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This dissertation presents an analysis of cultural heritage management, with a particular focus on back-country huts and the Department of Conservation. Fifteen huts managed by the West Coast Conservancy of the Department of Conservation were used as a case study. The meanings associated with them were determined by discussion with users, through examination of the huts themselves and through an analysis of the operations and actions of the Department of Conservation. Meanings associated with the huts are known through personal experience and interpretation, and external indicators. Back-country huts are also important as symbols of the exploration and development of Pakeha/European Aotearoa-New Zealand.

The study concluded that the management of back-country huts needs to be a dynamic process because perceptions of cultural heritage are not static. The Department of Conservation needs to change its management focus from primarily natural resource preservation to accommodate broader concerns for the conservation of cultural resources. A strategy is proposed which enables a range of participants (from members of the local community, vested interest groups, to staff of the Department of Conservation) to decide which huts should be conserved as cultural heritage. The strategy allows for perceptions of cultural heritage to change over time.
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Chapter One - An Introduction

Setting

John and I had trudged up the true left of the Arahura River. It had been raining steadily all morning, and with the rising river, the usual route which involved several river crossings was difficult. Steep banks on our side meant that we had to cross, so we linked arms and picked our way across. We managed to stay on the true right of the river, which involved some 'bush-bashing', until we came to where Slaty Creek joined the main river - on the opposite side. This river crossing was completed successfully - thankfully, because the river was quite high and continuing to rise. We were wet through, not only from the waist-deep water, but also from five hours in the rain, and were looking forward to finding our destination for the day - Slaty Creek Hut.

The sight of smoke curling through the trees signalled the location of the hut and the presence of other people - what other crazies would be out in this weather? Jim and Mel had arrived a few hours earlier. They'd come from up river - crossing the Main Divide at Amuri Pass, but were no less wet than we were. It had been an unexpected bonus for them to find Slaty Creek Hut - Mel described it as a 'palace'. The fire blazing in the hearth made it pleasantly warm and cheerful. It seemed old, roughly built from big slabs of wood with four simple bunks and a fireplace, but it was warm, dry and comfortable. We were sorry to leave its hospitality the next morning, but set out into the pouring rain.

This brief narration of my experiences at Slaty Creek Hut provides a context for the discussions in this dissertation. Staying in Slaty Creek Hut did not just mean that we were saved from pitching the tent in the rain. The hut epitomized many of the stories I had read and heard about old-time trampers, deer cullers and climbers. It was functional and yet it was more than this - it was a relic and a reminder of past times. Slaty Creek Hut had none of the luxurious trappings of huts on the Routeburn or Milford Tracks, but it still had character. However, the continued presence of huts such as Slaty Creek is threatened by the policies and practices of the Department of Conservation because they are little used and offer few services except as a dry place to stay. High use by trampers, climbers and walkers warrants the continued maintenance of a hut, whereas a hut with few users per year is threatened with demolition by Department of Conservation staff - because it is perceived as being unnecessary, irrespective of its actual or potential other, less apparent values. I wish to consider this imbalance and examine the role of back-country huts as more than just a means of gaining shelter.

This dissertation evolved through a number of developments: courses in cultural heritage management as an undergraduate student sparked an interest in further study, while a personal interest in the back-
country and the Department of Conservation's management process lead me to discussions with a number of people, including staff of the Department of Conservation. The resulting study deals with back-country huts as cultural heritage resources and considers the broad concept of cultural heritage management with a specific focus within a specific framework - the focus is back-country huts and the framework is that of the Department of Conservation and its operations. The scope of cultural heritage as a resource is vast, so this approach constrained an otherwise huge task to manageable proportions. The Department of Conservation's framework and operations were particularly interesting because although their statutory role is to protect Aotearoa-New Zealand's heritage, their operations and framework are influenced by the rational and monetarist policies of Government - financial resources are limited.

Aims and objectives

The aim of this dissertation is to examine the concept of land-based cultural heritage, and the practical implications of recognising concerns about heritage on the conservation estate.

Dissertation objectives

1. To explore the heritage roles and meanings of huts in the back-country;
2. To assess their historic and cultural importance and significance using a range of approaches; and
3. To discuss ways of managing huts as cultural heritage.

