation; 2. tourism; and 3. interactions with the park management agency. She found that the residents of Golden Bay had more positive views of the National Park than those of Karamea; generally based on the fact that substantial income was generated by tourism associated with the National Park in Golden Bay, while the residents of Karamea who derived less income, associated the National Park with the closure of resource extractive industries and a downturn in income.

McCleave (2004) also found that the communities she studied were dissatisfied with the consultation process prior to the gazettal of the National Park leading her to recommend that there be more transparency of the process. Further to this, she also recommended that decisions be based upon accurate information, and incorporate effective communication strategies and create common goals between the management agency and the community.

### 2.2. Summary

In summary, I have considered literature which I believe informs the reader of some of the more important ideas that have informed my thinking around this topic. As noted earlier I believe that specific context negates the relevance of many aspects of generalised theory. The objective of this thesis is to provide a rich, empirical understanding of the experiences of the community in order to provide a useful tool for analysis that, I consider, should be a precursor to any major conservation initiative that has a notable affect on a neighbouring community.
Chapter Three: Flora, Fauna, Population and Settlement

This chapter presents a physical description of the Island and its flora and fauna and the current human population and their physical settlement. The purpose of this is firstly to show how the natural features of the Island fulfil the criteria set out in Section 4(1) of the National Parks Act 1980 and the General Policy for National Parks 1983, and that their preservation is in the national interest. Secondly, it also develops the background to which this thesis, and the national park proposal, is set and highlights important characteristics of the Island. Thirdly this chapter introduces the people of Stewart Island, their settlement, community and some of their characteristics as described in previous studies and as observed in my own research – thereby providing the reader of this thesis with the necessary context with which to view and understand the following chapters.

3.1. Geographic Isolation

To comprehend the Stewart Island residents’ perceptions of the creation of Rakiura National Park it is first necessary to understand the environment within which they live. This includes the physical landforms, the vegetation, the extreme climate, and the sea that surrounds the Island and separates it from the rest of New Zealand. It also includes the social and cultural environment of the small population. The physical aspects of the Island and its location permeate into the lives and culture of the Islanders, shaping their worldviews and in some ways their attitudes to life, change and people from the ‘outside world.’

Stewart Island is one of most remote and inhospitable places in New Zealand. Situated well within the ‘roaring forties’ between 46° and 48° south, it is the third largest of New Zealand’s Islands (see Figure 2). Its geographic position places it at the very edge of the cool-temperate zone, just above the Sub-Antarctic region. Separated from the South Island by 25 kilometres of the notoriously rough Foveaux Strait, Stewart Island gives the impression of being at the ends of the earth. To the west, east and south it is surrounded by the vast expanse of the Southern Ocean, with only a scattering of smaller Sub-Antarctic Islands between it and the Antarctic continent.
Stewart Island measures 65km from north to south and 40km from east to west. It has a coastline of 755km and a land area of 1720 km² (Meurk and Wilson 1989). This gives the Island approximately the same land area as that of Hong Kong and Singapore combined (1724km²). The only existing settlement on the Island, Halfmoon Bay, named for the surrounding bay, is situated on the north east coast and is home to the majority of the Island’s 384 residents (see Figure 2 for location) – a stark contrast to the 11,756,366 people who inhabit Hong Kong and Singapore! The population of Stewart Island is tied to the Island’s economic fortunes and tends to rise and fall in line with the booms and busts of the Island’s economy; it has however, never exceeded 700.

![Figure 2: Map of Stewart Island](image-url)
Weather dominates life on Stewart Island. The annual rainfall in Halfmoon Bay is 1600mm, and it falls on 210 days a year (DoC 1999a:33). The skies are often overcast and the sun shines for only 1700 hours a year (NZTB 1997:5). Rainfall on the western and southern parts of the Island is estimated at 5000mm (Brinkmann and Peat, 1992: 70 -77), in part due to the strong westerly winds of the 'Roaring Forties' (DoC 1999a). Summer daytime temperatures average 16.6°C, occasionally reaching a maximum of 28°C. Over winter, the average temperature is 9.9°C (DoC 1999a:33). Frosts do occur in winter, but are never severe because of the surrounding sea. The climate and vegetation of the southern part of the Island is similar to that of the Sub-Antarctic Islands, being colder, wetter and cloudier than the northern part of the Island, with wind-stunted low-lying scrub covering the land (DoC 1999a:8).

The weather has helped shape the Island's physical landform, as well as its flora and fauna. The sea, driven by strong prevailing westerly winds, shapes much of the western coastline, excavating cliffs that are interrupted by sprawling beaches and dunes. In contrast the eastern coast is characterised by sheltered inlets, bays, and beaches. The strong westerly winds that buffet the Island stunt the growth of vegetation wherever it is found without shelter, pushing branches ever eastward (DoC 1999a).

The following section describes Stewart Island’s physical environment and its climate, providing an understanding of the relatively pristine nature of the Island, and hence, its suitability as a National Park. The National Parks Act 1980 describes the criteria that determine the suitability of an area for national park status. The following sections, in presenting some of the Island's natural features, describes examples from the Stewart Island / Rakiura National Park Investigation Discussion Document (1999) of how features of the Island meet the criteria set out in the National Parks Act 1980, section 4.1 as is described in the General Policy on National Parks 1983, section 7 (See Appendix 1 for a fuller description of this).
3.2. Stewart Island’s Physical Environment

Although the southern part of the Island is mainly granite estimated to be at least 100 million years old, the Tin Range is largely schist. The northeastern third of the Island, dominated by Mt Anglem (the highest point on the Island at 980m above sea level), is formed by the igneous rocks of biotite and tonalite. Between these two zones is a complex concoction called the Paterson group that includes sedimentary schist estimated to be at least 300 million years old (Brinkmann and Peat, 1992: 16-19).

The many unique natural landforms on Stewart Island reflect its diverse geological composition and provide visitors with spectacular scenery. Port Pegasus in the southeast is a large sheltered body of water bordered by the outlandish granite exfoliation domes of the Fraser Peaks, Gog and Magog inland, and seaward by three islands – Pearl, Anchorage and Noble. This area, before the gazettal of Rakiura National Park, was Port Pegasus Nature Reserve, which covered the bulk of the southern area of the Island (67,400 hectares) (DoC 1999:5). Port Pegasus is listed as a site of ‘National Importance’ within the New Zealand Geopreservation Index and is described as one of the outstanding scenic features of the Island (DoC 1999: 7-8).

Masons Bay, on the western coast of the Island, is one of nine beach and dune systems listed as sites of ‘National Importance’ within the New Zealand Geopreservation Index, as is the Tin Range; both of these areas are also used to highlight how areas of the Island meet the outstanding scenery and landform criteria (DoC 1999b:7).

The northern part of the Island was dominated by the Mt Anglem Nature Reserve prior to the gazettal of Rakiura National Park, an area that covered 17,000 hectares. In all the nature reserves covered 52 percent of the Island’s conservation land (DoC 1999b: 2). Nature reserves, unlike national parks, require the issuing of permits for authorised entry; DoC (1999b:23) states that “if a national park is formed these areas would need to have Specially Protected Area status (a higher form of protection than that of National Park status) placed over them to retain the level of protection currently in place.”
3.3. **Stewart Island Flora**

Vegetation on the Island can be described mainly as a covering of low-altitude rainforest and wetlands. There are a variety of ecosystems ranging from alpine herb fields to vast sand dunes, scrublands and forest. These flow in an undisturbed continuum from the mountaintops down to the sea, and are comprised of a huge variety of plants and plant communities. The wetlands of Ruggedy (north-western central area), and of Freshwater Flats (head of Petersen’s Inlet), are listed as ‘Wetlands of Ecological and Representative Importance’ (DoC 1999a:16).

Botanist Hugh Wilson, who conducted in-depth research into the flora of Stewart Island, has described 160 plant community types ranging from alpine herb fields through to wetlands and podocarp forests (DoC 1999a:34). Amongst these communities are 21 threatened native plants including one of New Zealand’s rarest plants, the dune creeping herb *Gunnera hamiltonii* (DoC 1999b:10), and there are at least 23 plants that are endemic to Stewart Island (DoC 1999a:34).

The forest canopy is podocarp / hardwood mix, comprising mainly kahikatea, rimu, southern rata, kamahi, totara, miro and matai. There are no southern beech (*Nothofagus*) on the Island as there are on the West Coast of the South Island – this is thought to be the result of glaciation during the ice ages, leaving Stewart Island without a distinct treeline and a blurred distinction between sub-alpine and scrub land, grassland and herbfields. The treeline exists at 800m on Mt Anglem (DoC 1999a:34).

There are around 80 species of ferns and four species of tree fern on Stewart Island. The sub canopy includes broadleaf species, coprosma species, fuchsia species, and manuka (Brinkmann and Peat, 1992: 70 -77). As well as the forest and wetland areas there are also sand dune ecosystems, coastal scrubland, and herb and cushion fields present in the alpine areas that boast 23 endemic plant species (Meurk and Wilson 1989: 1).
The flora of the Island also contributes greatly to the scenic beauty of the Island, as is demonstrated by this observation from an 1888 tourist guidebook: "in summer the attention is frequently arrested by the floral beauty of the forest, especially striking to the new comer... here is the magnificent Rata, arrayed in all of its splendour of colour, each massive tuft a blaze of crimson..." (Traveller 1888:45).

### 3.4. Stewart Island Fauna

As well as unique and remarkable landforms and old growth forests, as a remnant of primeval New Zealand, Stewart Island is renowned for its indigenous fauna. The Island has areas that are of such importance for the fauna contained within them that they are listed as Sites of Special Wildlife Importance (DoC 1999b).

As is common with islands, there are many unique sub-species endemic to Stewart Island. Included amongst these are kiwi, weka, fernbird, robin, New Zealand dotterel, three lizards and a quarter of all the alpine invertebrates (DoC 1999a:45). Stewart Island has provided an important refuge to many species, especially birds and sea birds. For this reason, and due to the many species present on and around Stewart Island, it has become a popular destination for bird watchers and ‘tickers’: tickers are enthusiasts that literally travel about ‘ticking’ species off a list of yet-to-be-encountered animals, much in the way of game collectors but armed only with camera, notebook and pen.

A prime example is the kakapo, a large flightless parrot (the only one in the world) endemic to New Zealand and extinct on the mainland. Once thought to be extinct, it was discovered on Stewart Island in the Port Pegasus area in 1977 and subsequently moved to the predator-free Whenua Hou / Codfish Island Nature Reserve, three kilometres off Stewart Island’s west coast. In addition, the endangered southern New Zealand dotterel nests on the Table Hill and Tin Range uplands; while the kiwi (the southern tokeoka) feeds during the day, behaviour completely different from the rest of this usually nocturnal species (DoC 1999a).

The kakapo is not the only member of the parrot family on the Island. It is also home to the kaka and both red and yellow crowned parakeets. The kaka is threatened in the South
Island but has a healthy population on Stewart Island. Similarly, red crowned parakeets are numerous throughout the Island’s forests with a fewer number of their yellow crowned counterparts, a situation that is the reverse of that on the mainland (Peat 1999:9). Other forest birds of interest on Stewart Island and its surrounding islands include the saddleback, bellbird, tui, grey warbler, South Island tomtit and weka (Meurk and Wilson 1989:1), many of which are endangered and extremely rare, if not extinct, on mainland New Zealand.

Seabirds are numerous on and around Stewart Island, with more than 20 species breeding there. Included amongst this number are the yellow eyed, Fiordland crested and little blue penguins; large Stewart Island, little, pied, black and spotted cormorants or shags; and Cook’s petrel. Sooty Shearwaters (titi or muttonbird) nest upon many of the 170 surrounding islands (Meurk and Wilson 1989:1). Albatross are a common sight around Stewart Island, and Shy and Buller’s Mollymawks are common. The giant northern royal albatross is also a reasonably common sight as is the black browed mollymawk (Peat 2000: 53). Other seabirds that can be seen at sea surrounding Stewart Island include a variety of petrels, prions, gulls and albatross.

The coastal region of the Island is home to a number of marine mammals, of which the fur seal is most common, despite the ravages inflicted by sealers in the 19th Century. The rarest sea lion in the world, the New Zealand or Hooker’s sea lion, is also found along the coastline; although only in Port Pegasus do they occur in any significant number (Peat 2000:53). Bottle nosed dolphins are often seen in schools of up to 40 around the bays, and whales occasionally strand themselves upon the Island’s shores.

Terrestrial species of note include both the short and long tailed bat, both of which are endangered. Six species of lizard also live on Stewart Island, three of which are unique to the Island. There are also 15 known species of freshwater fish including six species of galaxiids, long and short finned eels, lamprey, and freshwater crayfish (Peat 2000: 51). The Island’s freshwater communities live in almost totally unmodified freshwater systems, free from trout and other introduced species that impact upon native freshwater fish elsewhere in New Zealand (Meurk and Wilson 1989:1).
Further to this, the Island is free from mustelids (ferrets, stoats and weasels) that are a threat to native bird species on the New Zealand mainland. Fortunately, the Island also escaped the introduction of rabbits and hare and other exotic ‘pest’ species including mice, feral goats and pigs. However there are introduced species present, including feral cats, rats, and opossums that pose a threat to the native fauna and flora. Another introduced species, considered a pest by DoC, is the white tail deer, initially introduced as a game species for recreational hunting.

This section has highlighted the many natural features of Stewart Island including its ecosystems, unique fauna and flora, and spectacular scenery. These qualities explain why Stewart Island is potentially a very desirable tourism destination, and justifies the gazettal of 85 per cent of the Island as a national park as it meets the criteria set out in the National Parks Act 1980, Section 4(1) and the General Policy for National Parks 1983. As stated in the ‘Report to the New Zealand Conservation Authority’ (DoC 1999b:46) “the investigation area is recognised to contain scenery, ecological systems and natural features that should be preserved in the national interest... the Director-General of Conservation considers the majority of the investigation area meets the National Parks Act criteria for suitability as a new national park.”

3.5. The Settlement of Halfmoon Bay

All 384 residents of the Island live in and around the settlement of Halfmoon Bay (officially, but not commonly, known as Oban), on the northeastern coast of the Island (see Figure 3). This location provides a relatively sheltered harbour, which is essential as this is the main connection with the mainland and the base for the remaining fishing industry. The settlement (see Figure 4) covers only two percent of the Island’s total area, although many of the properties are measured in tens of hectares. Properties range from the small urban house and section through to properties measured in the tens through to hundreds of hectares. The privately owned area of the Island covers approximately 2 percent of the Island’s total area; DoC manages approximately 93 percent with the remainder set aside as SILNA (South Island Landless Natives) land (DoC 1999b).
The streets and roads of Halfmoon Bay are not found in the usual grid pattern common throughout New Zealand, but are dispersed thinly throughout the settlement and nestled amongst the surrounding bush. This is due to the spontaneous nature from which the settlement originally grew, far removed from the planned settlement common to the rest of New Zealand (Worth 1978). The roading network of the Island stretches some 22km in total, of which only 13km are sealed (Booth and Leppens 2002). The houses themselves, of which there are 234 occupied dwellings (Statistics New Zealand 2001) range from very old, little cottages through to large, opulent modern homes.
The Island has had a reticulated electricity network since 1988 which is able to supply electricity to a maximum of 900 people and their industries, generated by three diesel bulldozer engines. The cost of electricity is therefore high and the ability to increase generation is limited. The electricity system, with which all residents now appear happy, faced opposition when it was introduced. The cost for each household for their connection was (and still is for some) a bone of contention (reportedly about $10,000 per household), and remains a reminder of the possible infrastructure costs Islanders face if they bear the brunt of tourism development via their rates.

A reticulated sewerage system was developed in 1997 with a capacity for 690 people and their industries. At the time of the research 220 homes were connected to the reticulated sewerage system (Booth and Leppens 2002). The Island’s refuse collection station was due for closure in December 2003 when its resource consent expired.

The limited infrastructure highlights the limited investment made in the Island by successive governments dating back to the 1800s.

3.6. Getting About

Walking in to Halfmoon Bay, the most striking feature is the sense of being in a 'time warp', transporting the visitor back 20 years. The town centre is small and sparse (see map 3). The village’s fishing legacy is evident everywhere you look – from the wharves to the storage to the dinghies and so forth, whereas any obvious signs of tourism are much harder to locate.

Travel to and from the Island is by boat or plane, enhancing the feeling of isolation from the mainland, especially in rough weather. The weather can turn the short trip to Stewart Island into a notable experience, either exciting or frightening depending on one’s disposition. The 12 or 20-minute flight (depending on whether the six or twelve seater plane is operating) can be very bumpy, especially if the westerly, easterly or southerly winds are blowing strongly (which they predominantly are). Likewise, these same prevailing westerly winds can whip the shallow waters of Foveaux Strait up to a fast moving, sharp and breaking three-metre swell, making the hour-long ferry crossing.
extremely rough with the swell meeting the ferry side on. Thus the arrival of many visitors to the Island is accompanied by sea- or air-sickness.

3.7. Population

The population of Stewart Island has never been overly stable: since the first Maori and the earliest European settlement of the Island, people have come and gone in a steady turnover of people. Many have come to the Island pursuing work or profit, but this does not always come to fruition. The population has, however, remained fairly constant throughout its European history at around 350 -400, with peaks of 665 people in 1930 and 550 people in the 1950s. The rise and fall of the population reflects the economic fortunes of the Island and its industries over time as we shown in Chapter Four.

In 2001, at the time of the research, there were 384 permanent residents living on Stewart Island within Halfmoon Bay and surrounding areas, representing a decline of 33 people or eight percent from the 1996 population (Statistics New Zealand, 2003). Census figures indicate that 55 percent of the Stewart Island population are male and 44 percent are female (Statistics New Zealand 2001). Ten percent of people were aged over 65 years, a figure comparable to the national figure of 12 percent. Likewise, 14 percent of the population was Maori, comparable to the national figure of 15 percent and higher than the South Island population of seven percent. Nine percent of residents were aged less than 15 years, significantly lower than the national figure of 23 percent, a direct result of the fact that the Island has a primary school but no secondary school (Statistics New Zealand 2001). The current (2001) school roll was 21 children.

This section has presented an overview of the demographic characteristics of the community and a physical description of the settlement. The next section extends this and presents descriptions of the community’s character, attitudes, beliefs and lifestyle.
3.8. People, Place and Ways of Being

Life on Stewart Island is largely shaped by a number of factors; firstly the natural characteristics described in the sections above, secondly the harsh climate of the Island and finally the influence of the main occupation of the Stewart Island population for the past 50 years. The dense forest and harsh climate have excluded human settlement from spreading far from the small town centre of Halfmoon Bay – this is also partially due to the requirement of the fishing industry to have a reasonably sheltered harbour from which to conduct its activities.

Since World War II the lifestyles of the people of Stewart Island have largely been shaped by one industry, crayfishing. Fishing has been largely responsible for shaping life on the Island throughout its history and especially within the crayfishing period of 1945 – today (2005), and as such some of its characteristics and idiosyncrasies have pervaded the life and culture of the land based community. Fishing in the waters that surround Stewart Island is an intensely weather-dependent occupation, given the propensity for the weather at this latitude to be extremely rough with high winds and seas.

The climate of Stewart Island, as described earlier, is harsh and has helped in shaping the landscape and vegetation of the Island. The climate also has a large impact on the life of the people who have settled on the Island. “The single largest influence on Stewart Island is its southern ocean climate. This pervades everyday life on the Island, especially as it is inherent to the practice of obtaining a livelihood from the sea. It underscores the people’s attitude, especially about their Island and leads to the formation of settled and strongly held opinions. The impact of the land and sea are generally inseparable” (Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust 1980:1). The weather, in tandem with the Island’s geographic location, magnifies the isolated nature of Halfmoon Bay and enhances the common belief of Stewart Island locals that they are ‘different’ and ‘special’—‘harder’ and tougher than their soft, city-dwelling counterparts.
Living in such a climate requires a certain amount of strength, individualism and a desire to pit oneself against the elements – a harsh and dramatic lifestyle far removed from the nine-to-five grind of an urban lifestyle. The occupation of fishing requires the flexibility to go to sea when weather allows, and to sit on shore waiting when it does not. This reality explains the propensity for Stewart Island locals, or at least those that have a long history on the Island, to operate on what is known as ‘Island time.’ By this description the people of Stewart Island have the outlook that ‘things get done when they get done’ – there is no rush; the clock is not an exact keeper of the daily grind; service and speed are not necessarily the order of the day.

This perception of their difference has been described in many different ways reflecting the many different ways they have dealt with the ‘outside world.’ The following section provides a sample of these descriptions from a number of different texts, dating from the 1880s until the present day, providing essential background for the reader about to plunge headlong into the recent research on the Stewart Island community described in later chapters.

People have come to the Island for many reasons. Booth and Leppens (2002) surveyed 103 individuals and discovered that amongst these ‘employment’ was ranked as the most prevalent reason for moving to the Island, followed by ‘marriage’. These people valued ‘nature and scenery’ the highest followed by ‘peace and quiet’, ‘lifestyle’ and ‘knowing people in the community.’ When asked what they liked the least they replied ‘isolation’, ‘cost of living’, ‘people’ and ‘tourism.’ In both of these response sets isolation features highly and may be explained in the differences between long term residents and short term residents, with the long term residents valuing the isolated and nature characteristics highly while the short term residents see this as a problem; this is only my opinion based both upon this research and the study conducted above.
3.9. Characteristics of an Isolated Community

Members of the Stewart Island community consider themselves ‘well researched,’ or even ‘over researched,’ according to some residents I spoke to within the community. Upon my arrival on the Island, to begin my field work, I was informed of this fact and advised that people would not want to speak to me by at least five different locals. Regardless of this fact I found that the people of Stewart Island were more than willing to share their opinions of life and change on their Island. However, to gain a fuller understanding of the community and how the opinions shared with me during my research developed, it is necessary to gain insights from the past.

As well as Basil Howard’s historical work “Rakiura: A History of Stewart Island, New Zealand” (1940) there have been a number of other texts and studies of the community, including guidebooks (Traveller 1888; Flanagan 1898), a joint report prepared for the Department of Lands and Survey and the New Zealand Forest Service (Purey-Cust & McClymont 1978), the Queen Elizabeth II National Trust (1980) report and Levine and Levine’s (1987) anthropological study of a crayfishing community.

These sources provide some insight into the community and its culture. Excerpts are taken as appropriate from these sources to highlight how the Island’s people have appeared to outsiders in the past and how the writers of these texts have reported on them. These are supported by quotes from my informants collected during my fieldwork. Although the people of Stewart Island live in a harsh environment, far removed from the urban centres of New Zealand, my experience is that they tend to be resourceful and intelligent. This is supported by other sources:

“The people of Stewart Island are hardy, responsible, conservative and self-reliant. They are by no means uninformed or lacking educational background. Like most island peoples, especially those removed by distance from the centres of government control, they are fiercely independent. Indeed we were impressed by their general knowledge and their educational standards. Many of the prominent members of the groups with whom we had discussions were people who had held responsible positions in other parts of New Zealand before settling in Stewart Island to enjoy its special appeal.
There are of course some large families that have been on the Island for several generations and look at the island as being theirs, with some justification" (QEII 1980: 3)

The belief in their ownership of the Island is evident in a number of ways including the way in which people not from the Island are described.

Islanders’ view of ‘outsiders’ (one of a raft of terms used on the Island to connote people who do not live there – and perhaps one of the more pleasant ones) oscillates between one of indifference to one of suspicion. Part of the suspicion stems from the influx of people during the crayfishing boom years (and probably from the earlier industry booms) that were viewed as only wanting to make a quick buck at others expense. Often, ‘newcomers’ (labelled as such by ‘old timers’ and adopted by newer arrivals) stay only briefly, unable to make it in the fishery or unable to adapt to ‘Island life’, as Levine and Levine (1987:36) also noted.

More recently the community’s attitude was described by the ‘Lonely Planet’ 2000 edition guidebook as: “the hardy and independent people have a healthy suspicion of the law and bureaucracy” (Williams, Niven and Turner 2000: 675). This view was borne out through my informants, with many of them indicating that there was a huge distrust of the government, and especially DoC, and is continued in more depth in Chapter Six. For example:

“I said look the problem [viewed by some of the community] with DoC doesn’t just start with you guys [DoC staff on the Island]. It goes way back, it’s [hatred by the locals] nothing directed at you, it’s directed at DoC and the system."

“I have a certain perception of the Southland District Council, they are very good at putting a spin on things, that whole process ... I think they had a definite agenda going into it and the way that that plan was worded.”
As well as the influence of past experiences and dealings with the government, this attitude is perhaps as much to do with the manner in which they approach their own dealings with each other as well as with officialdom.