The nature of the issue means that the project can be segmented into two parts. The first part involves developing an understanding of the role of huts as heritage. The second part requires this understanding to be considered within the context of the philosophical and operating framework of the Department of Conservation.

---

1 The phrase 'Aotearoa-New Zealand' has been used throughout this dissertation because it explicitly recognises that Aotearoa-New Zealand is a bi-cultural (or perhaps multi-cultural) society, although this dissertation deals primarily with the Pakeha/European culture.
Methodology

A case study approach is used because this reduces the scale of research to a manageable size. This is not so much a method, as an overall framework within which specific research methods are used for specific purposes. The strength of this approach is that the researcher can focus on something which can be understood in its complexity, but is of a manageable size (Moore, 1983).

The case study area was defined by the boundaries of the West Coast Conservancy of the Department of Conservation. This conservancy was selected for pragmatic reasons. Conservancy staff were supportive of my study and interested in the potential results, supplying accommodation, transport and administrative assistance, while archives and files relating to the huts were in the one geographical area of the West Coast region.

The West Coast Conservancy of the Department of Conservation has 160 huts in the back-country in its care. All huts could not be studied so 15 were chosen from a Department of Conservation inventory. A ‘criterion sampling’ method was used to select particular huts. Criterion sampling involves picking all cases that meet some standard - such as the age, size, or type of hut (Patton, 1990). The criterion used to select huts was that of date of construction. This is because there is an undeniable link between things considered to be heritage resources and their association with times past. Thus, selecting huts which are likely to have some history, spanning a number of years, means that differences in perception about heritage can be examined. Other criteria could have been used, such as selecting huts which were representative of certain terrain types, geographical area or historical era. However, using more criteria to refine the case study further seemed unnecessary because the 15 oldest huts listed incorporated a range of terrain types and historical periods. The huts, their dates of construction and locations are listed and illustrated on the following pages (Table 1.1 and Figure 1.1).

---

2 It was estimated that 15 huts could be studied at the required depth within the time available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hut name</th>
<th>Year built</th>
<th>Area/Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam's Flat</td>
<td>before 1932</td>
<td>Fenian Track, North-West Nelson Forest Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Gully</td>
<td>c1920</td>
<td>Croesus Track, Paparoa Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Hut</td>
<td>c1920</td>
<td>Croesus Track, Paparoa Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meikle's</td>
<td>c1930</td>
<td>Moonlight Track, Paparoa Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaty Creek</td>
<td>c1952</td>
<td>Junction of Tutaekuri and Waieheke Rivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutaekuri Junction</td>
<td>c1952</td>
<td>Tutaekuri River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane Creek</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Head of Rochfort Basin, Crane Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locke Stream</td>
<td>c1939</td>
<td>Taramakau River, Arthur's Pass National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer's Delight</td>
<td>c1930</td>
<td>Lake Kaniere Walkway, Lake Kaniere Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whataroa Junction</td>
<td>c1935</td>
<td>Junction of Whataroa/Perth Rivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolan's Flat</td>
<td>c1926</td>
<td>Perth River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almer</td>
<td>1952/3</td>
<td>Franz Josef Glacier, Westland National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>1930/31</td>
<td>Fox Glacier, Westland National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Rock</td>
<td>1931/2</td>
<td>Copland Valley, Westland National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue River (Blowfly)</td>
<td>c1910</td>
<td>Haast-Paringa Cattle Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1  Huts to be investigated
Figure 1.1  Map of West Coast and the huts in the case study
The focus of this study is the huts themselves. But what must not be forgotten and what is vitally important in examining this issue, is their association with people. People ascribe value to a resource. Thus, selecting 15 huts for further study is only one part of the project. People must also be part of this study. Huts cannot have value as cultural heritage without the memories, interpretations and histories of specific people. Various research methods must be used to examine the meanings associated with huts as links with the past.

Documenting research into the history of the huts was enriched by oral histories, while the meanings huts have for people was explored by collecting data through participant observation and informal and depth interview methods. Finally, the operational framework of the West Coast Conservancy of the Department of Conservation, that is the policies, practices and procedures, was observed and questioned. This process provided considerable insight into current approaches to the management of huts and the interpretation of cultural heritage by staff of the Department of Conservation.

The phrase 'old huts' was used in any discussions with participants during field work, in preference to the terms 'historic' or 'heritage' huts. It was considered that the term 'old' seemed to be less value-laden than 'heritage' and 'historic' when exploring the concept of huts as heritage with respondents.

The framework used in the case study analysis was derived from an understanding of 'meaning'. Meanings convey the way we use cognitive classifications and categories to impose order on the world (Rapoport, 1990). The idea of meaning and its association with places is fundamental to the discussions of many authors. For example, Tuan (1975a:152) proposed that place is a centre of meaning, while similarly, Rapoport (1990:13) wrote people react to environments in terms of the meanings the environments have for them. The meaning of a place is constructed by experience because locations of experiences are 'places' (Walter, 1980-81:162). Experience is defined by Tuan (1977:8) as the cover all term for the various modes through which a person knows and constructs a reality and by Walter (1980-81:162) as perceiving, doing, thinking and feeling. Thus, place incarcerates the experiences and aspirations of a people (Tuan, 1975b:213), but cannot be created

---

independently. Phenomena, such as experience, 'gossip' or 'stories' create a place (Tuan, 1980).

There are different levels of meaning. These range from an object or place which has meaning because it is functional, having a practical use, through to more with symbolic meaning (Rapoport, 1990). Places and things may have meaning because they have an 'atmosphere' or 'feel', because they are useful, or because they have visual appeal (Tuan, 1975b). This analytic framework of meaning acknowledges that places have meanings, but that these meanings are not absolute, being influenced by both the individuals' experience and the physical and social context.

Dissertation structure

Chapter Two contains analysis and exploration of the meanings attributed to huts, identified in the case study. Experiential meanings and external indicators of meanings are discussed, and analysis is provided of the Department of Conservation's practices which deal with back-country huts. This discussion of meanings and the links between huts and the past sets a framework for Chapter Three where the concept of cultural heritage is examined. This is a broad-based discussion, drawing from a variety of sources, reflecting the scope and nature of heritage. Chapter Four presents a discussion of the protection of cultural heritage in Aotearoa-New Zealand, including an analysis of cultural heritage management practices within the Department of Conservation. In Chapter Five, possible alternative approaches to cultural heritage management are discussed, while the study conclusions are presented in Chapter Six.
Chapter Two - Meanings of Huts

Chapter introduction

People have always needed shelter for survival and huts in the back-country have been invaluable as shelter, but huts are not just functional. Many other meanings and values can be associated with them, although these meanings are not the same for all people. One person who visits Nolan Flat Hut may appreciate it because of its associations with a special tramping trip, while someone else may consider it to be valueless because they never want to use it nor have they heard of the Nolan family and their associations with West Coast farming history. Understanding the meanings huts have for people is important when considering the contribution huts make to our cultural heritage and especially when we have to make decisions about the future of huts in the back-country. In this chapter, the range of meanings which emerged from the case study are presented.

Meanings from experience

Many experiences, events and adventures can be associated with huts in the back-country. When the descriptions and accounts of these experience are compared and interpreted, a range of similar meanings become apparent. Four categories of ‘meaning’ were derived from interviews with back-country hut users. These were: huts as shelter; huts as a focus and motivator which encourage visitors to remote areas; and huts as the means to an experience of a certain type of living arrangement. The fourth category deals with differences in the meanings of ‘older’ huts. To many people, only the last of these would suggest a positive heritage link - history and age - but this is not necessarily so if you accept the validity of other ideas of value. It is this wide range of meanings which characterise cultural heritage resources.

Only the perspectives of back-country users were considered in this section. The categories outlined here are not exhaustive, but the information collected in this phase of the project provides some insight into the meaning and values associated with huts in the back-country. Other meanings which can be triggered by external factors as well as experiences are discussed in the next section.
Huts as shelter

The standards of huts on land managed by the Department of Conservation cover a spectrum ranging from the most basic, such as Whataroa Junction Hut, which is in a dilapidated and run down condition, to the most palatial, typical of huts on the Routeburn Track. Despite these differing standards, it seems that for many people, the only fundamental requirement of a hut is to provide shelter - a means for warmth. For example, one respondent, Gordon, said: they just need four walls and a roof basically, while another, Fred, suggested a fireplace is great for cooking and drying clothes.