3.10. Summary

This chapter has introduced a number of important factors that remain central throughout this thesis for understanding both the Stewart Island community and its transition to national park status. It has presented the natural features, fauna and flora that fulfil the requirements of the National Park Act 1983. Further it has introduced the community and their settlement, as well as highlighting the importance of both the Island’s isolated location and the influence of the weather on the people of Stewart Island. It also provides an insight into the development, or lack thereof, of civil infrastructure. Through this information the Chapter provides the basis from which to understand the Stewart Island community, giving an insight into their attitude towards authority, bureaucracy and outsiders, and how these factors influence the manner in which parts of the community approached negotiations over the National Park.
Chapter Four: ‘Boom – Bust’ Trend of Stewart Island Industry

The unusual historic interest in Stewart Island rests, however, not upon its remote beginnings, but upon the fact that while all of those trading posts and whaling settlements later merged their individuality and became parts of an organised and progressive colony, it [Stewart Island] alone remained outside that development, a No-Man’s-Land rejected by the first New Zealand Company, ignored by the Colonial Government, and untouched by social and economic forces so busily active in the neighbouring settlements of New Zealand (Howard 1940: preface).

This Chapter provides a history of human settlement on the Island, beginning with the Waitaha and progressing through European contact and occupation. It maps out European settlement in relation to industry developments on the Island, tracing the rise and fall of each. The Chapter shows how initial choices made in relation to people and the Island then shaped the possible future choices open to Stewart Island. Implicit in this is the ‘boom – bust’ cycle of industries on Stewart Island that has been driven largely by various factors at a larger geographic scale, and how these cycles have shaped the community and available choices at given times and have driven the need for new industry development.

The concept of ‘path dependency’ is helpful in understanding these developments, as it shows not only how the initial choices were made, but also how the timing of those choices have influenced potential choices at later points in time when the influence of the boom and bust cycles have driven a change in economic focus. These boom-bust cycles have driven both the exploitation of nature resources and conservation strategies as a response to these incidents of resource exploitation. It is through this pattern of actions and reactions that Stewart Island has progressed towards national park status.

4.1. The First People

Human occupation of Stewart Island began over 700 hundred years ago when the Waitaha people are believed to have first come to Stewart Island. To the Waitaha and then the Kati Mamoe and Kai Tahu people that followed, Stewart Island was known as Te Puka-o-te-
waka-a-Maui (the anchor stone of Maui's canoe; from the legend of Maui and his catching of the fish (the North Island) from his canoe (the South Island) (NZTB 1997:5). These early people camped on the beaches, river mouths and strategic headlands, seeking a safe haven away from the many wars on the mainland. Sites of more permanent settlement were few and limited in the main to the Neck (see Figure 4) (Brinkmann and Peat 1992: 20-22). The Island also provided Maori with plentiful food resources. Kumara, the staple root crop of the Maori was unable to be cultivated in such a cold climate, but other plentiful food sources were available. Amongst these the titi, or muttonbird (sooty shearwater), was the most highly prized. The chicks of the titi were pulled from their burrows during autumn and cooked and preserved in their own fat, then stored in kelp bags. The titi provided the early Maori with an important source of trade with Maori further north for valued items such as pounamu / greenstone (Peat 2000:16). The harvesting of the titi still takes place today and is a customary right of Ngai Tahu protected under the Ngai Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998. Other birds that provided readily available sources of food were the kereru, weka, kakapo and kaka; all of which are now protected species.

There were many other food sources available for Maori on Stewart Island. Oysters were harvestable from the rocks, as were mussels, scallops, paua and kina. Blue cod was caught by hook and seals were occasionally taken. Berries from the kotukutuku (tree fuchsia) and tataromoa (native bush lawyer), as well as shoots and roots from certain varieties of fern, provided an accompaniment to the seafood and birds (Brinkmann and Peat 1992: 20-22). This first occupation of Rakiura / Stewart Island was thus as a safe and secluded home with a plentiful supply of food and commodities. The effect of these first peoples, their harvesting practices and techniques, and the scale of their trade was however quickly overwhelmed by the efforts of the early Europeans.

4.2. Early European Contact

Stewart Island has been caught up in the international economy since the earliest recorded European contact on 5th March 1770, with the visit of Captain James Cook (Howard 1940:4). Cook was himself on a mission to find and provide the British Empire with the mythical Terra Australis Incognita, the great southern continent believed to exist in the
southern hemisphere. The British were still intent on expanding their Empire in a race to capture land and resources, thereby increasing their wealth and influence over that of their competitors. In 1773, Cook, on his second and more thorough investigation of New Zealand, reported that there was timber and seals aplenty in the southern region and on Stewart Island (Brinkmann and Peat, 1992: 16-19).

Seals, not timber, were targeted as the first resource of the Island to be extracted and exported to far off markets. The first European settlement on Stewart Island was established in 1804 by a group of sealers who were left on the Island to investigate Cook’s report of large numbers of seals and to accumulate as many seal skins as possible. During the years 1809 to 1811 there were semi-permanent populations at a number of locations, all serviced from Port William (Howard 1940:20-37). Men would disembark from vessels to be left behind for some months to collect sealskins before being retrieved by their ships. These sealskins were destined for the Chinese, American and English markets to meet the fashion for felt hats and gloves (Owens, 1996:31).

By the 1820s fashion had moved on and the fur seal had been driven close to the point of extinction by the exploitation of the industry, a result of the over-estimation of their numbers and the fervour with which the sealing gangs attacked their task (Brinkmann and Peat, 1992:24-25). Sealing, and its eventual demise, provides the first example of the influence of changes at a larger geographic scale and the beginning of the ‘boom - bust’ cycle of industry affecting Stewart Island.

The effect of the decision to pursue sealing, rather than timber extraction, can be seen as the first decision that set the fortunes of the Island down one particular path dependent sequence that inevitably leads through to the present day. The decision was not based upon local conditions but rather macro economic forces and the law of supply and demand. Had timber been the first resource targeted the historical sequence followed would have taken a different direction altogether; the result being that today we would be faced with a completely different set of choices other than national park designation and tourism. As Pierson (2000; cited in Mahoney 2000:510) notes in respect of path dependency “earlier parts of a sequence matter much more than later parts.” A further difference would have been that the European people who initially settled on the Island would have been
interested in timber and more land based industry, rather than the sealers (many of whom originated from the convict colonies in New South Wales, Australia). As it was, timber was not specifically targeted until a later, and less influential, time in the Island’s history.

4.3. The First Permanent Settlements

The first permanent European settlement recorded around Stewart Island was on Whenua Hou (Codfish Island) in 1823 in Sealers Bay. This settlement was the home of sealers who had, up until that time, been spread along the coastline of Foveaux Strait (Brinkmann and Peat 1992: 16-19). The bay they chose was on the leeward side of Whenua Hou, was difficult to access and dangerous in north-easterlies, therefore it can be presumed that it was not established as a trading port (Howard 1940: 64).

At approximately the same time on the eastern side of Stewart Island a shipbuilding settlement was established in Shipbuilders Cove at Port Pegasus by William Stewart (Howard 1940: 72). It was envisaged that the sealers would have a growing demand for vessels in the pursuit of their industry, however, Stewart did not and could not realise that sealing would not provide the demand and profit needed to sustain his settlement. To complicate matters, the quantity and quality of timber at Port Pegasus was inadequate for the boat building industry Stewart envisaged; as with the earlier experience with seal numbers, the reports on the true nature of the timber resource proved false (Brinkmann and Peat, 1992: 16-19). The settlement persevered until 1833 when, on the completion of a schooner on which they had been working, the inhabitants sailed away (Howard 1940: 74-77). This boat building settlement had its fate tied to that of sealing, the initial industry of choice, leading to its demise as a result of the sealing boom failing.

The economic focus on the Island quickly turned to whaling, with the first whaling base established at Preservation Inlet (Fiordland) in 1829, followed by a number of others on the mainland coast of Foveaux Strait (Howard 1940:78). By the late 1830s European and American whaling ships were using Paterson Inlet as a port of call.

In 1836 a number of ex-sealers and whalers settled with the local Maori on the Neck, at Paterson Inlet (Hall-Jones 1994:75). The Maori population on the Neck numbered around
200 at this time. The Europeans took Maori brides and settled down peacefully with their new relations to a largely subsistence lifestyle, with some trade of agricultural and fish products with whalers (Howard 1940: 79).

The nature of the settlements was in part due to the character of the settlers, which again was dependent on the initial choice of industry. Had timber been pursued first instead of sealing it can be surmised that the production of timber would have led to, and necessitated the building of settlements. Had this been the order of events, timber production would have provided the Island with an economic commodity in demand in the colonies of Australia and elsewhere in New Zealand at a time when such a timber industry was not established elsewhere. It would also have provided sealers with permanent bases from which to work, and homes to which to return, in turn constraining the future choice of conservation on the Island and altering the path upon which it started down.

4.4. The Timber Boom

In 1861 timber was re-evaluated as a profitable resource that could bring the Island further settlement and development. The first sawmills were established at Kaipipi Bay, in Patersons Inlet at this time (Purey-Cust and McClymont 1978:44). The sawmillers chose this as their base due to the rich supply of rimu in the vicinity (Hall-Jones 1994:125). Their timing was also fortuitous as it coincided with the discovery of gold in Otago, creating a ready, if temporary, market for their timber.

The gold rush of the 1860s increased Dunedin’s population dramatically, creating a shortage of housing. Due to this, the timber from the Stewart Island sawmills found an insatiable market in Dunedin (Howard 1940: 183). Large sawmills provided full-time employment for the male population, as well as their first ready source of money. It attracted many men from the mainland, where unemployment was creating hardship. The Islanders, who had lived so long on subsistence activities, now enjoyed a new comfort that came from an export trade in timber (Howard 1940: 179).

This again highlights the reliance and dependence of Stewart Island on forces operating at a larger geographic scale for economic gain. However it also reveals a weakness in such
reliance in that distance, transportation costs and external conditions beyond the Islanders’
control direct economic activity on the Island. It also sets the Island and its potential
industries further down a particular path, with the timing of this industry and its boom -
bust pattern resulting in a further constraining influence in relation to this industry’s role in
the Island’s future.

Dunedin adapted quickly to the increased population with the establishment and
organisation of a timber industry in its small satellite towns and communities. For Stewart
Island this meant the initial competitive edge was lost. Its distance from the market and
associated transport costs saw the export volume of timber from the Island drop
dramatically as towns on the mainland quickly gained the advantage of having better
quality timber that was easily accessible, closer to the main markets, and having newly
developed rail links for transport. This situation was compounded further as the population
of Dunedin plummeted as a result of the exodus to the West Coast goldfields, culminating
in the closure of both of Stewart Island sawmills in 1868 and an exodus of those mill
workers who had arrived from the mainland for employment opportunities (Howard 1940:
183-184).

In the 70 years up until 1931 when the last sawmill closed, loggers had cut only an
estimated 2500 hectares of forest out of the total forest area of over 150,000 hectares;
touching only the most easily accessible and desirable stands (Hall-Jones 1994:125). As
the milling failed, some Stewart Island residents, as well as some very well-respected
visitors, perceived the value of intact forests as potential tourism attractions. Their interest
in this industry resulted in the protection and conservation of the Island’s forests, this
choice is discussed in depth in Chapter Five.

Further consequences of the timing of the timber industry on Stewart Island was that it
happened at a time when fishing was developing, providing the need for timber required to
make fishing and cargo vessels. The combined interest in timber, boat building and fishing
resulted in less interest in other industries such as farming, further reducing the possible
future choices of industry of the Island.
4.5. False Tin and Gold Rushes

Another attempt at developing a resource extractive industry on Stewart Island was initiated on the back of the gold fever prevalent from the successes at Otago and stories of wealth abounding. Prospecting for gold on Stewart Island began in 1866 after a discovery of gold near Mt Anglem. This quickly died away in 1869 when it became apparent that worthwhile quantities of gold were not forthcoming. A second discovery of gold at Port Pegasus in 1881 sparked a second minor rush, however by 1888 this also proved futile and was abandoned (Purey-Cust and McClymont 1978:43).

Mining for tin started in 1888 with the discovery of tin sand in the Port Pegasus area. Dr J. G. Black, Professor of Chemistry at Otago University was asked to analyse some specimens from the area. Excited by the prospect of having discovered a second Cornwall, Prof Black announced his find in Invercargill, leading to a rush to obtain licences (Hall-Jones 1994:154).

All proceeded well until the visit of the government geologist Alexander McKay in 1889. McKay noted that there were only limited amounts in the Pegasus area and that the source was actually further into the Tin Range. To complicate matters further, the tin ore was mixed with tungsten ore, with the two being almost impossible to separate. Reports of McKay’s findings were followed by more bad news, with reports of a lack of lodes in the area. Interest in tin quickly waned and the attempted tin mining industry ground to a halt (Howard 1940: 186).

The failure of the mining industries ensured that the Island survived in relatively pristine condition, inadvertently providing a further step along the path to conservation as yet another major industry proved unviable and unsuitable for the Island.

4.6. Farming

Farming was the largest and fastest growing industry in New Zealand toward the end of the 19th Century, leading to the establishment of farming as the largest export sector after the development of refrigerated shipping (Gardener, 1996:80). The first pastoral run on Stewart Island was established at Masons Bay in 1879 and comprised 2020 hectares. This
attempt at pastoral farming came at a time when refrigerated shipping was opening up the British market to New Zealand lamb, and sheep farming was booming (Gardener, 1996:80).

A second run opened on the Neck shortly after, with a number of smaller runs also established. These farms provided produce for the local butcher and eating establishments. However, because of the harsh and adverse weather conditions, by 1925 it was recognised that the idea of agriculture was unviable and development was abandoned (Howard 1940:27), although the larger runs at Masons Bay and the Neck continued to supply Halfmoon Bay with fresh meat. Purey-Cust and McClymont (1978:23) report that “farming on the Island has since eroded away due to poor soils, a difficult climate and intractable vegetation, high transportation costs, isolation and a lack of local lime or other fertiliser.” Indeed, the last of the farms shut within 10 years of their report. The lack of fresh meat on the Island remains a contemporary issue: all meat consumed on the Island is either imported from the mainland or comes from the proceeds of hunting white tail deer. One consequence of the failure of farming was however, that the usual pressures associated with farming, such as burning for forest clearance, failed to destroy any large area of the Island’s forests.

4.7. Settlement and Development

The population of Stewart Island today remains at a level comparable to that of the 1800s, around 380 people. At times in the past the population has risen matching the peaks in Island industries and fortunes, only to fall again as employment and industry have declined. There have been attempts in the past at expanding the settlement on Stewart Island and increasing the population; this idea however was not overly successful, partially due to the isolated location, harsh climate and the amount of opportunity present throughout the rest of New Zealand.

Howard (1940:178) described the early settlers of Stewart Island as men “who had come in from the sea, rough sailors seeking the comfort of a home upon a pleasant shore… they founded a simple community of unambitious sailor-folk.” Howard characterised the early settlers of the Island as being content with a slow pace of life and uninterested in material
progress, not necessarily interested at all in expanding their settlement or engaging in nation building.

As the settlement at Halfmoon Bay slowly grew in the 1860s and 1870s many of the newcomers wished for the same luxuries and comforts they had enjoyed on the mainland. As well as these material interests, they also wished for the innovations that complemented their commercial interests, resulting in the establishment of a ‘progressive movement.’ This coincided with the inauguration of (Sir) Julius Vogel’s ‘Public Works Policy’ and the focus on development of basic infrastructure on the mainland (Howard 1940:185). By 1872 two post offices were opened, bringing organised communication to the Island and the beginning of social progress. This was closely followed by the opening of two schools, the appointment of a Constable, a Resident Magistrate and a Customs Officer (Howard 1940:186).

Stewart Island was not formally part of New Zealand until 1864, at which time the Crown purchased the Island with funds provided, under protest, from the Southland Provincial Council (Howard 1940:180). However, the Provincial Council was adamant they would receive a return for their investment in the Island, and therefore attempted to establish ‘Special Settlements’ of not over 100,000 acres each with the hope that their offer of a free grant of land would overcome the barriers to settlement of the harsh climate, lack of viable economic base, and isolation (Howard 1940: 184).

However, “the depression of 1868 had given the newer settlers - had they but known it - the first warning that their hopes of economic development were ill-founded and that the island resources were not capable of supporting a population dependent wholly upon industry” (Howard 1940:184). The pause in development of industry and settlement on Stewart Island, marked by the end of the timber boom in 1868, baffled the Provincial Council.

In 1877 the provinces were replaced by County Government; however the establishment of Stewart Island County was delayed until 1892, some 15 years later. Until the establishment of the Stewart Island County Council, Stewart Islanders remained reliant upon a distant administration which failed to give much attention to progress, settlement and development.
of the Island. The Provincial Council believed the lack of any real development, settlement or economic or industrial success on the Island was the fault of the Islanders. This was in part due, the Provincial Council believed, to the half-caste population, their half-hearted attempts to develop fishing and the Islanders lack of enterprise and lazy indigence (Howard 1940: 184), as opposed to the lack of development, infrastructure, the harsh climate and isolation.

What was actually happening was that the geographic isolation combined with other factors, including the development of industry which was dependent on mainland markets and the subsequent failure of these industries as the mainland settlements developed their own resources, was creating a downturn in demand for Stewart Island fish and timber. This resulted in the closure of both of the Island’s sawmills and the Island’s largest fishing station. This pattern of ‘boom - bust’ of industry is mirrored by a pattern of ‘boom - bust’ of the Stewart Island population, with people coming to the Island following the promise of employment and financial gain and leaving when industry invariably retracted or failed. This trend of industry failure highlights further evidence of path dependency of Stewart Island, with the early choices in industry and their subsequent failure directing the outcomes and choices possible in the future. Howard (1940:188) wrote that “today (1940), after eighty years of experiment, development and retrogression, the economic situation is hardly different from what it was a century ago... today, history begins to repeat itself. Most of those who tried to exploit the economic resources of the Island have withdrawn, worsted by a resentful Nature; the fishermen alone continue an almost unequal struggle in dwindling numbers.” Indeed, fishing has been one of the two industries that have endured throughout the Island’s history, albeit in differing guises and to varying degrees; the other, tourism, is discussed fully in Chapter Five.

4.8. Fishing

Fishing has long been an important source of wealth on Stewart Island, from being a staple of subsistence living through to providing an export industry for the Island. In 1945 it became the main industry of the Island, with boats using the sheltered anchorages around the coast as bases while trawling in the surrounding waters. However, throughout Stewart
Island's history fishing has had to adapt to meet changes in demand, technology, legislation and available resources.

The early settlers relied upon fish as a means of subsistence. By 1862, however, the situation changed from being a subsistence-driven fishery to an export-driven industry in the form of smoked, dried and salted fish. Species caught in the waters around Stewart Island include blue cod, groper, moki, trumpeter and greenbone. This export industry appeared in response to the expansion of settlements on the mainland and their demand for fish, and made possible by the introduction of a new, regular ferry service (Howard 1940: 204).

This early success soon faced the same fate as that of the timber industry in 1868. Mainland settlements had soon developed and expanded their own fisheries, reducing the demand for Stewart Island fish (Howard 1940: 213). Again external conditions shaped the existence of industry on Stewart Island, but rather than succumb to the external forces the Stewart Islanders developed new innovative methods of getting their fish to the markets, progressing further down the fishing dependency path. In 1884 a fish cannery was established, and during the next five years won a series of gold, silver and bronze medals at the Colonial Indian Exhibition 1886, the International Exhibition Melbourne 1888, and the Exposition of Paris 1889 for innovation and quality (Sansom 1970: 177).

By 1885 the industry was able to get fresh fish to the mainland markets, due to the introduction of the new steamer ferry service. This, however, meant that fishing was limited to the two days immediately before the steamer was due to guarantee freshness, and given the harsh weather, was not always possible (Brinkmann and Peat 1992:39). Further attempts at the development of the fishing industry on the Island continued to occur with Bluff fishing merchants, G Nevill and G Williamson, laying the foundations for the first refrigeration plant on the Island at Port Pegasus in 1897. This company continued successfully with the few boats they possessed, exploiting the fertile new fishing grounds discovered around the Trapps Islands, some 60 nautical miles off the coast of Stewart Island (Hall-Jones 1994:163-165). The company, however, was forced to close down with the outbreak of war in 1914, owing to a shortage of working hands as a result of most of
the fishermen having volunteered for the armed forces (Howard 1940: 216). Again economic development was stifled by external influences.

The discovery of oysters in the early 1860s was a boon for the Island, although the base for oyster boats later moved to Bluff. The first shipments of oysters to the mainland were purchased enthusiastically, engendering a “blind enthusiasm,” resulting in the plundering of the oyster beds with little regard for the conservation of the source of their profits (Howard 1940: 222). By 1867 the oyster beds were depleted to the extent that the industry was abandoned temporarily. In August 1868 extensive deep-water beds were discovered in Foveaux Strait near Port William. However, the Island fishers had not learnt from the earlier lesson on the results of exploitation and began their work with the same disregard for the future (Hall-Jones 1994:163-165), firmly setting in place a pattern of economic operation that has continued to be a part of the Stewart Island economic environment and that has in itself, contributed to the formation of a path dependent future of industry on the Island.

By 1872 it became apparent that the beds were near exhaustion and were closed. In the same year another extensive oyster bed was discovered, but this was to meet the same fate of over-fishing, although this time the fishers requested the government introduce a closed season on the oyster beds in 1877, which continued until 1879. The government agreed to the restrictions resulting in the industry continuing and prospering. Larger boats were introduced to work the deep water beds. The result of the use of larger boats, combined with the oyster boats having to cross the strait every second day to drop off their catch, was that the oyster industry slowly moved its base to Bluff and the markets of the mainland. By 1900 a steady trade of oysters to Australia was established and in 1931 a Bluff cannery was established and the oysters were then able to be exported to England (Howard 1940: 224-225).

Commercial fishing continued in the Stewart Island region after the First World War. In 1920 the Stewart Island Fishing Company opened a freezer plant at Halfmoon Bay, resulting in the main fishing base moving from Port Pegasus to Halfmoon Bay (Brinkmann and Peat 1992:37). Fishing remained a seasonal activity, and the insufficiency of income derived from fishing remained a large issue for Stewart Islanders. Fishing at this time
occupied an unimportant place both within the New Zealand economy and as part of the New Zealand diet, and as such was not scientifically developed and received little political attention, in part due to low local demand and no adequate export markets (Howard 1940:220).

By 1940, Howard (1940:188) observed fishing to be in decline. Fishing, at this time, had never been a stand-alone industry on Stewart Island. The Islanders had to offset income gained from fishing with income generated from other sources. The main economic activity the Islanders relied upon for the additional income was tourism, which became popular from the late 1870s onwards providing the additional income required by the Islanders. The income from fishing or tourism alone was probably not enough to support a family, but the income from both was. Howard (1940:205) described fishing in 1940 as “...the principal occupation of the Islanders when they are not engaged in transporting tourists in their busy motor craft.” This situation, however, was soon to change with the development of a new fishery in the form of crayfishing.

Until 1945 crayfishing was insignificant as an Island industry: “crayfish are also exported to the mainland, but the quantity is so small, proportionately, that it has not been included in the statistical discussions” (Howard 1940:221). The development of this fishery, which was a result of external factors and guided by decisions made at central government level, not only changed the fishing industry on the Island but also the form of tourism present on the Island, as discussed in Chapter Five.

4.9. Crayfishing

The development of crayfishing on Stewart Island after 1945 resulted in a huge change in the Island’s social and economic structure: an influence it continued to exert in different ways throughout its tenure as the economic mainstay of the Island. The influence of crayfishing on the Island has been so great that even though crayfishing provides less employment and income for the Island today, the people of the Island still exalt crayfishing as an integral part of their identity and as a central aspect of their settlement.
After the Second World War crayfish, a species that had received very little commercial attention up until 1945, were developed as an export commodity. The government encouraged the growth of this industry by establishing a one-man licensing authority to review and grant licenses, predominantly with a view to re-settling returned servicemen into New Zealand society (Riley 1980, cited in Levine and Levine 1987: 11). Needless to say the regulatory controls over the fishery at this time were encouraging rather than prohibitive.

On Stewart Island, prior to 1950, the economic mainstay for the residents was cod fishing on leased and private boats, offset by seasonal tourism income. A rapid expansion of the industry followed as a market in the United States was developed for frozen crayfish tails, creating a great demand for crayfish. This resulted in an influx of ‘newcomers’ into the Stewart Island community and fishery, with boat numbers in the Bluff area increasing four-fold between 1948 and 1956 (Levine and Levine 1987: 12), pushing the population up from 328 in 1945 to 576 in 1951, and remaining around the 540 mark throughout the 1950s (Statistics New Zealand 1945, 1951, 1956, 1961).