The shelter and warmth which huts provide are reassuring to back-country users. The knowledge that there are huts in an area, even if they are not using them, is comforting. Grant suggested that if bad weather comes in, it is nice to know there is somewhere [to go]. Even when I'm hunting, I like to know there is a hut somewhere. If it does really pack up I'll take off to there. This means that even the most basic shelter provided by hut has a use. It may only be in very bad weather, but it is important.

Huts as an incentive

Huts in the back-country not only provide shelter and warmth in bad weather, they also draw people into the valleys, hills and mountains. The shelter which they give means that people do not need to carry tents. This can be quite important, as Pauline said I don't think I'd go if you just had to stay in a tent anyway, or risk getting a camp site or something. Just knowing that there is a hut to get to is a real attraction. A hut can specify a trip, provide a focus, or it can designate a lunch stop. Pauline maintained that if I knew there was a hut there then I'd go there because it is like a stopping point drawing you in. Or, it may define a day's walk, as explained by Kevin: If there wasn't a hut in the bush up the Wanganui, I'd carry on through to the tops. Even though a hut may fulfil a particular

---

4 'Standards' is used in terms of the physical features of huts: the number and type of bunks; cooking facilities; provision of running water and so forth.

5 These huts have gas cookers, running water and are serviced by a warden in the summer season.

6 The 'tops' means the alpine terrain above the bush line.
function, such as shelter, it is also an incentive which can encourage people to go to places where they might otherwise not visit.

**Huts as a type of dwelling**

Huts also offer a particular style of living arrangement. They are usually one or two rooms, with bunks in both rooms. The confines of the hut, the need to share facilities and discussions on issues such as route finding means that people will talk to each other. For some, the socialising may be the high point of the trip. For others, with a different agenda, meeting people is not a requirement of their experience. As suggested by Kevin: *It is nice to go with other people whose space is similar to your own, but it is different to going into a whole hut full of tourists who have not 'unwound' to the same extent.* Fred thinks huts are important because *it gives people who haven't got tents and things like that an opportunity to experience something other than city life-style.* These social issues contrast with the typical Department of Conservation view that the primary purpose of huts is to provide shelter. As these discussions have shown, huts mean more to users than a roof over their head.

**Huts as relics**

The discussion thus far has centred on general aspects and features of huts, but the issue of older huts was also discussed with back-country users. Some huts were identified as having 'character' or 'atmosphere', features which come with age. As Doug put it:

*We like a hut to be quite small, with just three or four bunks in it, an open fireplace and probably character. I suppose we prefer it to be old rather than new. [This is] because character is something that develops over time. It is silly but you get a feeling for these things.*

Donna suggested that it was stories about a hut which gave it character.

*It is always neat to have a hut with a bit of history. There are a lot of huts which have stories which go with them. They are usually the older huts, although, even when a hut has been pulled down and a new hut built in its place, quite often the stories carry on with that hut.*
Similarly, Kevin said:

*The reason I go into the mountains and hills is because I like becoming aware of things. I like thinking about things and to go to an old hut and sleep in there. I like thinking about things that have happened. I like to think about what was happening in the world when this hut was younger and all those sorts of things. It is like being connected up to a part of history.*

It is difficult, if not impossible, to have fixed ideas about describing character, because it is associated with intangible feelings. However, Kevin identified features that suggest a hut has character: *The sacking beds, the odd plaque, saying when it was made. Names carved on the posts. Old newspaper things on walls.* Sue also attempted to articulate the tangible aspects of character: *[The huts have] just two beds, but they go way back to the old culling days and so they have kerosene stoves in them, magazines from 1947, old jars of vegemite.* It did not seem to matter if there were incongruous features in old huts. Sue said: *I don’t look at the aluminium window and say “Oh dear, they haven’t stuck to the nature of the hut”. I think, well, it is only a hut, and someone probably had to carry it in.*

Character, which is important to users, cannot be attributed to a particular thing, place or time. However, it can be linked with features and relics that are in and around the hut.