The move from cod fishing to crayfishing was swift, as the economic returns from crayfishing were identified, as well as the opportunity for local fishermen to establish businesses for themselves. In 1948 there were 21 boats in the Bluff-Stewart Island crayfishery, and by the following year this had trebled to 63 boats. The total catch for the fishery for the same period went from 11 tonnes in 1948 to 191 tonnes in 1949, or from 0.5 tonne per boat in 1948 to 3 tonne per boat in 1949 (Levine and Levine 1987:12).

Although there was limited entry into the crayfishery at this time, the catch rate, and the opportunity for business and profit, attracted more people to the Island during the 1950s and 1960s. Competition for crayfish, and for areas of sea floor up on which to set ones crayfish pots, increased with the increasing number of boats and with advances in technology used to catch crayfish. As one of my interviewees noted:

\[ I \text{ remember Dad fishing and they used to pull the pots up by hand before} \]
\[ \text{they had echo sound and hydraulics and all of this other fancy equipment.} \]
\[ \text{They would be loading up with crayfish and they would be getting 800 or} \]
\[ \text{900 pound of tails per boat and that was pulling the pots up by hand and} \]
that was without a winch or nothing just one hand behind the other.

The result of this was that the crayfish resource was put under increasing pressure, resulting in less crayfish being caught and competition between fishermen increasing further. By 1963 the actual number of landed crayfish had begun to decline (Levine and Levine 1987: 12). Higher prices made up for the decline in catch per boat, and the fleet continued to expand and mechanise.

Restricted entry was removed at this time by central government and resulted in what the local people described as a “gold rush" ensued and by 1977 the number of boats had reached 225 (Levine and Levine 1987: 12). Levine and Levine (1987:100) described life on Stewart Island during their anthropological study of the community as a “picturesque, tranquil, harmonious village of Oban, centred around Halfmoon Bay, is composed of men who are bankrupting each other in what is acknowledged to be a “cut throat” fishery.”

My interviews revealed the attitude described by Levine and Levine is still prevalent today, as the Island people compete for resource and profit.

You never tell a lie but there is a hell of a lot that you don’t say that you should. Like Nancy was complaining to one of our fishermen relations one day when she had to work [on the boat] when I ran out of kids, and she was complaining that her arms were sore and he didn’t show any sympathy at all he said you’ve been catching a lot of fish...hahaha... we haven’t lost that crayfishing mentality. It means you are as friendly as hell on the surface, but you absolutely hate the pr**ck if he’s catching more than you and you don’t know where he is catching them... Crayfishing was easy you just front people up, I suppose we have not lost the old crayfishing mentality of not telling a lie but never telling the truth, except when you say that ‘ohh my arm up here is coming out in sores from crayfish feelers’.

One of the major implications of this ‘gold rush’ was the influx of younger people attracted to Stewart Island, especially in the late 1960s, 1970s (Worth 1978:21) and early 1980s (Levine and Levine 1987: 12). This resulted in a steady rate of births on the Island increasing the primary school roll to around 75 -90 children according to many of my
informants. The current circumstances regarding children and the school are discussed further in Chapter Seven.

The government reintroduced controls in 1979 to arrest the decline in crayfish numbers, in part due to lobbying by the industry, and a moratorium was introduced on new licenses (Levine and Levine 1987: 12). This moratorium began the process of capitalisation of the New Zealand fishing industry in that fish stocks, now a scarce resource, began to have capital value for harvesters. This was particularly so for the major companies, as access to controls restricted new entrants to the industry and enhanced the value of the fish stocks further (Taylor Baines 2000:13).

4.10. 1980s Economic Restructuring - The Introduction of the Quota Management System

The intense competition and consequent over-fishing of crayfish continued to be a feature of the Stewart Island fishery until the 1980s. Up until the 1980s the fishing industry had provided the main source of income for many small coastal New Zealand settlements, including Stewart Island. However, with a change in political and economic focus at the national (and international) level a raft of new policies and legislation were introduced. One of these pieces of legislation was the Fisheries Act 1983. Introduced under an amendment to this Act in 1986, was the ‘Quota Management System’ (QMS) which was designed to facilitate the operation of market forces to allow quotas to be traded between operators (Taylor Baines 2000:12).

The QMS controls activities in New Zealand's fisheries by imposing catch limits and regulating the methods, areas and timing of those activities in each of the four fishing areas. Every year the Ministry of Fisheries assesses the ‘Total Allowable Commercial Catch’ (TACC) for a species, and allocates the TACC in the form of ‘Individual Transferable Quota’ (ITQ) to fishing operators. The ITQ is a tradable property right that permits operators to harvest a quantity of a particular species within an area designated by the Crown (Le Heron 1996:155).
To be allocated quota initially, fishermen were required to have kept accurate records of their catches during the previous seasons. Record keeping was often not a strong point of fishermen, on Stewart Island as elsewhere in New Zealand, resulting in non allocation or limited allocation of quota; as has been discovered in research of other fishing communities in New Zealand (McClintock 2000 in Taylor et el 2000; Horn et al 1998; Horn 2002). Further to this, the allocation of quota, based upon previous catch records, rewarded those fishermen that “were committed to a relentless style of fishing and tend to be the wealthier ones [fishermen]” and although they accounted for only “a handful of boats [they] take well over half of the total annual catch” (Levine & Levine 1987:30). This of course has had implications in relation to the people that had to move off of the Island as a result of the QMS and those that have remained on the Island, with the more successful (and therefore those that were seen to have caught more than their fair share) staying while the less successful (those that fished in a responsible manner catching fish at a more sustainable rate) moving off the Island.

One implication of the QMS is that uncaught fish in the sea now have a market value, enabling fishermen to sell or lease their uncaught fish (quota) to others. The QMS has capped the amount a fisher can catch, unless they are able to buy or lease additional quota. As a result of this many small scale operators sold their ITQ, rather than invest the time and money required to catch their quota, to larger companies. Major companies purchased as much quota as they could (an increasingly scarce resource) even selling their vessels to do so (more boats can always be bought), while many owner operators of smaller boats did not realise the importance of holding quota (Taylor Baines 2000:13).

This trading in ITQ has resulted in a classic example of ‘economies of scale’ within the fishing industry with the quota being sold by small operators becoming concentrated into the control of large companies working out of the most cost-effective bases; these invariably being on the mainland. This has seen the demise of the small fishing communities like Stewart Island, and the rise of large companies operating out of the major ports, using new technologies, combined with large catch capacity ships with processing capacities on board (NZTB 1997:11-12).
One of the implications of this for the Stewart Island community is that many fishermen sold up their quota and moved off the Island, leading to a reduction in the population. As the number of fishing boats based out of Stewart Island reduced so did the number of employment opportunities offered on the Island. A full discussion of these implications and their flow-on effects is presented in Chapter Seven.

Crayfishing has been one of the most influential shapers of the contemporary Stewart Island community and economy. Its legacy is apparent everywhere about Halfmoon Bay and lives in the minds and hearts of many of the Islanders. These Islanders connect the rise and fall of crayfishing as an industry that could sustain local owner operators closely to the policy directions taken by central government.

4.11. Summary

Throughout the history of human settlement on Stewart Island the struggle to gain a livelihood has been central to people's ability to continue living on the Island. Many industries have been attempted and have succumbed to either over exploitation by profit hungry individuals or as a result of changing conditions outside the control of the Islanders. The initial choice of industry, sealing, set Stewart Island down a particular path that ultimately led to Rakiura National Park.

Had the first European settlements been of a permanent nature as opposed to the temporary bases set up by the sealers then the settlement and development of the Island might have proceeded in a different direction. If the first Europeans had pursued timber instead of seals, then the settlements may have expanded into the forest and resulted in a much larger area of trees being cleared; a situation that would have resulted in a different outcome affecting the present national park. Further to this, by tracing the industries attempted on Stewart Island, and their timing in relation to one another, it can be seen that the early choice of industry, sealing and then timber, have set the Island down a path towards conservation.

The community on Stewart Island is presently emerging from the economic decline brought about by the end of the crayfishing industry and the Quota Management System.
introduced in 1986. Conversely, the drive behind the latest expanding boom is nature-based tourism. The following chapter examines the development of tourism and conservation on Stewart Island and highlights their interconnectedness as well as how the failure of the industries presented here have played a role in preserving the Island in a relatively natural state.
Chapter Five: History of Conservation and Tourism on Stewart Island

This chapter examines the relationship between conservation and tourism. It firstly highlights the relationship between conservation and the economic use of land, especially in relation to tourism. It then builds on the previous chapter which examined the history of boom - bust cycles of resource-dependent industries on Stewart Island, and considers how the choice and timing of these industries, in tandem with external influences, helped shape the present range of choices. It shows that as a result of the inability of industry to capitalise on the natural resources of the Island, settlement did not expand and the natural resources were thereby inadvertently preserved. This was followed by official recognition of the limits to industrial development on the Island, the future potential of tourism for the Island and the need to formally conserve areas of interest to tourists.

The Chapter then traces the development of tourism on the Island, highlighting the importance of the industry to the Island and the extent of that history. Further, it shows how this reinforced the drive to conserve large areas of the Island for conservation and preservation purposes. Finally, it can be seen through this chapter how Stewart Island has moved down a particular path that has led ultimately to national park status for the Island today in an attempt at tourism marketing at a national and international level by utilising ‘National Park’ status as an ‘international brand.’ The Chapter is presented in a chronological manner as this approach fits with the concept of path dependency as each choice shapes and constrains future choices.

5.1. An Economic Rationale for Conservation in New Zealand

In many countries, tourism plays a major role in the establishment of protected natural areas. An area’s ‘tourist potential’ is an important factor in the selection process (McNeely, Thorsell & Ceballos-Lascurain 1992:15) and in the negotiation that takes place with local communities. Conservation and economics are, and always have been, very closely linked in New Zealand. The earliest conservation regulations were based on utilitarian motives that sought to ensure future supplies of timber (1874), oysters (1866) and seals (1872) for the developing nation (Star and Lochhead 2002:121); all three were pertinent to Stewart Island.
The conservation estate has long played a part in New Zealand's economic development. The first reference to tourism in relation to preserving the natural environment was under the Scenery Preservation Act 1877. This was followed by further recognition of the importance of both 'natural curiosities' of national interest and mineral springs, both of which were considered to be potential valuable tourist attractions, leading to provision under the Land Act 1884/1885 for them to be 'reserved' (Star and Lochhead 2002:123). The Land Act was amended to include scenery in 1892 as a growing recognition that the country's finest scenery would attract tourists, and that failure to protect it would result in "killing the goose that would lay the golden egg" (Star and Lochhead 2002:123).

Most protected natural areas and national parks in New Zealand have been established in relatively inaccessible areas where development of natural resource-based extractive industries has been difficult or uneconomic (Bührs and Bartlett 1993). The geographic distribution of the current protected natural areas within New Zealand reflects this, with protected areas based primarily along the upland areas of mountains which is a result of the dominant emphasis on land settlement in the lowlands (Booth and Simmons 2000). Up until the late 1980s, "less than 0.5 percent of New Zealand's area had been designated National Park or Reserve in preference to a use foregone" (Molloy 1980, cited in Pawson 2002:150). Since then, three new national parks have been created on land that did have economic potential for development in the form of logging and mining.

The gazettal of national parks, both historically and today, has commonly been justified by presenting parks as a resource for regional economic development through tourism (Higham, Kearsley, and Kliskey 1999). The first national parks in New Zealand were all alpine parks, Tongariro (1894), Taranaki/Egmont (1900) and Arthur's Pass (1929) – landscapes which offered no potential for agricultural development (Hall and Higham 1998). This pattern continued as can be seen by the fact that 10 of New Zealand's 14 national parks fall across the mountain regions (Booth and Simmons 2000:41). Pawson (2002) interprets these as the "bits left over, those that could not be made to fit into the pastoral vision of Britain's southern farm" (Pawson 2002: 148). This scenario still applies with New Zealand's most recent park designations (Whanganui (1984), Paparoa (1987), Kahurangi (1996) and Rakiura 2002 National Parks) providing a tourism resource base for
remote communities (Higham, Kearsley, and Kliskey 1999); communities that have now found their traditional extractive industry base to become uneconomic and considered unsustainable by the government. Indeed it is now recognised that the significance of national parks as an important source of revenue generated from tourism has received greater attention than the resource uses forgone, such as logging and mining (Bührs and Bartlett 1993:58).

5.2. Tongariro – New Zealand’s First National Park

New Zealand’s first national park, Tongariro (1894), was the result of Chief Te Heuheu Tukino of Ngati Tuawharetua gifting the volcanic summits of Tongariro in the central North Island to the people of New Zealand in 1887. The Tongariro gifting has been recognised as the first donation of land for conservation purposes by an indigenous people (Forbes 1993).

This gifting of land, however, must be viewed through the lens of the macro conditions confronting Ngati Tuawharetua, especially the pressures associated with colonisation: the Land Wars; the Native Land Court and European desire for land ownership and development (Kirby 1997:85-86). Faced with an uncertain future for their ownership of the land, the vesting of their land ‘with the government’ ‘for the people of New Zealand’ may have appeared to be the best way to ensure the ongoing protection of their sacred mountains.

The then Minister of Lands, John McKenzie believed the land in question was wasteland unsuitable for farming or mining (Powrie 1997:23). McKenzie was, however, interested in tourism to the area and suggested beautifying the park by introducing deer and planting exotic plant species (Brooking 1996, cited in Powrie 1997). Public acceptance of the national park was based on the fact that the land was “almost worthless as far as grazing was concerned,” and that as a tourist attraction the national park was likely to be “worth ten times more to the country than if it was agricultural or pastoral land” (Star and Lochhead 2002:124). It had already “been described by a great many travellers as, perhaps the greatest scenery in the world” (Balance 1887, cited in Kirby 1997:88).
From this first example of national park creation in New Zealand three clear themes emerge:

1. The land to be protected was considered worthless economically for agriculture or industry;
2. *Macro forces* influenced the initial decision of Ngāti Tuawharetoa to gift the land; and
3. Tourism was acknowledged as being the only productive use of the land.

These three broad themes continue to be seen throughout the history of conservation in New Zealand, and are of significance when considering the case of Rakiura National Park.

5.3. The Development of National Parks in New Zealand – Four Phases

From the outset the recognition of the utility of “beautiful scenery” in attracting tourists was instrumental in extending various forms of protection, dating back to the 1870s (Booth and Simmons 2000). Tourists travelled to New Zealand to gaze at the Pink and White Terraces, to benefit from thermal mineral waters and to fish the country’s teeming fresh water lakes and rivers (Collier 1999: 45).

Roche (1979, 1981, 1984) developed a typology of three historical phases of protected natural area evolution in New Zealand; this typology has been extended by Booth and Simmons (2000) to include a fourth contemporary phase. Booth and Simmons (2000) and Roche (2001) suggest that the process of establishment of national parks and of protected natural areas in New Zealand has occurred in four phases that mirrored macro economic conditions at particular points in time: a period of initiation and acquisition from 1890s-1920s; a maintenance period from 1930s-1950s; a management phase from the 1960s-late 1980s (Roche 1981, 1984); and the present phase of business and negotiation from 1987-present (Booth and Simmons 2000:44).
5.3.1. Phase One: Initiation (1869-1902) and Acquisitions (1890s-1920s)

The initial phase - initiation and acquisition - lasted between the 1890s and the 1920s. Initial arguments to preserve nature resources and land, based on a utilitarian perspective, were put forward in parliament in an attempt to convince the House (which at that time was focused on development of industry and the use of natural resources to that end) to slow the rate of destruction of the country’s natural resources. Following this, further arguments were developed that embraced both aesthetic and ecological rationale; "preservation was intended to protect areas from the threat of destruction rather than for active recreational use" (Roche 1979:160-161).

This period saw the gazettal of Tongariro and Egmont National Parks, and the reserving of areas that would later form the basis of future national parks (Booth and Simmons 2000:41). This phase reflects a time in New Zealand’s history that saw the country increase the type and volume of agricultural exports and expand the amount of land settled as New Zealand entered an era of prosperity that lasted from the mid 1890s until the beginning of the 1920s (Brooking 1992).

Concurrent with this was a recognition that the natural resources of the country, especially native timber, were being used at an unsustainable pace and under a growing recognition of the significance of native species (Star and Lochhead 2002:127). The Forests Act 1874, the Land Act 1877 and then the Forests Act 1886 provided the initial measures under which land and forests could be preserved (Wynn 2002:113). These Acts were created in the interests of future supplies of timber and as flood and erosion protection measures. Scenery protection, reflecting recognition of the importance of tourism was one important initiative of this period, evident in the Scenery Preservation Acts of 1877 and 1903. The resulting reserves formed the foundation of the current system of parks and reserves (Star and Lochhead 2002:126). Tourism was first mentioned in relation to conservation under the Scenery Preservation Act 1877 while the Scenery Preservation Act 1903 saw tourism as an important component in protecting areas with the Commission that recommended reserves being placed within the Tourist and Health Department (Booth and Simmons 2000).
5.3.2. Phase Two: Maintenance (1930s-1950s)

The beginning of the ‘Great Depression’ of the 1920s and the 1930s saw the start of the second phase of protected natural areas, described as one of maintenance that lasted from the 1930s until the 1950s (Roche 1981). By this Roche means that there was largely no great expansion of protected natural areas, instead the areas already protected were maintained in their natural state. This illustrates the connection between economic conditions and the ability to develop conservation initiatives.

Although minor acquisitions continued throughout this phase, it was dominated by the consolidation of legislation for establishing national parks and reserves, with two important pieces of legislation, the National Park Act 1952 and the Forest Act 1949, introduced (Booth and Simmons 2000).

During this time the demand for recreation and tourism opportunities within the protected natural areas of New Zealand increased dramatically, resulting in both interests being represented on the National Park Authority that was established under the 1952 Act. Towards the end of this period saw the gazettal of Fiordland National Park (1952) and Mt Cook National Park (1953). Again the link between conservation and economic conditions is mirrored with these two new national parks coinciding with the start of ‘the long boom’ - a prolonged period of prosperity that lasted from the end of the Second World War until the early 1970s (Hawke 1996).

5.3.3. Phase Three: Management (1960s-1980s)

The management phase was characterised by a small but steady increase in the size of the protected natural area system with a large increase in visitation to backcountry areas (Booth and Simmons 2000). This phase began during the long economic boom, but conditions quickly changed with Britain entering the European Economic Community and the oil crisis of 1973 bringing an abrupt end to this time of prosperity (Hawke 1996). As unemployment and inflation rose, conservation was increasingly seen as “locking up” natural resources that might provide industry with the opportunity to expand and create employment (Devlin 1993; cited in Booth and Simmons 2000:43).
The focus during this time was on how to manage conservation land, and recreation, in line with ecological principles and the protecting of new areas that were under-represented within New Zealand's protected natural areas, including wetlands, grasslands and coastal sites (Booth and Simmons 2000).

### 5.3.4. Phase Four: Business and Negotiation (1980s – Present)

Booth and Simmons (2000) extended Roche's (1979, 1981, 1984) typology of periods of protected natural area evolution in New Zealand by suggesting that there has been a distinct phase lasting from the late 1980s until present. This latest period they believe is one of business and negotiation and mirrors the country's radical political, social and economic transformation since the mid 1980s. This has seen traditional extractive industries being replaced by Protected Natural Areas and the promise of tourism development.

During this latest phase four new national parks have been created. The establishment of Whanganui (1984), Paparoa (1987), Kahurangi (1996) and Rakiura National Parks (2002) can be seen to be the beginning of a 'marketing approach' to conservation: the areas are used to promote New Zealand as a tourism destination via campaigns such as '100% Pure New Zealand', as well as convincing the local communities of the potential economic gains associated with the new land status.

This new approach to conservation was based on a process of negotiation with interest groups and compromise, resulting in 'deals being done' to reach some level of consensus (Booth and Simmons 2000:46). The negotiation involved in the Paparoa case covered a ten year period, while the Kahurangi negotiations took 15 years (Booth and Simmons 2000). The length of negotiation taken for Rakiura National Park covered a period of some 24 years or more, from the time of an initial investigation into the administration of Crown land on the Island in the late 1970s.

The increasing importance of the role of tourism in conservation initiatives has become internationally recognised, with the IUCN (McNeely et al 1998:51) stating that "National Parks are an internationally recognised form of protection given to areas that are managed mainly for ecosystem protection and tourism." This recognition dovetails into the current
situation in New Zealand where conservation initiatives, such as Whanganui, Paparoa, Kahurangi and Rakiura National Parks, appear to be moves to promote tourism as a main industry in areas that have had to forego traditional industries and potential economic development of resources and land that has been ‘locked up.’ Rakiura National Park should be viewed within this context, but also with the unique history of Stewart Island and its industries that provide the context to the situation.

5.4. The Case of Conservation and Tourism on Stewart Island

The relatively intact natural environment of Stewart Island is largely due to the choice and timing of industries attempted on the Island combined with the Island’s isolated location with respect to markets. As I demonstrated in Chapter Three, a number of land-based natural resource extractive industries have been attempted, but these have generally followed a pattern of ‘boom - bust’ with only those that have been able to adapt to changing conditions and markets, fishing and tourism, enduring through time.

As discussed in the previous chapter, the lack of settlement and development on Stewart Island resulted from the failed attempts to sustain economically viable industries on the Island. Consequently, while the rest of New Zealand benefited from development and expanded transport connections such as roads, railways and shipping (Brinkmann and Peat 1992:40), Stewart Island remained relatively primitive and pristine. The combination of a lack of settlement, development and establishment of extractive land based industry of a more permanent nature led a number of individuals, both from Stewart Island and from mainland New Zealand, to emphasise its uniqueness and to promote the idea of nature preservation.

In 1884 it was suggested by the leader of a botanical expedition, Mr T. Kirk, that it would be a wise policy to retain the Island as a timber reserve. This was the first proposal for restrictions to be placed upon the sale and occupation of the land on the Island, and the government, fully aware of the limitations to development, approved of the suggestion. The timber resources of the Island were at this time recognised to contain no potentially profitable milling timber, given the Island’s isolated location, climate, terrain and external economic and social conditions at the time. This form of ‘preservation’ was also a form of
resource management, with an eye to the potential of tourism and the attraction of natural spaces to tourists.

5.5. Government Intervention on Stewart Island

The government intervened in the forestry industry in the form of the *State Forests Act 1885*, setting new regulations in an attempt to slow down wasteful logging of indigenous forests. This required operations on the Island to meet three objectives: "To prevent undue waste of timber; to ensure a supply of timber for future production; to provide for the "proper conservation of climate conditions by the preservation of forest growth in elevated situations" (cited in Purey-Cust and McClymont, 1978:44). This Act was passed in the middle of the 'Long Depression' (1878-1895), and would appear to be a utilitarian response to constricting economic conditions brought about by decreasing prices for New Zealand exports. At this time the government was beginning to think of natural resources that had little resource extraction potential, in terms of future tourism attraction potential. In February 1886, the whole of the forested area of Stewart Island, except that which had been granted as Maori Reserves, was declared State Forest by the Crown under the *State Forests Act 1885*. All land that was not already alienated from the Crown, surveyed or under survey, was included in the State Forest. This reservation of the land did not harm the milling industry on the Island, as the best and most accessible timber had been taken and operations were already waning (Howard 1940:194).

The reservation imposed restrictions upon the expansion of the settlement in the only attractive portion of the Island. However, with the forming of the Stewart Island County Council in 1896 some of the forest surrounding Halfmoon Bay was removed from the Forest Reserve in 1893 as many Islanders objected to the 'locking up' of the land, believing that land was required around the settlement for development and expansion (Howard 1940:194). It is interesting to note that this situation in 1893 reflects a surprisingly similar situation to that in 2001, with many of the Stewart Island community believing extra land is required and should be taken out of the conservation estate to allow for development and expanded settlement, even though the population in the 1890s compared to that in 2001 has remained virtually unchanged.
The pushing back of the boundary of the State Forest only stalled the inevitable momentum of conservation and tourism, as the government was already taking account of aesthetic value, in economic terms, of unspoilt scenery via the *Lands Act 1892* (Roche 1979: 34). By the close of the nineteenth century the government had conceived new policy to preserve the Island’s forests in their natural state (Howard 1940: 194).

The government, seeing that further settlement and development based on extractive industry on the Island was unlikely, realised that tourism was an industry that in the future would prove to be important, and that the main attraction of New Zealand, and Stewart Island, is the ‘clean and green’ natural environment. Through its essentially undisturbed natural environment Stewart Island is able to capitalise in a non-extractive manner, gaining profits from not extracting natural resources but from their use as recreational and scenic resources.

Ulva Island, in Paterson Inlet, was the site of the first reserve on the Island, established in 1899 under the *Land Act 1892* for the “Preservation of Native Game and Flora,” predominantly for the purposes of tourism. Ulva Island was at this time serving as a popular terminus for tourists embarking on water-based excursions and also as the site of one of the Island’s two Post Offices (Howard 1940:318). This was quickly followed in 1903 by a number of small and widely distributed reserves which were proclaimed under the provisions of the *Land Act 1892*, this time for the ‘Protection of Scenery,’ totalling an area of 2,780 acres (Howard 1940:319). A year later in 1904 the Commissioner of Crown Lands in Southland indicated that any hope the government may have had of further settlement of the Island had been abandoned, recommending that 46,000 acres be protected for scenic purposes and 208,000 be protected for Native Flora and Fauna (Howard 1940:319). Although the government did not immediately effect these recommendations, by 1907 both recommendations were implemented, hastened by the continued growth in tourist numbers in the early part of the 20th Century (Howard 1940:318).

The land reserved for scenery purposes under the *Land Act 1892* was consolidated with the introduction of the *Scenery Preservation Act 1908* and by 1919 all other land that had been
protected under the earlier legislation was brought under the provisions of the 1908 Act, with one final reserve added in 1921 (Howard 1940:320; Purey-Cust and McClymont 1978:50). This was during a period of prosperity for New Zealand (Roche 1979: 161). In recognition of the importance of the role of protected natural areas to the economic fortunes of the Island, Howard (1940:188) stated that “this policy [of protection] was continued by successive governments, and today [1940] most of the Island is placed under reserve as a permanent and unalienable asset to provide an income for the handful of inhabitants gathered at the northeast point of the land.”

5.6. The Promise of Tourism on Stewart Island

The main driving force behind the conservation measures outlined in the previous section was the potential of tourism as an economic use of otherwise uneconomic resources and land. “Tourism began on Stewart Island before 1880, and by the end of the century had been so far developed that the government, which had by then realised that agricultural expansion was impossible, took steps to ensure that the Island scenery should be preserved intact in certain areas accessible to visitors” (Howard 1940:188).

The popularity of the Island as a tourist destination is recorded in guidebooks, the New Zealand Official Year Book and in the Appendices to the Journal of the House of Representatives throughout the 1880s and early 1900s. For instance, in the 1888 guide book “Southland: A Guide”, Stewart Island is described as “...becoming a favourite resort for tourists, who are attracted by its healthfulness, its charming scenery, and the facilities for various health giving recreations, such as boating, yachting, sea bathing, fishing, shooting, and fern collecting”” (Traveller 1888:51). Clearly the attraction to the Island was the nature-based tourism and recreational opportunities that the Island possessed.

The attraction of the Island’s natural environment was recognised by many prominent individuals, including celebrated botanist Leonard Cockanye in 1909: “The capabilities of Stewart Island as a pleasure resort can hardly be over-estimated. That it will eventually be celebrated, not only in New Zealand, but throughout Australasia, is certain. The face of the earth is changing so rapidly that soon there will be little of primitive nature left. The Old
World is practically gone forever. It [Stewart Island] is a piece of the primeval world.” (Leonard Cockayne 1909; cited in Hall-Jones 1994:208).

This recognition of the forests’ future potential for tourism on Stewart Island combined with the minimal benefits for continuing with wasteful logging practices, inevitably leading to logging and productive use of the Island’s State Forests ceasing completely in 1931 (Purey-Cust, and McClymont 1978: 3). This coincided with both the 1929 Depression, when New Zealand was caught in an international economic slump, leading to what Roche (1979:162) describes as the ‘maintenance period’ in protected natural area management.

In response to the Depression, the New Zealand government initiated a period of financial discipline, and an extension of state intervention and regulation (Pawson and Le Heron 1996:8). In relation to the timber industry it was recognised that native forests could not sustain the level of production required, resulting in considerable effort being put into establishing exotic plantations at this time to combat rapidly dwindling indigenous forests (Kirby 1996: 114).

5.7. The Nature of Tourism on Stewart Island

The first organised tourism excursions from the mainland to Stewart Island are believed to have started around 1876 (Howard 1940:318). The beginnings of this fledgling industry centred on the attractions of the Island’s “scenic beauty of the spreading forests and the bays and sprinkled inlets” (Howard 1940:318).

Never slow to take up an opportunity, the entrepreneurs of the Island soon began catering to the basic needs of tourists. In 1870 the first of the boarding houses, Travellers Rest, was built by a Captain Harrold and was reported to be a busy place with crowds of visitors (Sansom 1970:32). At this time the Lonnecker home, which doubled as a store, provided visitors to the Island with eggs, potatoes, butter and fresh vegetables. This home became the Island’s first licensed hotel in 1875, after more bedrooms were added to meet licensing regulations (Sansom 1970:76). The Travellers Rest was soon joined by another boarding
house, Greenvale, in 1886. Greenvale became very popular and ran its own launches and pleasure cruises into Paterson Inlet, as well as hiring out dinghies (Sansom 1970:84).

By the 1890s Stewart Island boasted six boarding houses at Halfmoon Bay: the Travellers Rest; Greenvale; Oban House; Bay View; Seafield; and Ferndale; and at Port Pegasus there was also the Pioneer Hotel (Sansom 1970: 105). There were more visitors to the Island at this time than in the 1970s, with most visitors staying for periods of time measured in weeks (Sansom 1970: 105). Part of a description of Halfmoon Bay given by Traill (in Traveller 1888: 51) is that “…boarding house keeping are the chief industries, and there is a pleasing air of comfort and homeliness about the place and its surroundings.”

Tourism to the Island in the later part of the 19th century and early part of the 20th century was flourishing, evident in the number of guidebooks being published by the New Zealand government and private enterprise. Flanagan (1898:80), in his guide book describes Stewart Island as “…a great tourist destination during the summer months, and is easily reached by steamer from the Bluff” and Port Pegasus as “the finest harbour in the world.” The Island’s tourist facilities and attractions were also included in the ‘New Zealand Official Year Book’ around the turn of the 20th century. The New Zealand Official Year Book (1903) lists the major attractions on the Island as “…bathing, boating, and deep sea fishing excursions…and walking tours”, while the New Zealand Official Year Book (1906) describes them as “…the numerous bays and fiords”, and also states that “the boarding houses at Oban (Halfmoon Bay) are capable of accommodating a large number of visitors; there are several stores in the township” and that “an auxiliary oil ketch and other boats may be hired at Oban for coastal cruises.”

The attraction of the Island’s flora and fauna also feature in these guide books and the Official Year Book. Traill (in Traveller 1888:45-48) describes in some detail the highlights of the Island’s flora including the flowering of the rata, while Flanagan (1898:81) describes the attraction of the native ‘game’ birds such as kaka, wood pigeon, teal and paradise duck. Some 50 years after the initial tourism ‘boom’, Howard (1940:188) illustrated the continued role and importance of tourism to the local community and the Island’s economy: “The work of entertaining and catering for the multitude of visitors is a seasonal activity, but the profits derived from tourism probably exceed those drawn from fishing or
farming. Thirty years ago (1910) the tally of tourists had reached a total of 2500 annually, and in recent times it has upon occasion exceeded 4000. It is, however, impossible to gauge the monetary value of the visitation, for tourist disbursements flow in many channels and a large proportion of the income passes across the Strait in the payment of supplies. Nonetheless, the general financial stability of the community today is due in great measure to this recurrent flow of money."

After World War One, tourist traffic to the Island developed at such a pace that the Harbour Board and County Council had to introduce charges with which to improve and develop the wharves and jetties (Howard 1940:276). This increase in tourist numbers continued at a steady rate. During the 1933/1934 season it is recorded that 7441 people visited Stewart Island, with this number rising to 12,880 by the 1938/1939 season (Appendices to the Journal of the House of Representatives 1934; 1939). Regardless of this increase in annual visitor numbers the reliance on tourism was coming to a close as new opportunities came to the fore. The development of the crayfisheries resulted in the local economy booming and changing the reliance on, and type of, tourism on the Island.

In 1940, Howard (1940:278) went so far as to state that Stewart Island had become the most popular holiday resort in the south as a result of widespread advertisement of the Island’s scenic beauty and the attractions it offers to holiday makers. However, he emphasised, the responsibility for its development lies not with the local people but with the central government.

5.8. Tourism and the Effect of the Crayfishing Years

The development of the crayfishing industry had a major influence on the Stewart Island community, which helped remove the economic necessity of hosting tourism. Crayfishing provided the Island, the southern region and New Zealand with a substantial income. Also, the developments related to crayfishing created a change in both the characteristics of the Island community and tourism on the Island.

Tourism on the Island began to change in character with the appearance of holidaymakers and ‘crib owners’ who were able to buy small, residential sections within Halfmoon Bay from 1926 (Howard 1940:277). Between the end of the Second World War and 1960, 75
percent of the new houses built on Stewart Island were holiday residences. By 1968 43 percent of residences on the Island were holiday homes. This was a change from the boarding houses and camping grounds that had dominated tourism accommodation on the Island previously.

In 1961 the ferry Wairua began service on the Bluff to Stewart Island run. This was a modern, comfortable boat, with plenty of space and stabilising fins, with the capacity to carry up to 300 passengers and 160 tons of cargo. The Wairua, at this time, was the largest and most powerful ship ever built in New Zealand (Sansom 1970: 132). This vessel provides an example of the economic importance of, and wealth associated with crayfishing as the Wairua was the means of transporting the tons of crayfish to the mainland daily. With such a new, powerful and comfortable ferry service, day visitors to the Island started to increase (Worth 1978:22), as tourism slowly moved away from the long stay tourist using boarding houses, to day visitors and crib owners.

As restrictions on entry to the crayfishery were lifted in 1963 an influx of ‘newcomers’ arrived on the Island, creating a demand for housing as the population increased (Levine and Levine 1987:12). This put pressure on the holiday home portion of housing on the Island by the mid 1970s and early 1980s. Purey-Cust and McClymont, (1978:28-30) described Stewart Island as a popular holiday resort that had been known for many years among Southlanders and South Islanders, although they note that tourism had since dropped off due to the rise of the motorcar as a holiday transport tool.

The exact cause of the decline in both visitor numbers and the amount of accommodation offered on the Island is unclear. Perhaps Purey-Cust and McClymont (1978) were correct in associating the decline with the rise of the motorcar, however they also reported the boarding houses that had remained up until the 1960s had burnt down or closed, until only the hotel remained in the early 1970s.

Whether the decrease in overnight visitor numbers was the result of a lack of accommodation, or whether the decline in accommodation available was due to a drop in demand is unclear. What is clear is that visitor numbers to the Island remained relatively high, with 21,000 day visitors in 1977 travelling to the Island aboard the Wairua (Worth
At the time of their report (1978), Purey-Cust and McClymont (1978:35) stated that “commercial tourism is not at present a major force on the Island, particularly compared with the past.” This they believed was largely due to the lack of family style accommodation on the Island, a change in holiday trends and fashion away from the seaside, and an increasing reluctance to cross Foveaux Strait by boat. Although they presented no data to support their claims it appears clear, from the literature reviewed, that tourism on the Island has followed a wave pattern of visitation.

5.9. Changing Attitudes Towards Tourism

As the Island’s economy has changed through time, the characteristics of tourism and its economic importance and desirability to the local population have also changed. From the description above of the relatively frenzied (in Stewart Island terms) activity surrounding the set up of boarding houses, stores and hotels it is possible to see that the initial reaction to tourism was one of acceptance and endorsement.

It appears that as tourism developed on the Island, local people learnt to come to terms with what Howard (1940) described as a steady increase in tourist numbers. His view of the Islanders was that they had: “... developed a strange adaptability of temperament which enables them to live at ease in peaceful seclusion or in the midst of gay throngs of pleasure seeking strangers. The sudden and effortless change from the one to the other condition is the most remarkable feature of the social habits of the people today. Their ability to return to the interrupted course of calm existence when the last of the visitors has departed may perhaps be attributed to a care free philosophy transmitted through generation and generation from the pioneers who came in search of peace a long century ago” (Howard 1940:189). This ability to switch to and from tourism was an essential skill for the Island residents as tourism provided a substantial portion of their income.

Once tourism had been superseded by crayfishing as the economic mainstay of the Island, and as a result of the ‘gold rush’ and influx of ‘newcomers’ that accompanied the lifting of
the restrictions initially imposed on crayfishing, attitudes towards tourists and those not from the Island changed considerably. A slightly different view of tourism on the Island was aired by the Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust (QEII National Trust) (1980:5), who when reporting on the 1980 national park proposal stated that: “the inhabitants are not enthusiastic for tourism. They live on the Island mainly because of its own particular way of life and they do not intend to allow that to be changed.” It was also noted at that time that there seemed “little drive for, or likelihood of, any major development [in relation to tourism]” (QEII National Trust 1980: 2).

Their ‘unenthusiastic’ attitude to tourism was largely due to the fact that by this time in the Island’s history the reliance on income generated by tourism had become marginalised as income generated from crayfishing provided the Island with a more than sufficient income. Without a need for the extra income tourism could generate the Island community developed the attitude that they could do without the intrusion of having tourists on their Island and in their hotel overnight or for extended periods.

Regardless of this attitude the 1980 report (QEII National Trust 1980) believed that the number of tourists visiting the Island was increasing again, although most of those visiting were of short-term or day visitors due to the lack of accommodation. Further to this the report noted that neither the accommodation available nor the climate was deemed likely to attract a large influx of visitors, especially international visitors (QEII National Trust 1980: 5). The authors of the report considered that tourism would grow, but slowly compared to the rest of New Zealand, and that access to the Island, as well as the lack of facilities would limit major increases in visitor numbers.

To the people of the Island, and many of the visitors, the way of life made possible by the Island’s isolation is at least as important as the scenic, ecological or recreational value of the land (QEII National Trust 1980; Booth and Leppens 2002). It can be seen that the fear of rampant tourism development as a direct threat to this lifestyle, although somewhat unrealistic as will be shown in Chapter Seven, was aired as a major reason why tourism development was not welcome when the Island did not need the income derived from tourism. Again, it must be stressed that during this period of the Island’s history the
residents of the Island enjoyed what has been described by my informants as a 'lucrative income' from the proceeds of crayfishing.

Since this time the role of crayfishing in the Stewart Island economy has changed due to the introduction of the Quota Management System. This has resulted in fewer individuals participating in the fishery and enjoying its financial returns, and hence a decrease in the importance of the crayfish industry vis-à-vis tourism in recent times.

5.10. Summary

In summary this chapter has shown a number of the links between economic conditions, industry failure and both tourism and conservation. Early desecration of resources was followed rapidly by attempts to conserve the Island, in the wake of failure and given the prospects for tourism. The majority of the Island has been formally protected for nearly 100 years in a variety of reserves ranging from Nature Reserves through to scenic reserves with much of the protection originating from the potential for tourism.

The ability to set aside such vast tracts of land is owed to the failure of resource extractive industry to create a lasting land based industry. At times the residents of the Island have been enthusiastic towards conservation and have promoted the idea to government, while at other times they have been opposed to central government conservation initiatives. On Stewart Island then, the links between resource extractive industry, conservation and tourism are reasonably clear and provide a classic example of how conservation driven by tourism has often been directed at land that has withstood the pressures of settlement and development.
Chapter Six: The Creation of Rakiura National Park and the Consultation Process

This Chapter explores the process towards, and the creation of, Rakiura National Park. It considers the unfolding of events, including the public consultation process, from the perspective of the Stewart Island residents interviewed as part of this research. It shows how events of the past coupled with the recent economic and social conditions on the Island, as well as the wider economic conditions at the national level, influenced the ability of the government to propose and then gazette Rakiura National Park at this time. Again, to understand how the National Park was able to be created it is necessary to understand the influence of the past and how attitudes developed in the past were applied to the present.

The Chapter examines people’s opposition, support or total ambiguity towards the concept of Rakiura National Park and the different factors - political, cultural, social and economic - underpinning the positions taken by different members of the community. Through this it also demonstrates the ‘cartels’ that developed around the different community groupings and individuals that are in influential positions, both official and unofficial, and the role these played in shaping the different opinions on the National Park. It highlights how the Department of Conservation was left bearing the brunt of opposition after the initial announcements by politicians; and that the Department of Conservation was left without a clear process with which to work through the public consultation process.

The chapter then discusses the main reasons behind the drive to create Rakiura National Park, as depicted in discussion documents, newspaper articles and according to the views of Stewart Island residents. It examines what the residents believe were the main issues that were raised through the consultation process, in relation to the issues surrounding the national park, tourism and of the consultation process itself.

6.1. The Influence of the Past

As was demonstrated in Chapter Five, the driving force behind nature conservation on Stewart Island was primarily a result of the failure of successful exploitative industries, all of which failed due to either macro conditions or a lack of readily exploitable resources,
combined with the recognised future potential of nature-based tourism. The majority of land on the Island had been protected for over 70 years at this point. In the late 1970s a review into the future administration and management of Crown lands on Stewart Island was conducted as a joint study by the Department of Lands & Survey (DLS) and the New Zealand Forest Service (NZFS) (Purey-Cust & McClymont 1978). Two of their objectives were to:

- Collect and assemble available information on the natural, recreational, scenic and economic resources of the lands of the Crown. Relevant social and cultural aspects should be taken into account.
- To derive a pattern of land use recommendations or land use options that achieves the wisest long term use of available resource (Purey-Cust & McClymont 1978).

It was also noted in their brief that “it is not intended that the study make recommendations on future tenure and administration but it should be framed so that it can aid consideration of these factors as a second stage,” and that “the range of land uses to be accommodated is not rigidly fixed, but the study should examine the preservation of areas for conservation purposes, a wide range of recreational use from complete wilderness to developed areas” (Purey-Cust & McClymont 1978:244). The purpose of this document was to “form a basis for public comment and subsequent consideration by the two Director Generals (NZFS and DLS) and the Minister (of Lands).”

It is clear from the review objectives that the rationale behind this study was to examine best land use and administration options, although a national park was an explicit option; there was no imperative to investigate only one land use option.

The ‘second stage’ of this land administration review was conducted by the Queen Elizabeth II National Trust, the aim of which was to identify which of the government agencies (NZFS or DLS) should manage and control the Crown land on the Island, and under what guise. This research followed on from a visit by the New Zealand National Parks Authority, whom the QEII National Trust agreed with regarding the non-feasibility of creating a national park on Stewart Island at that time. Both bodies “share[d] the view … that the time is not right for the creation of a national park, although we would think that much of the Island would meet the criteria” (QEII National Trust 1980:13).
At this point one must ask the question: Why, if much of the Island meets the criteria for national park status, did these bodies oppose such a move? To answer this it is necessary to consider to the social and economic climate on the Island in the 1970s.

6.2. Social, Economic and Political Life on Stewart Island in the 1970s

Life on Stewart Island during the late 1970s and early 1980s was predominantly focused on crayfishing. Tourism had by this point dropped away to only a few people, though it was a relatively substantial day visitor destination. As Thomason, Crompton and Kamp (1979) argue, positive attitudes to tourism have been shown to increase as an individual’s economic dependence on the tourism industry increases. At this time on Stewart Island there was almost no dependence on tourism as a financial mainstay. Resistance to the concept of a national park by the residents of the Island was one of two obstacles present at that time, the other being the Islander’s attitudes towards government interference on what was deemed to be “their Island” (QEII National Trust 1980).

The attitude of Islanders to bureaucracy is first discussed in Chapter Three and is exemplified in the QEII National Trust (1987:3) document by their description that “like many island people, especially those removed by distance from the centres of government control, they are fiercely independent” and that this “spirit of independence, inherent in most island people dependent on the sea for their livelihood, was offended by the ‘bureaucracy of Wellington’ when it was decided that the Department of Lands and Survey...”. To understand the attitudes of the Stewart Island community in the 1970s towards the administration of Crown lands on the Island and the possibility of a move to national park status it is necessary to briefly examine their relationship with both the Department of Lands & Survey and the New Zealand Forest Service to those Crown lands. Quotes from my interviews are used here in conjunction with the joint New Zealand Forest Service and Department of Lands & Survey (1978) report, and the QEII National Trust (1980) report to demonstrate the persistent nature of some of the beliefs, attitudes and opinions held by Island residents then and today.
6.2.1. Relations Between the Land, the Government and the People

The people of Stewart Island have always had a 'distant' relationship with the governing bodies of New Zealand, evident in the initial accidental exclusion of Stewart Island from New Zealand under the Treaty of Waitangi, to the delay in establishing the Stewart Island County Council through to the decisions relating to natural resource extractive industries. Of foremost importance when discussing the creation of Rakiura National Park is the relationship of the government agencies that preceded DoC with the people of Stewart Island; a relationship that can be characterised as a struggle between conservationists and natural resource exploiters. The following section details some of the history of the two major government agencies involved with Crown land on Stewart Island: the Department of Lands and Survey; and the New Zealand Forestry Service. This history is essential for understanding some of the attitudes to the 1999 national park proposal.

Up until 1919 the exclusive control of the state forests on Stewart Island was the domain of DLS, in the form of a Forestry branch. The boundary of the State Forest had been pushed back by resentful locals who were keen on development and expansion in 1892, after the establishment of the Stewart Island County Council. The administrative situation changed as a result of the establishment of the State Forest Service which was handed exclusive control and management of the State Forests in 1919, although land held in reserves, as leasehold, and unalienated land was still the domain of the DLS (Purey-Cust & McClymont 1978:45).

In 1959 a new ranger was employed on the Island to replace Mr C. Traill (a Stewart Islander), who had up until that time worked primarily for DLS and later jointly with the NZFS and the Department of Internal Affairs. The new ranger, Mr McArthur, also worked jointly for both departments until 1967 when he was replaced by a ranger who was paid in full by the NZFS, leading to a sole manager role being performed on the Island by the NZFS. The significance of this is that from 1963, four years after Mr McArthur was appointed, there was a steady influx of newcomers to the Island in the pursuit of crayfishing profits. Many of these people still resided on the Island in the late 1970s (and today) and whose memories, and therefore their support (given that they were attracted to the Island in the pursuit of profit from natural resources), of land management is only that of the NZFS and not the DLS who have had the longer history on the Island. As is
discussed later in this chapter, this becomes an important point in contemporary relations with DoC, as DoC is seen as a continuation of the DLS (and therefore more remote and bureaucratic) rather than the NZFS (seen as more ‘local’ and closely connected to the Island by many of the people of the Island).

6.2.2. Land Use vs. “Locking Up”

Complicating this further was that the NZFS were viewed by many of the Islanders as an agency that was concerned with the ‘use’ of resources, whereas the DLS was seen to be more interested in ‘locking up’ these same resources. In the view of the Islanders this meant that the NZFS was development and profit friendly whereas the DLS was not. The DLS gradually gained more influence over land management on the Island. In 1974 the joint administration of the Island was formalised under a ‘Heads of Agreement’ approved by the then Minister in charge of the Lands and Forests portfolios. A joint report by NZFS and DLS that although unable to agree on an appropriate status for the Crown land on the Island, did manage to agree that most, if not all, of the lands should be set aside for public amenity and recreation (Purey-Cust & McClymont 1978:46) rather than as a potential timber resource or areas for mining.

The DLS “gradually assumed responsibility for undertaking the work required to administer and control its [Crown] lands” (Purey-Cust & McClymont 1978:2), a responsibility that had from 1967 been undertaken by NZFS. The amount of Crown land under the control of DLS steady increased, reflecting an increase in the recreational use of the Island’s Crown land. Due to this situation the DLS attempted to purchase a house within Halfmoon Bay to accommodate DLS permanent staff. However, in response to this development “immediately concern was voiced by some of the local residents who were perturbed at what they saw as unnecessary duplication by one Government agency of work and functions already being undertaken by another” (Purey-Cust & McClymont 1978:2). This was reflected by both government agencies, with each suspecting the other of attempts to takeover their operations on the Island.

This situation was further commented upon by the QEII National Trust in 1980, which stated that “the current division of administrative control between Lands & Survey Department and the Forest Service is strongly resented and ridiculed by the Islanders.”
Rightly or wrongly this division is seen by them as bureaucratic nonsense leading to unnecessary duplication of staff and services and to needless expense. They view the scene as one of two large government departments struggling with each other and exhibiting rival jealousies. They would have this situation abolished immediately. The resentment to which we have just referred is not new. There was strong and vocal opposition to the re-introduction of Lands staff in 1975, but unquestionably it has grown in the years since. We were surprised by its universality and its intensity” (QEII National Trust 1980:3-4).

The QE II National Trust report revisit this issue when discussing the preference of the Islanders between the two departments: “There can be no doubt that the wishes of at least the majority of the inhabitants are firmly that of the two departments, Forestry is to be preferred. Indeed the feeling against Lands is intense and extensive to a degree which, despite the warning to us that we would find it so, amazed us. Not one person took a stand to the contrary... we have no doubt at all that the Island is pro Forestry and anti Lands” (QEII National Trust 1980:9).