These physical indicators of the age of a hut were interesting to users from another perspective also. Relics and features give clues as to the age, era and people of a place. People liked knowing something about the past of the huts, even if it was informally gathered. Gordon thought it was important because *a bit of history about how they first got established would give you a good idea about the era and some of the times back then.* But there were also concerns about how much interpretation was appropriate. Victor maintained that: *There is a lot of places I have been where it would be good to have more of a history but, then again, it makes it too easy.* However, Kevin thought that interpretation would help *but it has to be done tastefully in a non-interfering manner.* *The interpretation should not cover signs of age, but it is to complement it.* There is interest in the pasts of back-country huts, and some huts in the back-country are tangible reminders of people from past times.
Some old huts should be kept, because as Doug said we regard them as an essential part of our heritage. Kevin had similar views:

*They should be preserved in a way that they can continue to be functional and still keep their character and their history, so that then history can continue. It just makes all the difference compared to a brand new hut which has 'loopies' [tourists] who would watch television if it was there.*

However, deciding which huts should be kept was difficult. As Grant said: *it would be nice to keep some of the older ones, but it is very hard to say which ones.* Older huts may be an integral part of a different experience - some huts are considered to have character which is something that seems to be connected with the past. Relics or features of the hut can indicate character, but there are few conclusive meanings that can be attributed to tangible features.

**Externally indicated meanings**

There is a diverse range of meanings which can be associated with back-country huts. Huts need not be experienced and known intimately to be valuable. Meanings can be ascribed to huts on the basis of external knowledge. The meanings discussed in this section are more easily recognised and identified than meanings which are associated with experience, because they are related to external factors. The key to these meanings is that huts need not be personally experienced for some understanding and associations with the hut to be felt. Some knowledge of the style of the hut, its history, the people in its history or its location may convey meaning and suggest value.

**Construction techniques**

The style, type of hut or the materials used may suggest that a hut has meaning. Pit-sawn slabs of totara were used in the construction of Slaty Creek Hut\(^7\). The slabs were sawn locally by deer cullers, the builders of the hut. The slab construction is unusual, and has a visual impact (Plate 2.1, page 13). Tutaekuri Junction Hut is also built from totara slabs, although sheets of flat iron have been nailed over the slabs as a preservation measure by the leaseholder. The iron obscures the unusual construction method (Plate 2.2, page 13), although the pit-sawn slabs can still be seen from the inside.

\(^7\) M. O'Reilly, pers. comm., 16 January 1992.
Plate 2.1  Slaty Creek Hut - photo shows pit-sawn slab construction.

Plate 2.2  Tutaekuri Junction Hut - nearly identical construction to Slaty Creek Hut, but pit-sawn slabs are obscured by iron.
Locke Stream Hut was built by funding from the Department of Internal Affairs in about 1939. The Department funded development of the Lake Sumner-Harper Pass-Taramakau Route as part of its commitment to outdoor recreation following the 1937 Physical Welfare and Recreation Act (Buchanan, 1978). It has a remarkable floor - boards were cut from the surrounding bush, dried for a couple of years, laid, then finished with an adze (Patterson, 1991). This rough, adzed floor is a predominant and distinctive feature in the hut (Plate 2.3), especially because of the cold draft emanating from between the boards, but its rarity as a fine example of a particular construction technique is probably not well known.

![Floor of Locke Stream Hut](image)

**Plate 2.3**  Floor of Locke Stream Hut

*Meaning in the past of Aotearoa-New Zealand*

Some huts have meaning because they are representative of a particular part of Aotearoa-New Zealand's past. These meanings can be made more visible by presenting a hut in a historical context - explaining its place in a particular history. All the huts in the case study can be discussed in a historical context - each of them has a past which can be re-constructed, although the re-construction of some is more difficult than others. The context and history associated with Adam's Flat Hut is
outlined as an example of this wider meaning (Figure 2.1). This history can be linked to a wider history of gold mining on the West Coast, and Aotearoa-New Zealand (Figure 2.2 on page 16).