6.2.3. The Rise of the Department of Lands and Survey and Enhanced Conservation

Resident’s views of these two government agencies goes further than just that of wasteful duplication; the main issue is one of ideology: use or conservation. For residents, the QEII National Trust is seen as holding the belief that the Island should be managed by only one of these agencies – the DLS, and it is this scenario that was the cause of concern amongst the local residents.

To the residents the NZFS represented a less restrictive approach to the management of the Island’s Crown land in the form of a Forest Park, with the NZFS itself seen as “still substantially concerned in timber production” (QEII National Trust 1980:7). The DLS, however, were perceived by the Island residents to be “very substantially orientated to the preservation of the ecology of New Zealand” (QEII National Trust 1980:7).

The QEII National Trust (1980:9) report states “the inhabitants’ conviction that a national park, or a mosaic of reserves administered by Lands (DLS), would result in some form of restrictions on their long enjoyed freedom to go on the land, to use the harbours as fishing bases for smoking, packing or some other form of fish processing, and to the unrestricted
use of harbours for shelter.” This in part was seen to arise from “memories of claimed differences of viewpoint with Fiordland National Park over the use of Milford and other Sounds. Lands (DLS) say there were no differences, but it seemed to us that the fishermen (sic) have been left resentful and suspicious” (QEII National Trust 1980:10).

These two reports (QEII National Trust and the joint DLS & NZFS by Purey-Cust & McClymont 1977) suggest that in the 1970s the Stewart Island residents were concerned about a number of conservation related issues including their access to traditional resources and the utilisation of coastal areas of the Island for their fishing activities and the impacts tourism would have upon their lifestyle. Further they saw the DLS as wanting to ‘lock up’ the land, thereby excluding any possibility of further industry or development of an extractive nature; these fears were fuelled by their deep suspicion of bureaucracy and government and the re-introduction of DLS in 1975.

The report of the QEII National Trust (1980:4) also goes on to state that “on weighing all considerations (except political) we believe that on a long term view the case for Lands (DLS) is appreciably stronger than for Forestry (NZFS),” however, “the fact is, … that the resentment of which we have spoken does exist, and cannot possibly be ignored in any decision making process of the government…we feel obliged to make clear that we have no doubt that the choice of Lands (DLS) would be in defiance of the wishes of the people and would lead to determined protest.” This was reinforced via the views stated by some of my informants, as is demonstrated later in this thesis.

The obvious wishes of the community resulted in the QE II National Trust (1980:17) to state that “the decision on who is best suited to administer these lands is therefore primarily a political one and a political judgement is required. The Trust does not read its request from you as requiring the making of a political decision.”

6.3. Towards the 1999 National Park Proposal

Initial moves to conserve nature on the Island came from a group of Stewart Island residents around 1900 and the concept was quickly adopted by several government
agencies. However, the impetus for the national park proposal more recently reflected the downturn in the crayfishing industry on the Island, and the consequent adverse effects on the Island’s economy. It was recognised by some members of the Island community during the late 1980s and early 1990s that a new source of income was required.

Tourism was seen as an obvious alternative given the rise in the popularity of New Zealand as a nature based tourism destination and the legacy of Stewart Island as a popular nature based tourism destination – and in the absence of an alternative economic strategy. At the time of crayfishing’s demise a number of conservation initiatives were floated including World Heritage Area status (1989) by the then Minister of Conservation, a proposal for a marine reserve in Paterson Inlet (1992 – gazetted in 2004) by both the community and DoC, and finally with suggestions of national park designation for much of the Island. Although the causal chain is somewhat unclear it appears that the early drive for changing the status of conservation land on Stewart Island to that of a national park originated from members of the Stewart Island community who after the release of the 1995 Stewart Island Concept Plan, realised the need to create guidelines for tourism development. The result of this was the establishment of the Stewart Island Tourism Strategy Committee in 1997 which consisted of members of various groups including Community Board members, tourism operators, fishers and residents. It was this group that, with direction and input from the New Zealand Tourism Board, developed and published the Stewart Island Tourism Strategy in June 1997.

In the Tourism Strategy for Stewart Island 1997, the Tourism Board and Strategy Committee pushed for national park status. Recommendation No 33, of this strategy states: “That the tourism industry on Stewart Island take the opportunity of the Department of Conservation’s review of lands it administers on the Island to advocate for the establishment of a National Park.” Later in the same year DoC published its Conservation Management Strategy for Stewart Island. Section 2.3.1.5 states that the “Rationalisation of the different land status is considered necessary” for achieving sensible management.

Various land management options were discussed including national park status. The DoC Conservation Management Strategy for Stewart Island/Rakiura (1997) saw the upcoming review of land status on the Island as an opportunity to rationalise the 76
different reserves under its control into one entity, thereby creating a scenario where planning, implementation and administration would be a far easier task for management — national park status was one option. It must be noted that upon the creation of the national park, DoC (1999b: 23) stated that certain areas would automatically be re-zoned within the national park to maintain the higher level of protection that was afforded to them as Nature Reserves.

In June 1999 an investigation and discussion document was requested by the New Zealand Conservation Authority, leading to the release of the *Stewart Island/Rakiura National Park Investigation* by the Department of Conservation. Interviewees on Stewart Island suggested that further impetus leading up to the release of this document resulted from a visit to Stewart Island of the then Prime Minister Jenny Shipley in 1998. Mrs Shipley and husband Burton visited the Island while they were in Southland in January, attending a barbeque on Millars Beach with Eric Roy, Member of Parliament for Southland.

"I was really taken by Stewart Island, and I was only there four hours... It is special... It is beyond me why Stewart Island is not a national park.” Prime Minister Jenny Shipley (The Southland Times 11/5/98:2).
Indeed, in 1998 Prime Minister Jenny Shipley and Conservation Minister Nick Smith were committed to establishing Rakiura / Stewart Island National Park as a ‘brand name,’ a move to the full commodification of the Island for tourism.

"A national park is an international brand name which would draw people to southern New Zealand... But until you get the branding and packaging right, you will not draw the numbers." Prime Minister Jenny Shipley (The Southland Times 17/4/99:3)

As a result of these and subsequent comments made throughout the public consultation process by both government representatives and DoC staff, many Islanders saw the push to create a national park on Stewart Island as largely driven by tourism. Public opinion on the Island was split on whether or not a national park and tourism were the right way forward for Stewart Island, with concerns over the impact on the Island’s character and the Islanders’ lifestyle on one side, and the perceived necessity for tourism as an economic recovery strategy for Stewart Island on the other.

6.3.1. Selling the National Park to the Local People as a Money Magnet

Tourism, boosted by the impending gazettal of the majority (85 percent) of the Island into Rakiura National Park, was offered by the government as the Island’s economic future and salvation. The tourism industry believed that tourism to the Island was slowly increasing and that elevating the Island’s status to national park would “produce extra pulling power” and would “heighten the Island’s profile” (DoC 1999a: 26). Government officials informed the residents of the Island during public meetings and with press releases that tourism would be their saviour and provide them with income, employment, business opportunities and further development of infrastructure and services – much to the disgust of many of my informants:

“I just wonder where DoC is coming from. I don’t think they are being driven by conservation values and they should call themselves the Department of Tourism and Making Money.”
Few residents appeared to believe the promise of tourism made to them by the government. Many believed the promise of economic gain was a lever that was used to ensure the national park went ahead.

_The key carrot DoC will use to encourage a community to become a national park is eco tourism. There is a saying that eco tourism is the largest growing industry in the world._

_DoC says that being a national park will create tourism, but that’s a lie isn’t it?_

_No it’s [tourism and economic gain] a bribe._

Many Islanders were of the view that tourism would increase anyway, regardless of national park status, as it was believed to have been doing before the national park proposal. Not only this, but some Islanders saw it as being only of economic benefit to those involved in the tourism industry or in a position of being able to move into, or invest in, the tourism industry.

_But I’m opposed to it! Always have been because why do we need to become a National Park? We don’t need to become a National Park to promote tourism. We know that by the amount of people that come here each year, and we have people from far and wide, from all over the world because they take home all of the information and pass it on by word of mouth. I can’t see that becoming a national park is going to do to make it better for the residents of the Island. I don’t know how we the residents will survive if everything, all of these ideas they come up with it go through. It’s fine for those who make an income from tourism but those that live on a fixed wage (pensions and benefits) it’s just going to become so costly [to live here]._

Members of the community who were retired were concerned with the importance placed on tourism, given that they were no longer in a position to benefit from tourism development and that tourism for them would become a financial burden in the form of rating increases from the Southland District Council. There were many other reasons for concern according to my informants. Some were not happy about the only option they were given, and about the much flaunted money making opportunities. Others thought that concentrating solely on tourism and economics was not what was needed, or wanted.
There has been a lot of talk and most of it has come from DoC. They’re saying ‘you guys really want this because your property value is going to go up and you’re going to make lots of money out of tourism’. Well I never. I know we need something but I don’t know if we really want tourism. I’m not exactly over the moon about tourism, and their waving the dollar signs in front of us.

Still others believed that the idea of a national park was a political stunt, designed as a status gaining exercise for Prime Minister Jenny Shipley and Conservation Minister Nick Smith. A number of informants believed it to be an attempt to secure the ‘green vote’ in the large urban centres before the upcoming general election of November 1999.

Yeah, they [Jenny Shipley and Nick Smith] thought it was a good idea and that it was going to help them win the election. At the end of the day when they retire they will have a national park attributed to them....

Jenny Shipley saw the proposal of making it national park purely as a vote gathering exercise - to tempt the greenies. I’m glad she fell over.

Jenny Shipley and Nick Smith thought they would get the credit for the national park. But it didn’t work out that way, because they were hoping that by election time they would have a national park and the necessary letters behind their names [to gain a percentage of the Green vote]. But it didn’t work out like that because there was so much to be done.

It appeared that the old suspicions that had developed around the DLS continued with some residents who saw the imminent creation of a national park as an empire building exercise on the part of DoC. Further to this they stated that they believed that the creation of a national park would result in the handing of total control over the Island to DoC and the government.

As far as the national park [is concerned] I honestly don’t know if it is good, bad or otherwise. My only concern is that it is giving more control to DoC and their managers and it just gives them more control over us.

I don’t know what their [DoC] ultimate aim is really. Tying up the land I
Distrust and suspicion of the government, their officials and outsiders appears to be part of the Stewart Island culture, especially amongst the fishermen. This culture of suspicion resulted in the creation of a number of rumours that circulated around the village telling of hidden agendas of the government.

*I have this image in my mind, to do with all of the conspiracy theories going around the bay and the fishing community that it [the national park] had nothing to do with conservation but it was a covert plan to stop fishing on the Island.*

*It was rumoured in the 1980s that when they turned it [the Island] into a national park they were going to kick everyone off of the Island.*

*In ten years time they are going to review the buffer zone, not that they have told anyone here, a guy named XXXX has got a letter from the DoC saying that in 10 years time they will do this, I’ve seen it, its not on. It’s just so autocratic, they [DoC] are not playing with a clean deck of cards, they have told lies and misled people, it has been a dreadful public relations exercise.*

One Islander summed up the relationship between the local fishermen and the government, especially the Department of Conservation.

*I think to there has been a lot of paranoia [amongst parts of the Stewart Island community], because DoC are involved and because DoC are the natural enemy to fishermen. I sometimes sum up [the situation] that if DoC proposed to put $1 million in the bank account of each fisherman they [the fishermen] would object just on principle because they would think that it was a trap to get them out of fishing. It’s almost impossible for DoC to do anything right in a fishing community. It doesn’t matter what they do.*

What can be seen from the discussion thus far on the 1999 national park proposal is that members of the community were sceptical, if not cynical, about the real reasons behind the national park proposal. These feelings continued to be expressed about, and through, the
consultation process that the Department of Conservation engaged in with the public and specifically with the Stewart Island community. It is interesting to note that unlike the earlier proposal that was met with universal disapproval from the Stewart Island residents in the late 1970s, the 1999 proposal was not met with such consensus. The following section presents and discusses the diverse views of the community, evident throughout my interviews and observations on the Island and also throughout the consultation process.

6.4. Public Consultation – Meetings and Workshops

The national park investigation was conducted under the National Parks Act 1980, Section 8, and was initiated by the New Zealand Conservation Authority after a proposal by the Minister of Conservation and the Southland Conservation Board. The consultation process involved a number of aspects including meetings with iwi, Stewart Island locals, Southlanders, stakeholder groups (conservation and recreation), and statutory consultation with the Minister of Energy (Ministry of Commerce, Crown Minerals), the Southland District Council and the Southland Regional Council. Submissions were also called for over a 12 week period. Although from the time of the announcement of the national park proposal and calls for public comment in July 1999, through to the gazettal of the National Park in May 2002 is less than three years the process did not run as smoothly as may be assumed. Many Stewart Island residents felt bitter and disillusioned by what they saw as the government only going through the motions of consultation and negotiation.

Rakiura National Park was the first national park created in New Zealand since Kahurangi National Park in 1996. One result of this was that the ‘institutional memory’ related to previous national park consultation and negotiation processes was missing, resulting in what a key DoC staff member described as ‘feeling our way in the dark’. Further to this the same staff member indicated that under the National Parks Act there are no clear guidelines or framework with which to work through the public consultation process. A combination of these factors is perhaps what led to many Stewart Islanders viewing the initial public meetings as being flawed, if not farcical.
The public meetings that were a part of the consultation process were a contentious issue for Stewart Island residents. The first public meeting appears to have set things off ‘on the wrong foot.’ This was a direct result of a ‘guest list’ being drawn up and ‘invitations’ being distributed to a selected group of locals only; many locals who were not invited to the meeting believed those that were invited were ‘pro-national park’ orientated.

Like at the first meeting, when the invitations only found their way to certain letterboxes.

The first thing he [DoC representative] did was he stood up and apologised, and he said they made up a list of who would be invited and that there were two lists but only one was actioned. He pointed out that there were public notices all around the Island, so there was no way they were trying to hide the meeting, and that it was a tragic, tragic mistake, at least that was their story.

For a start they had this meeting that we weren’t invited to, why would they have a public meeting that the public weren’t invited to? Nick Smith said it was an accident you were over looked. I’m not stupid, it wasn’t an accident at all. It was just bullshit to say it was, to question my intelligence by suggesting such a thing.

I can think of a half a dozen ways that could and should of gone about doing this, and approached the community first and warmed the locals to the idea before they went national with this, they shot themselves in the foot with this, and now they can’t and won’t get everybody onside about it and they will get conflict all the way.

This ‘public’ meeting was described in the 1999 discussion document ‘summary of consultation to date’ as “April 1999 – Minister meets with selected [emphasis added] Stewart Island/Rakiura residents” (DoC 1999b:14). The result of this ‘invite only’ public meeting was a number of locals ‘gate crashing’ the meeting, as the locals themselves describe their actions.

At the first meeting, which was a real beaut, the Minister was over here on
holiday, this was Nick [Smith], and at the hall instead of a bunch of enthusiastic backers turning up, it was a hard core group who got stuck straight into him, and Nick had a fairly rough passage.

They sent out this invitation to selected members and as it came nearer the time people got to hear about it and they got quite angry about it. So they phoned a couple of people who set up the meeting, and a lot more people showed up at the meeting, which was very good.

This was not the only reported problem associated with public meetings on the Island. Often Islanders questioned the timing of the meetings, which many believed excluded a large number of the community that could not take time off work or who were working at the salmon farm and unable to come back to town.

Well I haven’t been to any meetings ... But they have the meetings at funny times like in the middle of the week so the guys who are fishing and at the salmon farm and people like myself can’t get to them. Why don’t they have them on a weekend night a 7pm and those that are interested can go and stand up and be counted and those that aren’t then can’t complain and moan their arses off when it becomes a National Park?

I work on the salmon farm. I missed quite a few of them [public meetings]; umm I went to the second main meeting that they had, I went but I had my daughter with me so I could only see a bit of it and she wanted to leave so by the time I got back it was all over unfortunately.

Even the public meetings organised by the New Zealand Conservation Authority created problems. Firstly it was announced by the New Zealand Conservation Authority that public meetings would be held, but not on the Island. This resulted in protestation by Stewart Island residents with the effect that the New Zealand Conservation Authority altered its initial decision and meetings did take place on the Island (The Southland Times 11/12/1999). At this time it was reported that “the Authority supported the national park proposal in principle, but still had some issues to thrash out” (The Southland Times 1/12/1999).
Even though the residents were consulted, most do not believe their opinions were valued or even listened to at these meetings. This exaggerated the already present feelings of distrust, suspicion and fear that were, as presented earlier in this chapter, held by some on the Island.

I think that there was an honest attempt, an original honest attempt. What has really got the locals' backs up is the way that it was announced. They should of kept it quiet and held a public meeting for rate payers and Islanders alone, instead of having it plastered over the news with the Ministers [at the time] visit. In saying that they would like to put a national park status over us here, like you do that in a small community and your going to get the hackles up straight, no matter what you are talking about and something like the national park status gets people over here very heated. You hold on to what you have got, mainly because it's so hard to keep it over here so to have some Parliamentarian to come over and say "it's so beautiful over here aren't you wee Islanders doing great, I think we'll give you a national park." Without thinking "Is that what we [the Islanders] want?" and walk away. Yeah they had consultation and hui, they had public meetings here in town, and they had iwi meetings here, they did the iwi bit. But it's all horse before the cart, I really think they should have rethought how they went about it.

I don't think it is just that the Islanders are opposed to the national park per se, its the way its been forced upon them, they have been backed into a corner and they've come out fighting, not necessarily because they disagree with the national park idea but because they are that pissed off with the way that it was gone about.

To sum up the consultation they had, DoC had numerous meetings, they consulted and consulted but they never listened!

You know in the consultation we get on extremely well with all of them [DoC] but ha ha ha [interviewee having a hearty laugh over her first comment], I wonder why they spent all of that time in the workshops, I think I attended every one, it's always the same outcome. But I read that the public have been consulted and if they are not happy they have had every
opportunity. But they [DoC] haven't listened.

I didn't trust myself to speak coherently to him [Nick Smith.] I was so angry at his attitude, he was so arrogant and we were like little minnows, and him this great big fish. And he said "well its going to happen, so do you just mind sitting there and shutting up!

It is obvious from the above quotes that residents feel that the consultation process did not take heed of earlier study findings, namely that some of the people of Stewart Island are resistant to change, suspicious of government and bureaucracy, view the Island as their own and are not overly enthusiastic to share it with large numbers of tourists. The following section illustrates how many Islanders believed the national park was a 'done deal' before it was announced.

6.5. Rakiura National Park - A Foregone Conclusion?

Some Stewart Islanders interviewed had very cynical, if in some regards realistic, opinions on the national park proposal and on the public consultation process. They believed that the national park was a 'done deal' before they even knew about the proposal, and that the consultation process was only for the appearance of going through the motions.

I think they’re going to say yes no matter what people say or think about it, that’s what I think they’re going to do, like at the end of the day I don’t think anybody is going to stop them doing it, They’re going to do what they’re going to do.

I better clarify something here, they are always using the word ‘if’ Stewart Island becomes a national park, I am saying right now it is a foregone conclusion that it is going to be a national park so why use ‘if’ instead of ‘when’ it becomes a national park.

The arrogance of Nick Smith set the tone for the meeting, he just stood up there and told us it was going to happen, regardless, and at the end of the day we the Islanders didn’t have a say, and that the whole of New Zealand, the whole of New Zealand was effected, regardless of the fact that we are the ratepayers and that we live here all of the time and see what happens on
the Island. At the end of the day the government will have the final say, and we knew what that was going to be.

From when it was first brought up I don’t think there was anyone who thought it would not go ahead. It seemed like a done deal from the start, but they did go through the motions of consulting.

Not all of the Stewart Island community were against the proposal, in fact there were a diverse range of views within the community. Some of the community realised that regardless of what is decided as the right direction to take, there will always be those that disagree.

*I think Islanders are very fractious because they (fishermen) are very strong willed people independent minded people and just the people who live here per se, they are strong willed and very forceful people, and that can make consensus very difficult. I saw that a couple of years ago when the crayfishery seemed to be in great difficulty and they convened a meeting in Invercargill for all of the stakeholders of the crayfishery and they spent a day debating the issues around the crayfishery but they could not pass a single motion because nobody could agree on a single thing. That for me sums up the trouble on an island, people draw a line in the sand and the hard core say no we will not allow tourism development here and they will leave themselves wide open for the very development they don’t want to occur.*

Not only is there difficulties in reaching consensus on the Island but individuals within the community in positions of power can hold sway, dominating meetings and stifling debate contrary to their opinions. In some instances my interviewees suggested that it is safer to ‘keep one’s head down’ rather than jeopardise one’s standing with individuals who control large areas of the Island’s economy.

*Local decisions in a small place are made up of - this is normal, I’m not knocking them - are made up of peoples jealousies of each other. Christ, you could sit at a meeting and watch guys make a [incorrect] decision because someone was going to benefit and it took me a while to come to
terms with that being normal. The norm was decisions were made by people on a very short term basis based on self interest and their jealousies of each other.

Debate is difficult on the Island, at that first meeting the floor was dominated by about four people all very vocal opponents of the national park on the Island... and those were the people who dominated discussions at the meeting and they are very difficult people to talk to... So its very difficult, a lot of people in a public meeting on the Island will keep their heads down, and particularly about the national park, people who support the national park were very quiet I think because of the perception that it was going to go ahead so why expose yourself to any potential trouble.

While a lot of people go to the meetings there are not many who stand up and have a say, those who do are the same ones and they get a bit tiring after a while because they are just going over the same ground, over and over.

Also, those that supported the national park thought it would proceed anyway and therefore decided that there was no point in “putting their heads up over the barricades”.

Probably the most outspoken people on the subject of the park are those people who are not in favour of it. And I think their voices are the loudest.

...and the people who were either strongly for or strongly against. Strongly for didn’t say very much and strongly against spoke up rather loudly, umm and most of the time without any justification, usually just no we should not have a national park, for no reason, just that we shouldn’t have a national park because.

The way in which the different camps of opinion on the national park proposal view the support of their particular view reveals the stark reality of the righteous:

Yes, I think they are more open to it, there are, I think we could be roughly divided 60 - 40 in favour of it.

Out of the, I can’t remember how many were in the hall, but I would say
that 80% were opposed, to the suggestion, but all of the paper reports said the Islanders were in favour, they hadn’t done their research very well, it was as if they chose to interview those who were interested

What is certain is that Stewart Islanders knew that change was in the wind for better or for worse, and change invariably meets with opposition.

But anyway, I went to the second meeting and once again I sat at the back and I have this vision of it, just the body language, everyone was hunched over with their heads drawn down and with their eyes narrowed watching the people up the front there, it was a nice picture of a community hunkered down against change, I wish I had a camera. There is always an initial reaction against change no matter what the change was.

Regardless of the view that the national park was a forgone conclusion and that DoC was not listening to the views of the Islanders, the negotiation process continued with members of the community fighting to gain some concessions from the government and DoC.

Amongst the concessions sought by members of the community were the pushing back of the national park boundary to create a ‘buffer zone’ that would allow for future development and more importantly funding for infrastructure upgrades to allow for that development.

6.6. The Buffer Zone

Much of the debate surrounding the creation of the national park for the Stewart Island residents centred on the settlement area and negotiating how close to the township the national park boundaries would be. Many in the community wanted the originally proposed boundary pushed much further back from the settlement, with what they described as a ‘buffer zone’ in between the settlement and the national park.

The question wasn’t where do you want the boundary, it was what are the issues, and they [discussion groups at the workshop] all came up with the same answer [the buffer zone], each independently.

However I don’t know quite where we are at, but the main concerns have
been the buffer zone and the effect it is going to have on the facilities.

There was a show of hands at one meeting wanting to know if the buffer zone, that was the biggest issue - the buffer zone and umm to extend it further out, and there were three people against it and the rest for it.

There could be openings for other businesses as in eating places or whatever, but they talk about low key without being intrusive ... so that's my only issues are the facilities [infrastructure] and the buffer zone.

...the other argument I have is that in extending the boundary out, for the rest of New Zealand there is about 10% in national park but here on Stewart Island we will have about 90% in national park which is a heck of a lot of land and we are asking for a little bit more and its not going to be ruined in the meantime but it leaves that option open.

This was one of the most contentious issues to appear out of my research, with debate centred on where the boundary of the national park should go to leave enough of a 'buffer zone' for the settlement to develop and expand; even though it had not expanded or developed greatly over the past 100 years.

We are restricted to this little part of the peninsula here, we are hoping that in time we will be allowed to move into the buffer zone, but there is some doubt as to whether there is any possibility of that at all; there should be as most of this land was previously unoccupied Crown land up to 1987 under Lands and Surveys. In those days you could go and buy these blocks of three acres, these were all available for settlement, and at probably some stages in the past they were settled. But once DoC took over they reverted this to section 16 land and took the option off anyone ever buying it, so we sort of got hemmed in there quite tightly.