**Adam's Flat Hut, Fenian Track, Karamia**

Adam's Flat Hut is situated in the Fenian/Opunake area of the Karamia district gold fields. This area was part of the northern-most part of the comprehensive West Coast gold field. The area was rushed in the 1860s, but production continued spasmodically into the twentieth century. There was increased mining activity in the Karamia area between 1930 and 1936. This was largely because of the subsidised mining and operations of two mining companies during the Depression (Barnes, 1986).

Adam's Flat is a small clearing around Adam Creek. The clearing is named after John Adam, a miner who spent time mining the creeks nearby. He built a little slab hut on the flat, worked his claim after all the diggers had left to work elsewhere, and died at Adam's Flat in 1882, aged 42. A slab marking his grave is still standing.

The slab hut built by John Adam is not the same hut which is standing at Adam's Flat today. The age of the present hut is not known. Bobby Cross, a subsidised miner in the area during the Depression, said it was there in 1932, when he was first in the area:

*There was a joker who used to stay there. Supposed to be in his sixties and he was the nicest muscular man I ever seen in my life. He was always showing off his muscles. John Campbell wasn't a very big bloke, but he was muscular. Was a very fit chap he was. And when we came up from Karamia — carrying up to 80 pound of food on our back — old John would come out you know, and he'd say "Come and have a cup of coffee." Coffee for cup of coffee.*

![Plate 2.4 Adam's Flat Hut](image)

Bobby worked in a gang with his brothers in the Fenian/Opunake area for about two and a half years. They started by living in canvas tents, then built huts. The huts Bobby and his party built were burnt down in recent years for firewood. The hut at Adam's Flat is the only one left in the area, although there are a number of other relics still around in the bush.

**Figure 2.1** A history of Adam's Flat Hut
History of Gold Mining

The first European explorers reached the West Coast in 1846. The explorers were looking for more land for settlement. The Nelson authorities lost interest in the land because the explorers found rugged and difficult terrain, while the Canterbury provincial authorities considered its possession of 'West Canterbury' beyond the Alps to be little more than an embarrassment (Nolan, 1975:5).

There had been reports of gold in the West Coast rivers since the beginning, although only traces had been found. The first diggers were local Maori, and by the end of 1861, over 60 ounces had been sold in Nelson. The rush is considered to have started during 1864 at Greenstone Creek (Nolan, 1975).

The first gold in the Grey Valley was found in November 1864 in Blackball Creek. However, the difficult access and isolation, bad weather and better diggings elsewhere meant that the first rush following the find was small. However, from 1865 onwards, towns such as No Town, Nelson Creek, Moonlight and Nobles opened to support the mining population that had gathered in the area. George Fairweather Moonlight, a renown prospector explorer, discovered gold in the Moonlight field. Nolan (1975:56) suggests that the opening of this field was perhaps his greatest discovery.

The Karamea area was not known as a major gold area, although gold had been found: the tides of the gold rushes hardly touched Karamea (Nolan, 1975:38). However, in 1925, W. G. Jacobson appealed to the Mines Department for £500 to fund a track to a gold-bearing outcrop. But, because the site was unproven, the gold was considered to be patchy and localised, and the construction of a track through the rugged terrain would be expensive, so the Mines Department were not convinced to spend the money at the time.

There was renewed interest in the area in 1931 because the effects of the Depression were beginning to be felt. The New Zealand Government subsidised mining in a number of areas, such as the Fenian. It was during this period that the Adam's Flat Hut was built by subsidised miners.

Figure 2.2 A brief history of gold mining in Aotearoa-New Zealand

These histories can be very time consuming to produce, especially because many huts were not recorded in the various government departmental files, there are few written records, and many of the people who were associated with them are no longer alive, nor were many photographs taken. These issues can make it difficult to re-construct the pasts of some huts. There are exceptions to this of course. Quite a lot is known about Almer, Chancellor and Douglas Rock Huts. These huts are associated with the growth and development of guided mountaineering and tourism in Aotearoa-New Zealand. Many photographs were taken by mountaineers, and books written about their exploits. These records are available and generally accessible.

Brief details about the pasts of all the huts in the case study were collected. These stories are in Appendix B.
Associations with significant people

This category of meaning is linked, in part, with the histories and context discussed in the previous section. For example, one of the huts on the bank of the Perth River was built by members of a well-known West Coast family, the Nolans. Nolan’s Flat Hut was originally built in about 1926 and was used as a base for clearing bush to graze cattle. The hut can be seen as a memorial, or a tribute, to the Nolans, some of whom are still farming cattle on the West Coast (Plate 2.5 on page 18).