Often those who appeared in favour of the buffer zone were also the individuals who expressed opposition to the national park, tourism development, over-development, or any development on the Island.

The thing is there should be a substantial buffer zone to allow for development over the next 150 or 200 years.
So a lot of people on this Island think that this boundary issue is a vital one, and they think if they throw a huge boundary up from Little River to Kaipipi, which is a huge area of some tens of thousands of hectares, that it will one day be available for development. I am yet to understand anyone who has given me any concrete idea of what this development will be, because on the one hand they don’t want tourist development because they don’t want the place to change, but on the other hand they want 50,000 ha set aside for development. What do they want, steel mills, or suburbs stretching out to Little River? This boundary thing has led people to believe that people will be able to buy that land up in 50 acre blocks and bulldoze all of the trees and build nice apartments on it. I think that is completely unrealistic!

This quotation provides an insight into the thinking of some of the more vocal and powerful opponents of the national park; namely how they could benefit from it.

Once it becomes a national park they will have the same problem they are having at Milford Sound where a little piece of land is surrounded by national park and they can’t get room to move or expand or anything; the infrastructure there is going down hill.

I am told that the land between the township and the proposed national park is conservation land and would be no different to manage [than the national park], however it is much easier to add land than to take it out of a national park, it would also be good PR between the DoC and the locals and they would never of had, if they had accepted that or even modified their own boundary a bit they wouldn’t have had nearly the same anti national park feeling and opinion as they have had.

Those who disagree with the creation of a buffer zone believe that it has been created by a few individuals intent on pushing their own self interest without concern of how a large buffer zone, and any associated development, may impinge upon the village, wildlife, vegetation or the experience of visitors.

I think, and with good planning there is still room for that without taking in an extra buffer zone. And I think that we would be very short-sighted if we
do go down that road. But I probably one of only a few who feel like that, I feel it in my bones I don't like the idea of the extra buffer zone at all. I think it is been motivated by a few people under the old umbrella of NIMBY (not in my backyard), you know people that have said that having a National Park attached to their backyard or their boundary is going to hamper any development on their property, now I'm not actually clear but I don't think it would, but I think we would have to, that those landowners would have to be more sensitive how they develop because of the boundary.

Those people that say we want a buffer zone for expansion, what are they saying because you can't build on conservation land anyway. So an extra area of conservation land vested in the council is never going to happen and I don't think it ever should happen. I think that land is so precious that there is bird life regenerating and settling there closer into the village, and this is what makes the Island unique, umm this is why people will come.

Some individuals believe that the issues of the buffer zone was used as a distraction to keep the locals focused on one issue that the government would compromise, to an extent, on:

We haven't touched on the boundary issue, which I personally believe is a red herring. I believe that it has been thrown up by DoC as a bone for the locals to chew on.

Like I said at the last meeting the way in which Sandra Lee [Minister of Conservation] actually provoked discussion. When XXX finished talking she deliberately asked XXX more questions to stir up debate, that's when I saw they were trying to stir up debate on this thing which is pretty much their idea. It makes good political sense really, you are seen to argue about the boundary and then concede and the old Islanders walk away with what they think is a victory.

The DoC, however, believes that it had attempted to communicate to the locals that under no circumstances would any of the conservation estate closer to the settlement area be
offered as freehold land or for development. Some members of the community appear to have heard this message, but many are accused of not listening to the facts.

My understanding is that, and this is coming from a friend of mine who used to be the legal advisor for DoC, any land that is within the Conservation estate the only way to change the status of it would require a national emergency, the only way for it to be free from that would be a national emergency.

The boundary issue was a really good example of that, when the national park proposal was formed the department put in a likely boundary line, now all the land that is being included in the national park is managed by us and cannot be private land, and is not private land and you just can't add that to the national park because it doesn't happen that way. The boundary that was first established was quite close to the Halfmoon Bay township, in the reserves that border the village. The community was quite adamant that this was too close and they didn't like it being so close, the suggestions that came back from the community after lots and lots of pushing, they don't just come back with suggestions of their own accord. After heaps of prodding they gave us, finally after lots of prodding, they came back with a boundary line that went from Port William to North Arm, which is actually a bloody long way back, and then means that people don’t have access to the national park unless they have a boat or can walk for three hours. So that was not really acceptable to the Department and we gave them the reason why, but the community seemed adamant that the reason for wanting the boundary further back from the village was to allow for development. Now regardless of whether the land we are talking about is going to be national park or not the land is still of Conservation status and will still be used as a reserve and it will still be utilised as a reserve which means no development. I don’t know how many times I heard Lou Sanson [Southland Regional Conservator] and Dave Newey [DoC Community Relations Officer- Southland] and everyone else that was involved explain that over and over again, it is not getting through, means that they still think that the further back you put the boundary means that that land may open up for development. It isn’t going to happen.
Finally a compromise position was reached by both the DoC and the community, one that allowed visitors to access the national park on foot or by vehicle from the road end at Lee Bay.

6.7. Summary

Stewart Islanders are a very independent people with firm ideas and ideals. In the past when nearly all of the Island's income was generated by crayfishing, the people of Stewart Island were vehemently opposed to the concept of creating a national park on 'their Island'. The lack of recognition by the government and DoC of the culture of suspicion and distrust of the government and of DoC does not appear to have been given much consideration before or during the process. Exacerbating the suspicion of Islanders is the manner in which the proposal was announced to the community and the way in which the government initially dealt with the community, fuelling the opposition. Mistakes were perhaps exacerbated because of the absence of 'institutional memory' within the DoC and the lack of a clear legislative framework with which to work through the consultation and negotiation process, increasing the propensity for conflict. As a result the public meetings eventuated into an airing ground for the views of only a few vocal opponents of the national park.

Finally the Chapter raised the potential for self interest to be a dominant player within the consultation process, often driving the vocal opposition. The issue of the buffer zone illustrates this by showing the contradictions between not wanting the national park and tourism development, and wanting room to expand and develop the settlement.
The following chapter discusses the influence the demise of crayfishing and the rise of tourism has had on the Island community and their settlement. It also examines how members of the community view the creation of the national park and how they believe this will affect their lives and future on the Island. It will highlight the contradiction between the need for further development and settlement to fund infrastructure upgrades and the need for infrastructure upgrades to allow for further development and settlement.
Chapter Seven: Barriers to the Success of Tourism

"Widespread advertisement of the scenic beauty of the Island and of the attractions it offers to the holiday maker have made it the most popular resort in the south; but the responsibility for its development lies not with the few settlers, who cannot depend on the seasonal tourist visitation for a living, but with the Government, representing the people of the Dominion" (Howard 1940.278).

This chapter examines the effects of ongoing changes to the Stewart Island way of life; and especially those attributed to the development of the National Park. The chapter begins with a section on the physical infrastructure on the island and the likely effects upon it that further tourism development implies. This is followed by my analysis of the effect anticipated by the residents of the Island. It is essential to note that for the residents of the Island, the ideas of the National Park are viewed as virtually synonymous with increased tourism – the two are seen by the Islanders as inseparable if not actually the same single entity. This tendency is so prominent that at times informants spoke of the 'National Park' and 'tourism' interchangeably. This has invariably led to the discussion of the National Park focusing on the effects of tourism and the likely consequences of, and barriers to, future developments.

The way in which Island residents represent the transition towards the Island becoming a National Park reflects the influence of the past, as well as their views of the current situation and their fears of the changes they perceive to be occurring within the community. Their views appear coloured by their understandings of the way in which the Island’s history and past decisions made by government have affected their current circumstances. Associated are their views of the consequences of recent national structural and regulative changes for their economy and community. This chapter presents some of the key issues at stake that emerged from my analysis of views expressed by the people of the Island.
The first section of this chapter considers the physical issues facing the Island community and the real and potential barriers to further tourism development. These include the overburdened civil infrastructure and inadequate funding, housing shortages and the associated rising costs, the changing composition of the community, the long winter off-season that tourism entails, and issues relating to employment and income. Each is discussed in turn.

The second section of the chapter considers the perceptions of the Islanders of recent changes associated with the National Park and tourism, and the way in which they consider these changes are impacting on their lives now and in future. The analysis investigates the flow-on effects of the fisheries restructuring on the small community, how its social composition is changing, the perceived economic prospects, employment opportunities and the social problems created by the transition. Again, each is discussed in turn.

To make sense of the changes and the way that they are interpreted it is useful to employ Pawson and Le Heron’s ‘Geographic Restructuring Model’ (Pawson and Le Heron 1996) in conjunction with the notion of ‘path dependency’ that was presented in Chapter One. Indeed, the restructuring of the fisheries should itself be considered as one of the final steps down the path dependent sequence culminating in the establishment of Rakiura National Park.

7.1. **Section 1: Barriers to Development**

Development on Stewart Island is inhibited by its remote location and small population. The body of water separating the Island from the mainland creates a definitive barrier increasing the difficulties and costs of infrastructural development, such as provision of electricity, sewerage, roading, telephones and so forth. The cost of public services is a significant issue on Stewart Island. It appears that in order to maintain a community on Stewart Island there is a critical base line figure that the population cannot drop below if it is to survive, otherwise services, facilities and infrastructure will deteriorate. Central to the community’s survival is its ability to earn an income sufficient to maintain itself; but this waxes and wanes with the increase and decrease of the population and hence the rating base. As one of my interviewees noted:
7.1.1. The Physical Infrastructure and the Impact of the National Park Upon it

Central to any expansion of the tourism industry on the Island is the capacity of the civil infrastructure. Stewart Island's civil infrastructure is very limited and reflects the underdevelopment of the Island throughout its history. At the present point in time (2001) the civil infrastructure of the Island is at or beyond full capacity; this includes electricity, sewerage and waste disposal. The limited capacity of the infrastructure effectively limits further development and especially tourism development on a medium to large scale. Without the capacity to handle increased demands on the electricity generator and sewerage disposal, the ability to increase the number of accommodation establishments and the number of available tourist beds on the Island is severely limited. The following brief overview of this infrastructure as it existed in 2001 provides the context from which to view the understandings of the community. The information presented in this section is taken from Booth and Leppens (2002) and was gathered from the owners and managers of the infrastructure.

Roads
At the time of my research (2001) there were only 22.6km of roads, of which 13.1km were sealed. There were also 830 metres of footpath and 18 street lights, all of which were located within the town centre. Without prominent road markings and pedestrian crossings visitors tend to walk on the roads and it appears that few pedestrians observe normal caution when crossing the roads. Southroads Limited manages the roading under contract to the Southland District Council and employs one full time maintenance worker with a budget of $98,000 per annum. In 2001 it was reported that there were 204 cars present on the Island. Hence while traffic density is low, cars tend to travel extremely fast around the tight corners, presenting a considerable danger to meandering pedestrians.

Sewerage
The sewerage reticulation system was installed in 1997 with approximately 185 households initially connected; this number had risen to approximately 220 at the time of the research. The system was designed to accommodate a full-time population of 690
people. At the time of my research there were 384 full-time residents on the Island, allowing for a further 306 full-time residents. The research conducted by Booth and Leppens (2002) estimated 32,000 annual tourist visits to the Island, at an average stay of 3.3 days which equates to 321 full-time person equivalents; suggesting that the system had already reached maximum capacity and that any extension of the scheme or connection of houses or accommodation would overload the system still further.

**Electricity**

A reticulated electricity network was established in 1988; this system is owned and operated by the Southland District Council and supplies electricity to 337 households. The electricity for the 23km reticulated system is generated from three diesel bulldozer engines. The entire system is maintained by two full-time staff. The system allows for a maximum of 900 people and their industries, and an average of 400 people and their industries. The strain placed upon the system by the increase in tourism can be seen via the increase in demand. In 1997/1998 the number of units consumed was 14,130; by 1999/2000 this had increased to 56,971 units. The number of units consumed by the sewerage system pumps has also increased in this time from 9,001 units in 1997/1998 to 34,770 units in 1999/2000. There is an extremely finite supply of electricity, and this is substantially more expensive than that available on the mainland. Even a small increase in tourism would require substantial further investment.

**Waste Disposal**

The current refuse site was due for closure in December 2003 when its resource consent expired. No alternative strategy had been implemented at the time of the research, although discussions relating to this were ongoing during my research phase. One option mooted was that of shipping waste off the Island, however this is an expensive exercise given the Island's isolated location from the mainland across Foveaux Strait and the costs associated with transporting the waste. The gazetting of 85% of the Island as a National Park precludes the establishment of another landfill, and thus the lack of waste-disposal options presents another real constraint on population expansion.
**Water**

The Island’s water supply derives from the collection of rain water from individual household roof top run off into individual storage tanks. This is destined to remain the case unless the resident population exceeds 1000 individuals. If the population does reach this mark the settlement will then be required to develop a reticulated water supply. However, the amount of drinking water required for tourist accommodation is greater than that required by the general population. The amount of water able to be collected on the roof of an accommodation establishment will limit the number of visitors they are able to accommodate. In a dry year this may become a wider issue for the tourism industry on the Island.

**Wharves**

The main wharf for the settlement is that found in Halfmoon Bay. There are further wharves at Horseshoe Bay and at Golden Bay. The wharves are owned and managed by Southport. The main wharf houses the ferry terminal, cargo handling and a fish processing shed. At any one time there may be a mix of tourists, locals, goods, forklifts and vehicles present on the main wharf. In 2001 8,044 tonnes of goods were imported onto Stewart Island via the wharves and 4,603 tonnes of goods exported; the reported cost per tonne for shipping was approximately $110 plus landing fees on the wharves of between $2.50 and $5.50 per tonne depending on the material in question. These rates must be kept in mind when considering the cost of building as all building materials must be imported onto the Island; building on the Island is therefore considerably more expensive than building elsewhere.

**Housing and rate payers**

Data on housing from the 2001 Census shows that at this time there were 351 permanent residences and holiday homes on the Island. On Census night 234 of these were occupied while 117 were unoccupied. This highlights the small rating basis available to fund infrastructure upgrades. Considering upgrades are estimated to be in excess of $5million and the available pool of rateable properties (remembering that the conservation estate is non-rateable and there are less than 500 properties when commercial and industrial properties are included) the ability of the Stewart Island ratepayers to fund such
development is limited. As Stewart Island exists within the Southland District the added cost then falls to all rate payers in the Southland District.

In 2001 there were 38 building consents granted on the Island of which two were for new dwellings, seven for tourist accommodation and six for subdivision of property. It can be assumed that the increase in tourist accommodation will place further pressure on the limited infrastructure, as will the development of the subdivided properties into residential, holiday or accommodation establishments. Building on the Island has a number of added costs than would be expected on the mainland. Firstly there are the costs associated with transport the building materials to the Island. Secondly, there are basically no resident builders on the Island and therefore to build one must accommodate the builder and associated trades people and workers.

As is presented in section two of this Chapter the residents of the Island believe that there are a number of issues surrounding the provision of housing on the Island. In terms of housing and seasonal accommodation there are issues of prices and availability with second home owners preferring to rent out their stock to tourist for a greater return with less hassle associated with young transient workers. This of course poses problems for tourism operators who require seasonal staff but cannot find accommodation for them.

Booth and Leppens (2002) found that of the 103 residents surveyed as part of their study 87 percent believed that there was a housing shortage on the Island, which it was believed was affected by both rental accommodation (34 percent) and the seasonal tourism employees (23 percent) in particular.

7.1.2. Changing Employment – From Fish to Tourists

The ability to work and earn an income is essential to maintain a good quality of life and to achieve goals, such as home ownership. Within a small isolated economy such as Stewart Island, year round employment is limited. Further to this the choices of career available for full time employment are limited to the few industries present on the Island at any one time. Without sufficient employment opportunities to provide all members of a community wishing to work the ability to work, the wellbeing and continued existence of the community is threatened. This was the experience on Stewart Island as a result of the
introduction of the Quota Management System and subsequent demise of crayfishing as an industry that could provide sustained employment for the whole community.

During the 1970s the QEII National Trust (1980) estimated that 90 percent of permanent residents derived their income from fishing and the carriage of people and goods, and that most of the population was engaged in some aspect of these industries. This situation had not altered by the mid 1980s when Levine and Levine (1987), in their anthropological study of fishing on Stewart Island, reported that the community at the time of the Levines' study was economically dependent on self-employed fishermen and owner-operator firms exploiting renewable aquatic resources, whose crew members tended to be relatives or friends of the owners. Of the female population it was said that virtually all married resident adult females were housewives with a few also working at the Post Office, the hotel or the school; the opportunity for females to secure employment for any form on the Island at this time was severely limited (Levine and Levine 1987).

The demise of crayfishing and the re-emergence of tourism as a major economic force on the Island has seen the nature of employment change considerably. Fishing and crayfishing on Stewart Island can be characterised as being very well paid, an almost exclusively male workforce, hard work in rough conditions, and year round work. It is equally the case that tourism has significant drawbacks too as an employment strategy for the entire community. it is seasonal rather than year-round, is service focused, tends to be part-time and low paid, is dominated by young people and especially females. Further, it takes a certain personality type (gregarious, sociable, outgoing) that is often at odds with the characteristics of a successful fisherman, who after all must be able to cope with isolation and harsh conditions. Of course, some fishers have the ability to succeed in both industries; however I am only able to report on those fishers that remained on the Island at the time of my research as opposed to those that were reported to have left the Island during the early 1990s. The inherent differences between these two industries raise a number of points in relation to the transition of some Stewart Island residents from crayfishing to tourism.

7.1.3. Challenges to Successful Tourism on Stewart Island

For tourism, and therefore for the National Park, to be seen as successful it must be able to provide the residents of the Island with employment that provides a sufficient income for
them to participate fully in their society. This includes the ability for individuals to purchase houses, start a family and invest in their future. It is clear however that tourism leaves much to be desired. The part-time, low-paid, service-oriented work is not attractive to local residents who require year round work that pays substantially more, resulting in transient workers being attracted to the Island.

The consequences of this for Stewart Island are many. The ability to purchase a house has decreased as the price of property on the Island has increased dramatically, especially given the long off season from tourism. Those considering starting a family on Stewart Island must also consider the added costs involved and the fact that once their child is at secondary school age they must either pay for boarding school or move off the Island. Without the ability to start or maintain a family on the Island, the number of children present on the Island will continue to drop, which will result in the closure of the school. Once the school has closed the viability of starting a family on the Island or bringing a family to the Island will reduce even further. Such a situation will produce a community that is almost solely composed of adults.

A further barrier to tourism succeeding is that of attracting suitably qualified or experienced staff given the shortage of these workers in the tourism sector at the time of this research and especially in high profile and more attractive tourism centres such as Queenstown that are also short of such workers. Without suitable staff, operators are faced with a situation where their current staff may not produce the level of service required to facilitate return visits or word of mouth recommendations. Further to this, inappropriate staff may also cost them directly in lost revenue by not offering services or products.

7.2. Section 2: The Islanders' Perceptions of Changes Associated with the National Park

Given these real and physical obstacles hindering the successful development of tourism on the Island, it is necessary now to consider the way in which the residents of the Island see the opportunities and challenges ahead. A commonly expressed view among my interviewees was that increased tourism and the national park would not now be on the agenda if crayfishing had not been regulated via the Quota Management System, forcing
many small fishers out. This section considers the interconnectedness of industry,
employment, income, housing, migration and community composition and examines how
they are all played out on Stewart Island.

It is commonly noted in the tourism literature (see Chapter 2) that change is often met with
resistance and disapproval, particularly if those affected by change have not been involved
in effecting that change. Such resistance to change is particularly obvious on Stewart
Island, for social, economic and physical impacts are magnified as a result of the small size
of the population, the isolation of the island and its very limited infrastructure.

7.2.1. The Difficulties Facing a Single Industry Island Economy
As discussed in Chapter 4, there is a long history of people being attracted to the Island
during the peak of a new industry to capitalise on the economic opportunities; but
following this these people leave when either they have accumulated enough income or
when the industry crashes. This results in both positive and negative changes in the
economic, social and physical environment. The ‘boom and bust’ extractive industry
cycles described earlier, and most recently the introduction of the Quota Management
System on Stewart Island, appear to support this notion. As one informant put it,

...the economics of the last twenty years or so have had a severe impact on
the Island, and not a healthy impact at all, and quite simply we need
something to stimulate the economy here in order to get the community
healthy again in order for there to be opportunity for young people to come
to the Island, or anyone, or for people just to stay [living] here.

As previously described, the lucrative crayfishing industry led to what Royle (2001)
describes as a situation of Islanders ‘putting all of their eggs in one basket’. While
understandably tempting, this strategy carries particular risks for small islands, for the
collapse of a single industry leads to outward migration, thereby threatening the future of
the community (Royle 2001). The refocusing of the Island’s economy away from
crayfishing and towards a combined economy of both fishing and tourism should help to
mitigate this danger, spreading the risk. Yet it remains the case that the European history of
Stewart Island comprises a sequence of single economic foci, and this tendency continues
to influence the fortunes of the people of the Island today. It is also worth noting that this is
a risk inherent to life on a small island, for the opportunities for economic diversity are extremely restricted.

To understand the community’s thoughts and ideas around the establishment of the Rakiura National Park it is necessary to consider events from the Island’s history that influenced the social, economic and physical life on the Island, for the Islanders see this as being of utmost importance in understanding the present situation. Further, this also provides the context for many of the views expressed by my informants during their interviews and presented here as quotes.

7.2.2. Changing from Fishing to Tourism Employment

As discussed in Chapter Five, the introduction of the QMS in 1986 marked the beginning of the demise of most of the owner operator fishermen on Stewart Island, a great reduction in the number of boats operating out of Halfmoon Bay, and fewer individuals earning an income from the proceeds of fishing.

The result of capitalisation of fishing is that it is becoming less and less economically important to the wider community. I only came to the Island 10 years ago, and when I came to the Island ten years ago there were 30 boats still fishing out of the bay here. Whereas now that number is down to 10 or 12 boats just ten years later ...

For Islanders, the decline in earning potential from fishing, especially for young men, had a flow-on effect on the community composition.

...there would have been 15 viable crewing jobs, jobs that young people could make a living from, that number would be down 5 or 6 now.

.... the catching boats that stay away [overnight] where the crew hands had families and lived on the Island and the whole village had about 80 or 90 kids and there were about 500 of a population in the early 80s...
Faced with a decrease in fishing related employment, many fishermen diversified into tourism by running charter boats, water taxis, and sometimes providing holiday accommodation. While it might be noted that this trend represented a return to the pre-crabyfishing boom, this diversification does not suit all ex-fishermen. Aspects of the Island’s fishing culture, such as their fierce independence and pride, and an appreciation of isolation are difficult obstacles to overcome and prove to be a barrier for some Islanders in terms of moving into the tourism industry. The thought of working for someone else, or worse, having to be of service to strangers is not an idea that some Islanders cherish. The very characteristics and individual qualities that make you an effective and successful fisherman often make you a poor quality tourism operator.

...we don’t make any money out of that side of things, we actually like taking out loopies [tourists - on their fishing boat] ourselves but we just have a deep personal thing about that we don’t like charging them so that we don’t feel like their servants.

We Stewart Islanders like to be on a level footing, to look people in the eye, it’s not in our nature to serve.

The growth of tourism and the creation of Rakiura National Park have been hailed as the saviour by local and central government, the tourism industry and by many people in the community. The increase in tourist numbers, due to the increased status of the Stewart Island becoming Rakiura National Park, is expected to provide more business opportunities and increased employment with visitor numbers predicted to reach 40,000 by 2015 (Southland District Council 2000.15). Some of my interviewees endorsed this perception, perhaps given the lack of an alternative economic strategy.

It [the National Park] will be a good thing in the long run, every one will benefit, the amount of jobs it will create, but we want more money invested in the Island for these things to happen.

That’s one good thing about the [national] park is that it will create more employment, so there is always that.
7.2.3. Reluctant Tourism Participants

Although it is widely believed that the creation of the National Park will increase the number of tourism-related jobs on the Island, there are a number of factors to complicate matters. Firstly, tourism on Stewart Island is very seasonal, with the season lasting from spring Labour Weekend (end of October) to autumn (Easter) with a steep peak in the December, January, February months. Secondly, as has been noted previously, the climate of Stewart Island affects all aspects of life; tourism is included. The harsh weather, in the form of gale force winds and driving rain, dominates life on the Island and also effectively limits tourism to the summer months. Even in the height of summer this weather is evident and causes havoc with both the tourists and the hosts as visitors to the Island are forced indoors and are limited to the township. While the ferry brochure depicts the boat gliding swiftly across a mill-pond flat sea, Foveaux Strait can be inhospitable even in summer, adversely affecting the enjoyment of many and colouring their impressions of the Island.