Another hut which may also be seen in this way is Douglas Rock Hut. The hut was built in about 1931 to the standard Department of Tourist and Health Resorts design, the predecessor to the New Zealand Tourism Board (Chancellor Hut has the same design). The hut was built because the bivy rock became too small for the numbers of people needing shelter. The bivy rock, which is still used, was first discovered and used by Charles Douglas - hence the name Douglas Rock Hut (Plate 2.6, on page 18).

Physical context/location

The place of hut in the landscape can be meaningful. For example, Almer Hut, perched on a ridge high above the Franz Josef Glacier, seems quite insignificant amongst the mountains (Plate 2.7, page 19), although once you are there, it is a safe and secure haven in a harsh and hostile environment. Crane Creek Hut is located in an impressive site, although without the grandeur of the high mountains. The track to the hut winds through the Crane Creek gully, which is quite overgrown and difficult to follow in parts. So, after walking somewhat blindly through scrub and trees, a huge basin and hut in the distance invoke quite a sense of achievement. However, it is also worth noting that the hut itself is quite unappealing - there are few windows, the bunks are narrow and uncomfortable and the hut has a closed in feeling, although the site of the hut is special (Plate 2.8, page 19).


9 A notable Aotearoa-New Zealand explorer of the West Coast during the 1880s.
Plate 2.5 Nolan’s Flat Hut

Plate 2.6 Douglas Rock Hut
Associations with other relics

Some of the huts in the case study exist on their own with few visible remnants from the past other than the hut. Other huts, such as Meikle's and Garden Gully, have many relics associated with their gold mining history scattered throughout the surrounding bush. The Moonlight Track which passes Meikle's Hut is 'littered' with remains of other huts, tins and boots. Some of the land in the area is also visibly transformed with tailings and workings. People visiting the area are constantly reminded of the links the area has with people and events of the past (Plate 2.9, page 20).

Plate 2.9 Meikle's Hut

Iconography and huts

Analysis of the meanings of huts have thus far been individual. Adam's Flat Hut has a place in the history of gold mining; Locke Stream Hut has a hand-axed floor; and Almer Hut has an impressive site in the high mountains. However, the meanings of huts in the back-country can also be interpreted by iconography. Iconography involves ascertaining those underlying principles which reveal the basic attitude of a nation, a period, a class, a religious or philosophical persuasion (Cosgrove and Daniels, 1988:2). Using this approach, huts are examined as a whole, leading to an understanding of why huts
are important in the Aotearoa-New Zealand experience. After a brief history of huts, an analysis of their meanings as icons for the culture of Aotearoa-New Zealand is presented.

For much of the nineteenth century, Pakeha Aotearoa-New Zealand was a frontier colony, based on the exploitation of its natural resources. The population comprised of mainly itinerant, unmarried men, such as whalers, gold-miners, bush-men and gum-diggers. Housing styles were adapted from the simple canvas fly camps of early explorers to more substantial structures. Huts, typical of 1840s and early 1850s, were erected from material available and designed so that a man could build one on his own (Oliver, 1981:123). For miners, the key was mobility. It was: a happy-go-lucky life .... As soon as the best of the gold was won in any one place and the getting of more seemed likely to increase the labour of the process, 'Shift-Oh!' was the cry and the men went off elsewhere (Nolan, 1975:6). Their huts were not necessarily built to last in contrast to huts built in alpine environments for recreational and tourist climbing.

Huts have been considered necessary in alpine areas since the early days of alpine exploration in the late 1800s. Green, an English gentleman and climber, spoke of a need for huts whilst being entertained at a public dinner given in his honour by the Christchurch Athletic Club: I took the opportunity of impressing upon the company the importance of founding a New Zealand alpine club, and of devoting the subscriptions to building a few huts in certain centres of their Southern Alps (Green, 1883:287). The Honourable Viscount Bryce, a former President of the (British) Alpine Club pointed out the difficulties of climbing in Aotearoa-New Zealand because: the base of operations is distant, for no alpine hotels and hardly any shelter huts have recently been built, such as those which the Swiss, German-Austrian, and Italian Alpine Clubs have provided (Ross, 1914:xii). Huts in the mountain areas were considered important to the continued development of mountaineering in Aotearoa-New Zealand.