Some owner operators cope with the seasonality of their incomes by diversifying their fishing operations into tourism, much in the same way Stewart Islanders did before crayfishing.

Here they [DoC] identify employment opportunities and all of that, it's quite interesting how the employment opportunities have gone with the tourist people. As we said before we had fishing, and then it went to quota and then the quota disappeared and then we had the tourist. The fishermen and a lot of the families have now gone into the tourism to pick up their income and they see the National Park as a way of solving their tourism problems and increasing their money. But the real problem they have on Stewart Island is the winter off season, in Queenstown you have the skiing and the usual summer trade. But Stewart Island doesn't have that we only have the summer trade, and the National Park doesn't solve that problem for our local operators and our real problem is the off season.

The social trade, hotels etc, are low paid and seasonal. So over the winter period it's very slow, we need them to extend over the winter and extend the [tourism season] shoulder. So it could, but I don't know. They need the publicity; maybe once it is a National Park it will get more coverage.
For employees the seasonal nature of the work means that they will face periods of unemployment, having to leave the Island, or engage in a number of part time jobs at once.

...there are not enough locals out there in the full time year round jobs, ones that would give them a decent income rather than just seasonal.  

...there is always work to be done here if you really want work but on the other hand it may not be regular as in a permanent job.

Such a situation with employment on the Island obviously has implications for the Islanders, with employment moving to seasonal and part time positions.

7.2.4. Community Composition

Increasing the volume of tourism and services requires the range and number of service industry jobs to be expanded. Kitchen and waiting staff, café workers, cleaners, receptionists, guides are all required for successful enterprises to operate. Complicating matters is that tourism employment attracts transient workers from the mainland. As a result, the composition of the community has shifted from fishing families to increased numbers of young single people. From the perspective of many Islanders this has additional problems in relation to the scarcity of affordable rental accommodation and housing for seasonal staff.

...it's going to create jobs and it is also going to create a lot of [ill] feelings in that there is not enough accommodation now. If someone starts a business then they will need people to work that business and where are you [they] going to house them? They just about have to build a house. The only way for it is to stay in one of the backpackers, which is too expensive for six months. Tourism jobs are not very well paid, so it's not very attractive.

Other interviewees pointed out that it is not only very difficult to retain staff from the mainland once they are on the Island, but also that it is hard to attract locals to jobs in tourism. This perhaps reflects the low rates of pay, relative to the past incomes from fishing.
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We often have work opportunities, and it’s very difficult to find a local person. I think it comes down to they can’t earn enough; they chose the lifestyle over and above the dollar they get at the end of the day. I think that a lot of the local population that we have jobs for are not interested to work for $9.50 or $10 an hour over the summer period. They are used to better wages from fishing.

...well on the other hand there are plenty of locals who don’t want to do it, the thing is that they can’t be too choosey, but they are used to getting paid good money from the fishing, not the $10 an hour they get down there - they’re used to $15. There are a lot of locals that are unemployed. When I first came here [15 years previously] there was no one unemployed.

Could be a clash of culture but a job is a job, you then have to decide, like I hate washing dishes but I have done it for a living because I need the money so you choose. So its the choice you make and to me these people would rather be unemployed than to work for us, so I don’t know whether that is cultural or whether its just the money, like in the scheme of things when you have a lifestyle and somewhere to live as well as the recreational opportunities to provide fish and game for yourself, the money may not be that important.

The unwillingness of locals to take up the low-paid jobs results in a shortage of employment and hot competition for employees on the Island.

If we bring a worker over the next minute they have been poached... At the moment we are in big grumps because we can’t get any workers, but you ring up Work and Income New Zealand [central government employment agency] and they say there are 20 people on the Island actively looking for employment.

...but if there is all sorts of tourist opportunities here for tourist businesses what job would you do then as a young person, you could still only work as a chamber maid in a new hotel or as a waiter in the new restaurant.

The low wages offered by tourism employment are not considered sufficient to be able to provide people with the financial ability to start families on the Island, or to attract young
families to Stewart Island. Nearly all of my informants reported concerns about the state of the community in relation to diminishing number of families and children with many of my informants viewing tourism employment as a barrier to having a healthy community; one with families and children present.

It is so hard to start a family because you’ve got this large winter season to deal with, I would like to think they would like to come here and have a lifestyle community, but I don’t know if tourism is the way.

Yeah, but to work in a retail shop isn’t to get a wage that will support a young family or to bring a young family here...

In this way, the increased emphasis on tourism has flow-on effects on employment opportunities and incomes. It also has implications for the health of the community evident in the rise in the number of single people, decreasing opportunities for families, and falling school rolls. For several of my interviewees, this trend is having an immensely important and negative effect on Island life.

...and it is why if people come people here we think that it would be nice if they had a family, its not compulsory for them to have a family but it would be really good if they had a couple of kids. It just makes things flow if there are people using the facilities, there are all sorts of flow on effects of having kids at school.

We have to have a policeman with a large family, that’s what Ted Rooney [Community Board Chairperson] got in trouble for saying but it is true...

What we really want to come out of the Island becoming a national park would be for all of the trees and plants and birds out there to be protected and to bring a development into the community that would bring more families to the Island for work or [business] opportunities.
Other Islanders disagree, seeing the National Park and tourism as a step in the right direction. They argue that whilst it perhaps does not provide adequate opportunities, it is still an active step at revitalising the community. Here it should perhaps be remembered that there is no alternative economic strategy proposed.

_I think of myself as a supporter of the National Park. I think there are lots of reasons why it should happen and has to happen, and a good thing to happen on the balance. One thing that irks me is that people tell me they don’t want this kind of development to happen on the Island, inevitably the people who tell me that were a person who had their children on the Island when there were 100 kids at the school and who had their children on the Island when they were making very good money from fishing._

In this way, increasing tourism is impacting upon the community in many ways, on employment, housing, and the composition of the community. Opinions vary over the extent to which the changes are positive or negative. There was however considerable consensus around the significance of the declining number of children on the Island.

**7.2.5. Declining Opportunities for Island Families and Children**

For many of my interviewees, one of the most important markers of a healthy community is the proportion of school age children. An Island without a sufficient population to maintain the running of a primary school is seen to be in serious trouble. This is endorsed by Royle (2001. 128) who notes that “Once the decision is taken to close an island’s primary school, the death knell of an island is sounded, and almost inevitably parents with school-aged children will leave.”

On Stewart Island there is only a primary school, which has remained open since 1874. There has never been a secondary school on the Island, instead secondary school age children have been sent to boarding school on the mainland. At the end of the golden days of crayfishing in the late 1980s and early 1990s the school roll on the Island was around 90 pupils, by 2001 it had dropped to around 21 pupils. Many of the Islanders interviewed drew the connection between demise of the crayfishing industry on the Island and the fall in the number of children on the Island. The significance of the declining number of
children being born to Island families and the falling school roll was noted by many of my interviewees, who view this as an important beacon of community health.

...its [school roll] just declined and gone down and down and I'm hoping it will climb again, and it is why, if people come here, we think that it would be nice if they had a family. It's not compulsory for them to have a family but it would be really good if they had a couple of kids.

I've been watching the school roll for the 30 years I have been here, because for me that is an indicator of the health of the village. But I see now that we have bottomed out, because we have now made the transitional readjustment from fishing to tourism.

...we are back on the border line again, we are down to two teachers again and we are doing our utmost to keep the second teacher on the payroll, because the border line is 26. There were three leavers recently because they were going to secondary school and then there was this other family of four children and the family has moved away, and then there was somebody else with a couple of kids so we have dropped 12 children.

With the lucrative income of crayfishing, it was possible for families to send their children of secondary school age to boarding schools on the mainland. Without that income it became increasingly tough economically to send children to boarding school on the mainland, especially for larger families.

...now that our fishing boats are depleted because of the quota system, some people just couldn't afford to stay fishing and others moved away because they couldn't afford to put their children through boarding school. In its [crayfishing] hay day we had three children we put through boarding school, we had 20 odd kids going at various levels to various schools, we had two together, some had three going at once - its a big drain having them all there at once, the money was there in those days, but now people can't afford that.

I don't think there is one Stewart Island boy or girl boarding at Southland Boys or Girls, which must be a first this year, which is amazing as this has happened forever.
The expense of secondary schooling is believed by many Islanders to have forced many of the Island’s families to leave the Island, creating a void in the community that has not been filled. Not only did families move away but also no new families appeared to replace them at this time, neither newcomers nor locals. Hence the birth rate has also fallen.

*When my little daughter was born here two years ago there was only one other child born, maybe two a year, and of course the national average is 4.5 per 100 of population so a community of 360 should be churning out 14 or 15 children a year, but it’s two. Fifteen years ago there were 100 children at the school, so what does that tell you about the population pattern, whose left?*

*When our daughter was born (1960s) there was something like fourteen kids born in 12 months, which is quite a lot for a small island.*

Having a family and especially children was seen as very important to the community. It provides a common interest and the types of social ties that revolve around children and schools.

*Some of my friends and I talk about that, we really bemoan the loss of what used to be a strong family base on the Island, the traditional family is no longer a strong base.*

The children of a community brings the people together under a common cause, it provides a focal point and a sense of belonging. Levine and Levine (1987) recognised this in relation to the acceptance of newcomers to the Island and the fishery. “*Newcomers that ‘join in’, especially in activities involving children, such as the playcentre and school fêtes, are seen as contributing to the community.*” Many see the involvement in community activities and networks as something of the past, a past that they miss.

*I guess with a young family you get involved with the community in groups and the school and the life of the school on the Island.*

Many in the community saw the result of families moving away as a fundamental change in the Island’s community. This tendency coincides with the increase in the cost of housing and the ability to afford family life, especially based on tourism derived employment, and
the opportunities for families are thus becoming increasingly limited. Where families had once been the rule and children the common binding force within the community, the climate had changed to one where more single people were appearing within the community. This change is viewed by some Islanders as the start of a change for the worse for the community.

Yes, in the last five years or ten years max. The whole core of really strong community minded families left between 1992 and 1996. The population just went, the school roll just went down...most left for economic reasons, some of them left because their children were at boarding school age and it was getting too expensive to keep them at boarding school, some moved for work opportunities, and so many things started to crumble, and that paints a dark picture... but I just see this crumbling effect.

7.2.6. Population Turnover and Social Problems

Without the common focus of children, the school and the economic climate to support families, many of my interviewees suggested that the social atmosphere of the Island has started to decay. Those that remain do not find things easy. The loss of the industry, jobs and income, as well as the loss of the connection with the sea that they loved had a detrimental effect on Island life.

I think we had a year here recently when we had more suicides on the Island than live births. My contention is that this community is in real trouble already and people say they don’t want change. Even in the 10 years I have been on the Island there has been serious change and its negative change and its not good change at all. Like some of the loose [drugs, sexual assault, heavy drinking] behaviour that is happening now and the incidents that have happened this year, I think we are starting to see some real serious signs of a community in trouble, of an unbalanced community, a community in which there are too many sad drunk men in it, and not enough people doing the family thing. My contention is if they don’t want change there is a serious problem here that needs to be addressed.
The historical problem for Stewart Island - how to cope in the face of a declining economic base - thus re-emerged in the early 1990s, resulting in a lack of employment and a shift in the composition of the community. The decline in crayfishing began a chain reaction with a decline in income resulting in out migration of families, and what many see as immigration of single young people and their associated social problems, such as unemployment, drink, drugs and racism, to the Island.

Yeah, a lot of transient people, a lot of locals moved away, a lot. There are a lot of new people here, it's definitely made an impact but I think that's the economy though.

I am one of the old ones... maybe I don't see what is happening down at their level, may be they are quite happy with what they have got, maybe they don't see any sort of problems [with their lifestyles] as I do. I am upset and associate it with a drug culture, you know they say birds of a feather flock together.... and they are quite blatant without a permanent policeman they have been more in your face about it [smoking cannabis].

... it's the smoking pot on the benefit thing, that's a culture that has grown up since the quota thing, I mean it wasn’t acceptable to be unemployed twenty years ago [like it is today] it wasn’t an option, not a lifestyle option.

These social problems have been reported elsewhere. An article in North and South (June 2002) reported one Islander as stating “Up to five or six years ago you never saw the black t-shirts, studded belts and the rottweilers you see now. You see them on the West Coast. They like the wilderness, living on the edge, the isolation.”

When considering this, it is again important to draw on the experiences of the past, for instance following the decline of the timber industry in 1864 it was reported that “press references and official reports make it clear that lawlessness was rife and unchecked... Moreover, the influx of new settlers, who were strange and unsympathetic to the Island ways and consequent spread of settlement into more isolated groups, had destroyed the cohesion and loyalty usually found in compact communities” (Howard 1940.263). Thus my research demonstrated that ‘social problems’ are an important concern for many of the Islanders, attesting to the negative effects that they believe that increasing tourism entails.
7.2.7. Housing and Accommodation

Alongside the changes in the economic focus and the social composition that have resulted from the decline in crayfishing and increase in tourism, interviewees also emphasised the changes occurring in the physical environment of the settlement. Housing is one of the fundamental needs of a community. For Stewart Island the allocation of housing needs to meet the needs of the different segments of the housing market. Freehold properties owned and occupied by families and Island residents; rental properties occupied by Island residents; rental properties occupied by (semi) transient seasonal workers; holiday homes owned by New Zealanders occupied part of the year; holiday homes owned by overseas peoples; holiday homes rented to tourists and other tourist accommodation.

Within and between these groupings there is a high degree of competition, due to the limited amount of housing resource available on the Island; this in turn has increased the value and the earning potential of the housing stock. Tracing the role of housing through the past sixty years on the Island provides and insight into the current housing situation and possible future housing situations. What is seen through the investigation of housing during this time period is the relationship of the houses, and segments of the housing market, to the dominant economic focus on the Island. This section builds on the earlier description of housing and property ownership (see Chapter three) on the Island, and considers how the nature and characteristics of housing market have changed through time in line with socio-economic changes.

Houses are central to having a sense of place and feelings of belonging; they provide identity and stability to life. On Stewart Island houses and property provide the basis of the lifestyle that the Stewart Islanders enjoy. Having space between oneself and one's neighbours is highly valued, as is having native bush right up to your doorstep. Houses on the Island range from being secluded old small wooden houses nestled amongst the bush to large, new, obvious, ostentatious houses perched upon cliffs, headlands or beaches, with views overlooking the sea. The size of properties follows these same extremes with many sections being the New Zealand typical quarter acre, while other properties are measured in the tens or hundreds of acres.
people like their 2 or 3 acre blocks, in the township you have this concentration of little blocks, but once you get outside of it you get up to 5, 6, 10 up to 30 acre blocks which people have brought, and they put their house on it, it might end up with three or four houses on it, it's the lifestyle, its what they want to keep. I don't think it will change much.

My research demonstrated that privacy and seclusion are central to many Stewart Islander’s lifestyles. A number of influences have shaped the housing and accommodation markets on the Island as they exist today, from the building of the first house in the Halfmoon Bay area. The 1940s and 1950s saw a number of changes happen to housing on Stewart Island. First, crayfishing became the economic mainstay of the Island, providing a lucrative single income and replacing the dual income economy of fishing and tourism that preceded it. Concurrent to this, and as a direct result it can be assumed, tourism, which had been present on the Island since the 1880s in the form of long staying visitors at boarding house accommodation, underwent a fundamental change in its character including the rise in popularity of holiday homes.

Tourism did not disappear completely as a result of crayfishing, although it changed as a result of the changing economic, social, and cultural circumstances on the Island. The boarding houses and lodges declined as the Island's economic need for long stay tourism diminished. The number of day visitors to the Island began to increase as long stay visitors declined. At the same time the number of holiday residences, ‘cribs’ as they are known in the area, increased dramatically. Between the end of the Second World War and 1960, 75 percent of the new houses built were holiday residences (Samson 1971). A portion of these holiday homes were drawn into the housing allocation of the permanent residents as the population of the Island increased significantly as a result of the allure of crayfishing opportunities and profits.

However, the effect of the demise of crayfishing and families moving away from the Island in the late 1980s and early 1990s, due to the decline of crayfishing, was that many family homes were sold. The most obvious effect according to my interviewees is the conversion of family homes into holiday homes (or back into holiday homes as the case may be).

...the other thing is that 10 or 15 years ago 30 percent of rate payers were
holiday homes and now it would be up to 50 percent.

One result of this is that the potential for families to move to the Island is diminished because erstwhile permanent family residences are now being locked up for a large part of the year, with the new owners coming perhaps for a month a year. Exacerbating the problem is the perceived difference between the residents and the recent buyers of holiday homes; not only are the new owners not living on the Island but the Island residents believed many new owners to be from overseas.

You know, I reckon a lot of population is holiday home owners now. The two houses to the right of us here are owned by a chap from Queensland, and the house opposite us is owned by a lady in California, and those houses are both holiday homes, and the two across from us are both just holiday homes, you know the boat one and the one next to it, all of these used to house families, when everyone had a job, people with young families and children, it’s a real shame to see it happen.

Things have not changed as far as a whole lot of buildings and stuff, but I do believe that things will change and it is changing there is more people from other countries that own land here now. There are people from USA as you know who own land, there are people from Germany that own land, so I mean there is this influence from the outside, people from Australia own property here and I think as time goes on that will increase, although on the surface it appears pretty much untouched.

Although there have been holiday homes since the end of World War II, the new holiday home owners are seen as different. Whereas the original crib owners were New Zealanders, and predominantly South Islanders and more so from Southland and Otago, the new holiday homeowners are perceived as foreigners and rich. On the Island it is thought that these overseas owners are very wealthy, especially when their money is converted to New Zealand dollars from pounds sterling or American dollars. This perception of the newcomers brings with it some resentment and loathing, with some Islanders fearing the changes that may accompany such people.

The lifestyle of the Island could change, I’d hate to see this turn into a rich
persons playground like Queenstown, I know that we don't offer the activities or the weather that Queenstown has but there is something attractive about living off shore on an Island or having a holiday home on an Island, and especially an Island as beautiful as this. Already we have recently seen a large sale to an overseas person, and that type of sale in some ways worries the Islanders in that they are losing control, in that those who have lived here for ten years or more, think 'hey this is our Island' protective stuff, and protected from overseas investors.

Other members of the community present this in a different manner, believing that much of the antagonism directed at these newcomers is more a reaction to change.

I have often heard people say that it would stuff Stewart Island and that things will change and we won't like it, and the actual problem is the change and not the values at the moment ... And people say that ‘but we will have to live with the very wealthy’ as if this is supposed to be a very bad thing! So the point that I am making is that it is the change that seems to be more important than what we are changing from.

The change that is happening is one that again revolves around people that are economically secure. As tourism began to increase and the general awareness of Stewart Island began to rise within the New Zealand psyche, demand for property on the Island also began to rise. Part of the issue related to wealthy people buying properties is exhibited in the stories and rumours that the money offered for properties was so high that they could not possibly turn it down.

There are a couple of people around at Ringaringa who lived in Auckland, I think both of them were made redundant and were here on holiday and were on the bus and they decided to knock on the door and said “do you want to sell your house, we’d love to buy it” and he said “well I’ve got no real plans of selling it at the moment” and they said “we’ll give you $$$$” and he said he would have to think about it, because he might never get another offer like that. So he and his wife talked about it and decide to sell up.
Who would you rather sell your house to, a local that's scraping $30,000 a year or some rich fat cat American that will pay you heaps?

However, demand for houses does not just come from non-Stewart Islanders. During my research it became obvious that many Stewart Islanders had seen the potential income and quick profits in property speculation. Even those that when discussing the National Park, tourism and development stated that they did not want to see development and change within the settlement were themselves subdividing property they had purchased recently and attempting to sell it at highly inflated prices. This form of speculating appeared to be exacerbating the problem.

With the increased demand for houses and property, especially during the period just prior to the creation of Rakiura National Park, property prices increased dramatically alongside the predicted increase in tourism. This in itself was believed to make Stewart Island a very sought-after location for a holiday residence by both New Zealanders and overseas visitors with the ability to afford the price tag.

_The people have a lot of speculation about the land prices; they are asking a lot more of their properties than they might have in the past. There are one or two places on the market at the moment going for much more than they paid for them because they know that there are people from all over the world offering big dollars for homes and for your piece of land. What are you going to do, take the money and run?_

_Property prices have gone up, they have doubled and tripled, and a lot of people are buying and selling and building before it does become a National Park because they are scared once it becomes a National Park they won't be able to._

_In the last three months the prices have just gone boom, months ago there were probably 20 houses for sale, now there is only one. All of the medium range housing is gone, people are still looking for sections, but there are none._

_Everybody is going around now and they can see the dollar signs- the cash registers are ringing in their heads, and there are people rushing around_
buying up this and buying up that because they are looking ahead at tourism.

The increase in demand for houses and the proposed national park have seen house prices skyrocket, enabling those locals with land and resources to ‘cash in’ on both tourism and the current property prices. Often during the peak of the tourism season the available accommodation is fully booked, and during the traditional New Zealand holiday period of Christmas and New Year it is fully booked months in advance. At times the overflow of visitors have been accommodated in private homes, others are told to leave the Island as there is nowhere for them to stay (DoC Visitor Centre Staff personal communication 2001). This has lead to many Islanders extending their own houses, buying second houses where they can, converting garages, basements and sleep-outs to exploit the shortage of holiday accommodation and cash in on the tourists, resulting in a shortage of supply for locals.

This used to be a really strong fishing village, and all of that has changed now and a lot of the residents, more and more are going into tourism, starting up backpackers and bed and breakfast.

Some of my interviewees suggested that this was the result of one real estate agent who began renting out houses as holiday homes, leading some Island locals into buying properties to rent out as holiday homes, these are rented out at over $100 per night to tourists and the money earned over the peak season outstrips that which could be gained by renting to seasonal workers or to locals over the entire year and with less risk of damage to the property.

There are so many of the private residential homes that have now become holiday homes and people rent them out during the year. The likes of Christmas time accommodation is a real peak because people who have been renting in the off season have to find other accommodation as well, like some are charging nightly. We might have to go away each Christmas and rent this place out instead.
As the realisation of the profits tourism could bring to property-owning local residents there appears to have been a ‘rush’ to cash in, with spare rooms, sleep-outs and garages being rented out as ‘homestays’, ‘bed and breakfasts’ and ‘backpackers’.

...the fact of the matter is there are an increasing number of people coming and will continue to increase and somehow we need to cash in on it, we are try to ourselves by taking in travellers, to earn extra revenue... the [increasing] number of people that are in some way on this Island are cashing in on it, just look at the amount of accommodation on this Island that people are offering, I know, we have been taking a few travellers here and we are looking at taking more.

Islanders have sought to create accommodation where possible in order to supplement their incomes. This can be seen through the increase in ‘bed numbers’ reported between the release of the ‘Stewart Island Tourism Strategy’ (1997) and the study by Booth and Leppens (2002), in 1997 it was reported that there were 310 beds available whereas by 2002 it was reported that there were 449 (offered by 56 separate providers); an increase of 139 within five years. Further to this, Booth and Leppens (2002) discovered that holiday homes available for rental provided by far the largest number of beds, with 177 beds.

In the 10 months from completing my initial research in 2001 to my return visit in 2002, around seven new accommodation establishments had opened, with another one being built. Although in this way Stewart Island residents are capitalising on the current position they are in, one where there is a shortage of accommodation during the peak of the season, not all of the residents are able to enter into the accommodation industry.

When we travelled around New Zealand all of the people who owned motels were middle aged, there was nobody with young with kids. That is to say that if more motels get built [on the Island] it means that it won’t be built by people like us [a young married couple with children], they just don’t have the capital.

Although the younger members of the community are not the only segment to have barriers to entry into the housing market, with respect to home ownership their story appears gloomy. Not only are the younger members of the community disadvantaged in buying
property for a tourism accommodation business, they are now also at a disadvantage in buying a home of their own. Those residents without capital to establish themselves in a more lucrative tourism businesses such as accommodation (see Booth and Leppens 2002 estimate the income derived from tourism accommodation is nearly three times that of the next category) must find themselves year round employment – and this often requires them to leave the Island.

7.2.8. **Missing Out in the Housing Market – Negative Effects of Increased Tourism**

The 1990s was a depressed time economically for many on Stewart Island, leaving younger Islanders with only part time, seasonal or no employment. For those of this group still present on the Island it has resulted in their missing out on financial opportunities to buy their first house; as the opportunity for secure year round employment has disappeared for many. When combined with the recent dramatic price increases and the increased demand for property the ability to enter into the property market on the Island has disappeared.

_I would like to see a lot more locals given the opportunity to give it a go, instead of being passed over for 'fly by nighters'. But you are seeing that everywhere, it's not just employment, it's housing, you are seeing a lot more locals renting that at their age should be home owning. I mean it's not their fault that they don't have the money but it is that at times they don't have, the opportunity doesn't present itself._

This has left a large number of younger locals, some of whom are born and bred Stewart Islanders from families that have a history on the Island going back generations, without their own piece of land and house; a situation unheard of in the past. This leaves young Stewart Island people renting with uncertain prospects for their occupation of their present abodes or about the chances of securing land and a house of their own on the Island.

_I'm renting a big house with two other guys. But that house is coming up for sale soon, that's a worry. Like all of the young people that come over here to work, most don't own their own house. Some can't even find somewhere to rent... All the land is pretty much going to get taken. I'm trying to get my hands on some myself, but I don't think there will be any left within a_
reasonable price range. It's a bit late to do anything about it now, that's the sad thing. I really do feel, I see this place as my home! It should be above just making money out of it, it's o.k. to make some money but to lose your home because of it! (25 year old fourth generation Stewart Islander)

Running alongside the increased demand for property and houses has been an increase in demand for rental properties, by locals who do not own a house and by transient seasonal tourism workers. The ability to find rental accommodation year round is now a struggle, as the profits from tourist accommodation far outweighs the hassles associated with being a typical landlord. Further to this, with the demise of a family base on the Island has seen an increase in the number of single people; this exerts even more pressure on the rental accommodation market.

Yeah, a lot of transient people, a lot of locals moved away, a lot. There are a lot of new people here, its definitely made an impact but I think that's the economy though, prices have risen a bit.

You know that yourself trying to find somewhere, you’ve got to own to live here. There is enough problems with accommodation for locals without the seasonal workers coming through.

Although there are more houses there aren't as many children, but that is a fact of life, like there is a lot of single people, all of these single guys living on in houses on their own.

There are quite few houses but they are all single people now, not families. When we were children[1950s] they were all family homes with four or five children in each family, but that is a sign of the times now with people not getting married and not having children, you know taking it for what its worth.

7.2.9. Infrastructure

One of the main concerns of the local community relates to the need to upgrade the existing infrastructure. The reasons behind this concern are varied but legitimate. As stated above, in 2001 at the time of the research the very limited infrastructure was already past
its capacity, with every new tourism development adding to that overloading. The restricted and overburdened infrastructure capability limits the ability of tourism to expand and for local people to increase their tourism income. Any new developments are challenged by the reality that basic infrastructure needs are limited and near the point of collapse.

During my visits to the Island I was given a tour of the civil infrastructure and also observed some of its failings. On three occasions I observed one of the sewerage pumping stations in the middle of the township overflow onto the street, sending sewage down the street. On enquiring I was told that it was a result of tourists flushing nappies down the toilet; that the pump had failed due to an electricity outage; and on the third occasion that it could not cope with the peak season flow as the pipes installed were of an insufficient diameter to the volume of waste produced. Obviously, such occurrences have an extremely adverse impact not only on the environment but on the image that affected visitors to Stewart Island will carry away with them – far removed from the ‘clean, green, pristine’ vision that compels many to visit.

Similarly, the electricity on the Island is produced by a number of bulldozer engines that run 24 hours a day. These engines obviously have a limited life span, which according to one informant was fast approaching. Supply is dependent on the maintenance of these engines, with limited capability to increase supply to meet the increasing demand of tourism. The price of electricity on the Island is obviously much greater than that on the mainland because of the cost of importing diesel.

Further infrastructural concerns were directed at the roads. Not only had some coastal roading been eroded by high seas, there is also concern for pedestrian safety because of the lack of road markings. While the traffic volume is very low, it is also very fast, raising concerns for the safety of the numerous tourists that can be seen walking the narrow and winding roads of the Island. In addition, the wharf is too small to accommodate the high number of people disembarking the ferry, the existing fish processing shed and the loading and unloading of fish and freight, raising further safety concerns. Meetings on how to answer the waste management crisis bought on by the impending closure of the landfill were underway during my fieldwork, with the landfill due to close in 2003.
Particular concerns of Islanders regarding the infrastructure of the Island related to the lack of adequate infrastructure and services, the need to improve these to the level expected by tourists, and most importantly the onus of responsibility for paying for the required upgrades. This came up in the National Park consultation process.

Anyway I suspect that we are about to get an announcement that we are about to become a National Park, but the community of about 360 people can't be expected to pay for the facilities if we do get extra numbers.

I was talking to a guy the other day and he was saying it was the best time to live on the Island because the roads are better than they were 10 years ago and now the power is on which it wasn't 10 years ago and they have some sewerage on that we never had, and people coming from the mainland don't think so because they are used to better. But it has, and they are going to want more foot paths too if they are going to get a lot more people coming because at the moment there are a lot of people walking on the roads, so are they going to do that?

But if we had to enlarge the sewerage scheme, and the people are singing out that they want it now, because there were a few houses that were in the immediate vicinity of the town who are backpackers now, and some on the outskirts of town, and they are getting pressure on their septic tanks so now they want to join in the system, but that means extending that system and we haven't even paid for it yet, we are still paying it off, there is about 216 to pay that sewerage scheme off, but it means that these extensions are going to cost as much again, which means that you have got a hundred odd houses have to be supported by the rest.

A request was put in to central government by the Southland District Council for $8.1 million of funding for infrastructure upgrades.

The next thing is that we want $8.1 million, but we would be happy to get $4.5 million now, and invest that and then use the interest from that for development of the infrastructure. Again, in twenty years time there would have to be a water supply system. We are hoping to get more accommodation so we would have to enlarge the sewerage system and the electricity system.
We are told that all New Zealanders are allowed to have a say but if as a result decisions are made that are not in the Islanders interests and it becomes more expensive to live here with rates increasing then will these absentee decision makers be willing to help meet the cost, I know that we are all tax payers but in reality there would be a very small group that would bear the brunt of it.

At the announcement of the Rakiura National Park the then Minister of Conservation, Sandra Lee, stated that the government would help with the funding of the infrastructure upgrades, but as yet (2004) this has not come to pass. For some segments of the community, and particularly those who are retired or employed in the tourism industry, the increase in tourism and the pressure on the infrastructure and possible added costs on their rates bill appears unjust.

...and it will always be the locals who will wear the expenses, and when the Island consists of, at least a third of the population of the Island are senior citizens and some people who have come over and retired, and its scary for them when they have no income and if they have to dip into their nest eggs....there is always that thought in my mind that I can't stay here any longer, we are not going to see any money coming back into our pockets from all of these things we have paid for.

The other thing that sort of worries me a little is the infrastructure and things and how they are going to upgrading that to meet the need of all of the people coming over here and who foots the bill for that? The rate payers or what because I think it is unfair that if the government wants to stick a National Park on here that we should have to pay for the upgrades in infrastructure because we don't have to have change over here, it's just that the government wants it for tourism.

In addition, those who own several properties or tourism facilities and accommodation establishments are concerned at the cost, given the likely increase in their rates. These property owners will be asked to significantly increase their contributions in line with their investments and share of demand on the limited infrastructure. This became of interest when I analysed my data and discovered that the most vocal opponents of the National
Park were also some of the largest investors in tourism businesses. This of course has implications when considering the influence this small group of business people and their control of much of the Island’s employment opportunities. With a strong group of supporters it was this grouping that seemed to make the most noise about the National Park and about not wanting tourism, even though they had already bought into tourism in a large way.

So as a group we decided to not try and fight no National Park this time, we decided that as a group we should try and get as much [money] out of it as we can for as long a term as we can into the future and the battle has been that one. It has concentrated in the area of the village. We gave up the idea of winning against a National Park, and DoC being a bit more flexible in their long term management, but we are down to still fighting bout the [National Park] boundary and the amount of money and it just sits.

It therefore appears that as anywhere, opposition to or support for the National Park is affected by the vested interests of different people. It appears that a major factor influencing the positive or negative attitudes relates to the costs or profits seen to derive from tourism. Without upgrades and improvements to the infrastructure the ability to expand the tourism industry is limited. Faced with soaring infrastructure costs it is only logical that people would oppose the National Park and increased tourism, as these costs would out strip their profit in the foreseeable future, particularly when the possibilities for economic benefit are extremely restricted.

7.3. Summary

Since the late 1990s, Stewart Island has faced a new bout of accelerated change, reflecting the demise of the existing economic mainstay (crayfishing) and economic restructuring. This has resulted in an increased impetus for tourism, which appears one of the few options available with economic potential to sustain the community in future. However, the changes associated with increasing tourism are a mixed blessing.

For many Islanders, the income drop that resulted in the loss of lucrative cray fishing incomes has not been offset by tourism gains, with negative implications for employment,
the buying of houses, and the opportunities available to families on the Island. Further, the expansion of tourism is hampered by the need for substantial investment in the Island’s infrastructure, and Islanders are understandably concerned over who is expected to pay. To attract still further tourists, as the National Park undoubtedly will, requires more accommodation on the Island. This is however not currently possible without major upgrades to both the electricity, sewerage and waste-disposal systems.

The issue of further tourism development is therefore doomed to remain vexed. Certainly, tourism appears the only option for maintaining the economy of the Island. Yet in many ways, it compromises the very features of the Island that its inhabitants value. Islanders recognise the contradictions and ambiguity inherent in the changes that are occurring. They appreciate the inevitability of change, yet feel the associated losses deeply. What seems certain is that the National Park will not ‘solve’ the problems confronting the community, and indeed that it has created a whole new set of contentious issues.
Chapter Eight: Conclusions

This thesis has presented a study of the creation of Rakiura National Park derived from a range of resources and focusing on the stories, experiences and understandings of the Stewart Island residents. The gazettal of the National Park can be seen to be the latest in a long sequence of macro decisions relating to Stewart Island and the use of the natural resources of the Island. In order to understand the recent developments it has been necessary to trace the oscillating fortunes, and barriers to development, throughout the Island’s 200 year European history. I contend that the initial decisions taken in relation to the resources of the Island and industry have determined the path of subsequent development on the Island; one that initially lead to the conservation of the majority of the Island and ultimately Rakiura National Park.

The path dependent sequence Stewart Island is following reflects the macro forces that have dictated the economic and regulatory environment within which it has had to operate and survive. Stewart Island remains a small, isolated island with a small population that believes strongly in their rights and ownership in relation to ‘their Island.’ In the past 200 years many things have changed in relation to people and their built environment; yet there are certain continuities that persist. The Island’s history provides the context within which the creation of the National Park must be understood, for this helps to explain the different attitudes held by the Island residents in relation to the government, conservation, tourism and development of their settlement. In becoming Rakiura National Park, Stewart Island presents a clear example of the ongoing and increasing recognition of the importance of the natural environment and of elevated conservation status as key attractions for tourism.

The objective of this thesis was to present a case study of the perceptions of the people of Stewart Island of the creation of New Zealand’s most recent national park. It has examined the manner in which it was created; their experiences and understandings of their transition from fishing and crayfishing to nature-based tourism; and the effects of these changes upon their settlement and their lives. Importantly, there has been a transition from a sole focus on a natural resource extractive industry to a situation where nature-based tourism is becoming their main industry.
In analysing my data and presenting my findings I have utilised Pawson and Le Heron’s (1996) ‘geographic restructuring model’ to help explain the economic, political, social and regulatory changes that Stewart Island has experienced in the past 200 years. In conjunction with this I have employed the concept of ‘path dependency’ within a historical sociological narrative to present the findings within the context of the temporal sequence within which they have occurred. This combination helps to illustrate how these macro forces at the regional, national and international levels have shaped the economic and industry fortunes of the Island, and goes some way towards explaining how the Island has slowly moved closer and closer toward National Park status.

By employing these two theoretical concepts I have highlighted how Stewart Island has followed a pattern of ‘boom and bust’ in relation to both its economic and social fortunes. Through successive failures of industry on the Island the Stewart Island residents once more find themselves in a situation where they are again reliant on tourism to provide them with the economic capability to remain living on ‘their’ Island. This situation was recognised by many individuals on the Island and has eventually resulted in the ascendancy of conservation to the level of National Park to further boost the re-emergence of tourism as a major industry.

The effect of the most recent restructuring of industry on the Island is recognised by many of the Island residents. The demise of the fishing and cray fishing industries on the Island started in 1986 with the introduction of the Quota Management System. The outcome of this was the inevitable result of economies of scale which saw the quota move from many small Island based operators to fewer larger mainland based operators. This is reported by many of my informants to have had devastating effects on the Stewart Island community and resulted in many families moving off the Island and the school roll falling to just 21 pupils.

Running concurrent with the demise of fishing was the rise of tourism, which became recognised as a means to produce income and employment. As a result of the rising importance of tourism to maintain the community on the Island it became apparent to a number of the Island residents that the time to promote the idea of a national park for the Island had arrived. Although there was vocal opposition to the proposal the outcome never
appeared in doubt, with many of the residents of the Island stating that it was a foregone conclusion prior to its gazettal.

The evolution of tourism on Stewart Island is still in a transitional stage, with increasing numbers of tourists wishing to visit the Island. However, unlike tourism developments on the mainland, Stewart Island has a limited capacity to expand to meet this increasing demand due to the limited infrastructure present on the Island, for its capacity has already been reached. The largest hurdle to future development of the civil infrastructure is the lack of capital available due to the small number of rate payers on the Island compared to the large capital costs involved. The lack of increasing the capacity of the civil infrastructure, namely sewerage, electricity and refuse, limits all further forms of development. Without an expansion of the number of accommodation providers and tourist beds the tourism industry will not provide sufficient income to sustain the Island’s economy and meet the growing demand for accommodation by tourists, seasonal workers and young Stewart Islanders.

Increasing tourism is further limited by tourism sector employers, transient seasonal workers and young Stewart Island residents. Tourism operators who require seasonal staff are now faced with the situation of there being no seasonal accommodation for their staff, resulting in these operators having to purchase property explicitly for this purpose. Such a situation of course leads to much larger overheads and initial investment into the business; thereby limiting access into the industry for those without the capital resource required to not only provide start up for the business but also provide accommodation for any staff they may need to employ.

Transient workers coming to the Island for the tourist season are also finding the shortage of suitable accommodation an issue. Rents are high in comparison to tourism industry wages and there is a total shortage in properties for rent. However without this transient workforce the tourism industry on the Island would find itself with a shortage of workers; a situation that would then see tourism wages rise as operators attempt to retain their staff. For young Stewart Island residents the realities of the National Park and the tourism industry are rental properties are highly sought-after, given the demands by both tourists and seasonal workers for accommodation. Alongside this they have seen house and
property prices rise to a point where they are beyond the income they derive from working in the tourism industry, as tourism employment is generally characterised as being seasonal, part-time, low paid and dominated by young people and especially females. For young Stewart Island residents working in the tourism industry this then means that given the large increase in property prices on the Island they are unlikely to find themselves in a position to buy a property or house on the Island. If buying a house and starting a family are the priority of some of these young people then it is likely that they will leave the Island, having further consequences for the community’s composition.

The current change to the community composition highlights the recent decline in the number of young families and children on the Island; a trend that looks unlikely to change in the near future. This is of major concern for many Islanders, who maintain that the presence of children in a community is an indicator of the health of that community. Replacing these young families is an increasing number of young, single transient workers and middle aged, middle class New Zealanders that have come to the Island seeking business opportunities that come with National Parks and tourism. The outcomes of this change are unclear but could include Stewart Island becoming another ‘party destination’ much like Queenstown – to the horror of many of the residents.

8.1. Consultation

Further resistance to the National Park (and, through association, tourism development) derives from the fact that many in the community feel that the changes have been imposed upon them externally with insufficient consultation. From the initial announcement through to the gazettal of Rakiura National Park, many Islanders argued that the consultation initiated by the Department of Conservation was simply an exercise of ‘going through the motions’. This perception reflects many factors – such as the fact that the initial public meeting was exclusive and limited to ‘invitees-only’, the notion that the National Park was a ‘foregone conclusion’ given the increasing emphasis on conservation by central government, and invariably a degree of self-interest among affected parties. For its part the Department of Conservation inherited a situation from the then Minister of Conservation who had already begun the consultation process with the public announcement of the proposal via the national media. Understandably, many in the
community steadfastly believe that they should have been consulted and informed of the announcement prior to its airing on the news bulletins of the national media.

Although the consultation process initially appeared flawed given the debacle of the invitation only meeting through to the New Zealand Conservation Authority originally not intending to hold public meetings on the Island, the Department of Conservation did attempt to consult widely and educate the community as to the effect of national park gazettal upon their community. Part of the difficulty associated with the consultation process from the Department of Conservation perspective is that there is no formal process laid out for them to follow - in fact there is no directive in the National Park Act 1980 to consult at all. This combined with a loss of institutional knowledge of how even the most recent previous national park consultations evolved meant that DoC staff had to create the process for themselves and for the community.

The antagonism produced by such a situation strongly suggests the need for some amendment to legislation and also to the policy process. The Department of Conservation and the whole of central government must take responsibility for the effects that creating national parks and similar conservation initiatives have for neighbouring communities. Failing to take responsibility for the increased pressure and cost of upgrades to the local infrastructure and the impacts of increases in house and property prices on local people will ensure that such initiatives will continue to meet with opposition in the future.

Much of the opposition to the Stewart Island proposal was loudly voiced by those who had large stakes in the tourism industry, particularly regarding accommodation. The main reason for this would appear to be at least two-fold, with this group wanting to lobby the government for funding to upgrade the failing local infrastructure; given that they are large rate payers on the Island having two accommodation establishments that between them have close to 100 beds and would therefore face large increases in their rates bill. The other advantage to having vocal opposition to the proposal is that it provided ongoing nationwide coverage of Stewart Island in the media, confirming the old Hollywood adage that ‘any publicity is good publicity.’
With the prospect of much of the land contained within the high country leases being moved into the conservation estate the need for clear process and obligations of consultation are required. Without providing staff with the guidance and direction necessary to establish and maintain good relationships with communities, consultation processes in the future may also become only public airings of individuals' interests and desires.

By creating National Parks for tourism purposes, responsibility for the impacts and costs of that tourism to neighbouring communities must be accepted by the Department of Conservation and central government. Revisiting the words of then Prime Minister Jenny Shipley, it appears that part of the intent of the creation of the National Park was to attract tourists to the Island:

"A national park is an international brand name which would draw people to southern New Zealand... But until you get the branding and packaging right, you will not draw the numbers" (The Southland Times 17/04/99:3).

If Rakiura National Park was really a ‘branding’ exercise as stated, then responsibility for attracting tourists to the Island who then overburden the infrastructure lies with the government. Further to this, acknowledgement of these associated implications and proposed strategies to alleviate these impacts and costs must be incorporated into any proposal and subsequent management plans prior to public consultation. The ideological separation of people and their settlements from our national parks is perhaps an area that requires review in the near future as an outdated system that no longer fits with the realities of tourism-driven conservation.

8.2. Lessons for the Future

This research suggests that prior to consultation with a community bordering a proposed conservation area that a substantial engagement with the community and their history is necessary. Conducting a qualitative study, such as this, prior to a conservation proposal would have a number of benefits. Firstly it would allow the community to engage with the proposal in a meaningful way, avoiding the implied insult of being told via an announcement at an ‘exclusive’ public meeting. Secondly, developing an understanding of
how residents see their place and community and the macro forces that have led them to the point of transition to conservation and tourism provides valuable insights that could help to secure a mutually beneficial outcome. This in itself provides an overview of potential issues and impacts of such a development and can provide the Department of Conservation with a means to attempt to alleviate these fears. Thirdly, it also enables a clear view of the areas of contention and the rationale behind them; saving time and effort in public meetings with an opponent that has a clear objective which in this case was central government funding of civil infrastructure. Finally it provides the members of the community with the opportunity to meet one on one with a researcher to talk through their story and contribute in a manner in which they feel valued; this is more likely to gain support of those involved.

This case study provides an example of the importance of context and history in the implementation of conservation initiatives and presents two concepts that at the present time provide useful tools with which to research such an initiative. Path dependency is a tool which can be used to understand how the past has influenced the present and describe how the consequences of certain choices and decisions have shaped the choices available today. In the case of Stewart Island and Rakiura National Park it provides a useful tool to raise questions in relation to the current decisions and choices and how these will play out in the future. At the top of this list of questions would have to be how viable is the reliance on long term tourism?
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Appendix 1: General Policy for National Parks

"7. SELECTING NEW PARKS AND PARK BOUNDARIES"

The purposes of national parks are set out in Section 4(1): "... for the purpose of preserving in perpetuity as national parks, for their intrinsic worth and for the benefit, use, and enjoyment of the public, areas of New Zealand that contain scenery of such distinctive quality, ecological systems, or natural features so beautiful, unique, or scientifically important that their preservation is in the national interest." This standard is a high one befitting a status which can be altered only by an Act of Parliament (S 11).

One of the functions of the National Parks and Reserves Authority is to consider and make proposals for the addition of land to national parks and the establishment of new national parks (S 18(e)). Boards also have a function of giving advice to the Commissioner or the authority in this context (S 30(f)).

Section 8 provides that the authority may after advising the Minister of Lands request the Director-General of Lands to investigate and report to it on any such proposals. The Director-General is required to give public notice of the proposal, inviting persons and organisations to make written suggestions on it. The Minister of Energy is also to be advised of the proposed investigation.

Before making a recommendation to the Minister of Lands that land be added to a park, the authority is required to consult the appropriate board (S 7(2)). Certain classes of land cannot be added to a park without the recommendation of the appropriate Minister (S 7(3)#6).

The authority has a responsibility to consider the inherent suitability of land for preservation as national park in terms of Section 4(1). However, proposals for additions to parks or for new parks may sometimes have significant economic and/or social implications, and in requesting an investigation the authority will seek information on such impact. In reporting to the Minister on the suitability of Land for national park status the authority will also inform him of the economic and/or social implications. The final decision made by the Governor-General in Council on the recommendation of the Minister...
can then be made in the light of the available information and on the basis of the national interest.

Policy

7.1 The following criteria will be used to assess the suitability of areas suggested as new national parks. These criteria will also be applied to areas being considered for addition to existing parks where their addition is for purposes other than to improve the location of boundaries. Criteria for boundary adjustments and location of boundaries are given at policy 7.3.

(i) The statutory requirements of Section 4(1) for provision of national parks will be interpreted as follows:

Areas recommended for national park status must contain, for their intrinsic worth and for the benefit, use and enjoyment of the public, some or all of the following:

(a) Scenery of such distinctive quality that its preservation is in the national interest; and/or

(b) Ecological systems so unique or scientifically important that their preservation is in the national interest; and/or

(c) Natural features so beautiful, unique, or scientifically important that their preservation is in the national interest.

(ii) In addition to the requirement to assess areas as to their suitability for national park status in terms of Section 4(1) the following criteria will be considered:

(a) In general, national parks should be relatively large, preferably in terms of tens of thousands of hectares and preferably comprising contiguous areas.

(b) In general, areas under consideration should be natural areas, but predominantly natural areas will be considered if they:
- contain modified areas which can be restored or are capable of regeneration, or
- contain features of significant historical, cultural, archaeological or scientific value, or
- contain features which have no equivalent in an unmodified area in a national park and which are so beautiful, unique or so scientifically important that they should be protected in a national park.

7.2 In addition to consideration of the above criteria, any investigation requested by the authority under Section 8 will be required to include an assessment of the likely economic and/or social implications at the local, regional or national levels for consideration by the Minister in conjunction with the authority's recommendation.

7.3 In fixing the boundaries of new parks or additions to existing parks the following criteria will apply and will also be used to assess proposals for changes to existing boundaries:

(i) Ecosystems within the park should be able to withstand pressures from possible environmental change on lands adjacent to the park.

(ii) Adjacent land uses should not detrimentally affect or dominate park values.

(iii) Boundaries should encompass complete landscape units.

(iv) Boundaries should allow the maximum possible right of access by the public consistent with the need to preserve park values.

(v) Boundaries should be convenient for efficient management of the park and also for the occupier of adjacent land.

(vi) Boundaries should where possible follow physical features such as ridgelines and streams as these are natural and easily identifiable on the ground. Natural physical boundaries are normally preferable to vegetation boundaries, man-made features or straight line boundaries.
7.4 In coastal parks the addition of foreshore areas will be sought because they are ecologically part of the park and are required for efficient park management. Where appropriate, applications for grants of control in terms of the Harbours Act 1950 will be sought.

7.5 Exclusion of land from parks may be recommended either to make a more appropriate boundary or if land within a park does not comply with the criteria in policy 7.1 above and could more easily or more appropriately be administered by another authority. If the proposal to exclude land from a park has not been subject to the public participation procedures of the management plan, public comment will be sought unless the authority agrees that it is not necessary.

7.6 The landowner, or authority administering the land, and the regional authority or united council of the appropriate local authority region in which the land is situated will be consulted before an investigation into the potential of land for national park is proceeded with.