Concerns for social equality and a belief that Aotearoa-New Zealand was an egalitarian society were widespread. It was accepted that everyone in New Zealand has equal opportunity ... that anyone can

---

become wealthy if they work hard (Consedine, 1989:174). These ideas were extended through into the activities of New Zealand Alpine Club, which called for Government intervention in the provision of recreational huts:

We believe the time has come when the Government should cater for climbers with smaller means, for the sport appeals to both rich and poor. Huts might be provided in the main alpine districts and sufficient rental charged for their cost of upkeep (Harper, 1921:4).

Huts were built by Government Departments at various times. For example, the Department of Internal Affairs built huts in remote valleys for their deer control operations in the late 1940s and early 1950s. The New Zealand Forest Service and the Department of Lands and Survey constructed some huts for recreational purposes.

Huts can be seen as significant in the development of the colony of Aotearoa-New Zealand, as people could build one which suited their needs. Similarly, huts can be seen as important in the development of mountaineering, while later, huts were part of a movement to ensure access to the back-country for all people. From this brief analysis, huts have been illustrated as having a place in the development of Aotearoa-New Zealand society, and epitomise the exploration and development of remote areas. Huts have meaning and value as icons - symbols representing these times.

The meaning of back-country huts for the Department of Conservation

The meanings people associate with huts in the back-country are linked to many factors, including personal experience, the age and condition of the hut, its location, appearance and how much a person knows about it. The meanings the Department of Conservation associates with huts are particularly significant because these meanings affect the way they care for and manage the huts.

The staff of each field centre generally make decisions about the care of huts within their management boundaries, albeit under the guidance of the recreation planner for the conservancy. They usually consider huts to be recreational facilities first, before any other values are contemplated. Staff responsible for the management of huts and other recreational facilities may recognise the possibility of ‘historic’ values, but will then need to refer the hut to the historic resources section of the conservancy for ‘formal’ assessment. In this section these processes are discussed, leading to an
expression of the view that the Department of Conservation has just two perspectives of huts.

Recreational facilities

Generally, the care and management of a hut depends on the amount of use the huts receive, although decisions are also made regarding how adequate the huts are seen to be for users. This suggests that the meaning of huts to the Department of Conservation is 'shelter'. For example, Adam's Flat hut is in a dilapidated and untidy condition. It is thought to have 20 to 30 over-night visitors per year. No maintenance is carried out, nor is any proposed for the hut. Whataaroa Junction is in a similar condition. It is not maintained either. These huts are not significant shelters to the Department of Conservation. In contrast, Douglas Rock Hut is used frequently (approximately 460 people per year). It is visited by Department of Conservation staff at least twice per year and minor repairs are carried out as necessary. Major maintenance is noted and planned for a future date. Blue River (Blowfly) Hut is often used (approximately 130 people per year) and so warrants attention from the field centre staff, who visit up to six times per year. Minor maintenance is carried out during each of these visits.

Currently, huts tend to be managed on an *ad hoc*, case-by-case basis, but future management is expected to be more structured in line with the development of regional and national policy - a Recreation Strategy. The Strategy is a component of the *West Coast Ten Year Plan*. The Recreation Strategy will detail priorities for managing recreational facilities over the next 10 years. Basic information for this strategy will be provided by Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (R.O.S.) classifications and maps. The R.O.S. is a descriptive classification of recreational opportunities. The components of a recreation opportunity are: the setting (physical, social and managerial); the activity (such as fishing, walking or climbing); and the experience. Experiences are judged according to

---

15 The Conservation Law Reform Act of 1990 legislated a strategic planning approach for the Department of Conservation. Each conservancy must have a plan of its goals, objectives and resource management priorities for the next 10 years in place by 1995.
people’s relationship with ‘wilderness’ and the classification spectrum ranges from ‘remote’ through to ‘developed’, although according to Clark (1982:11), the interactions it implies are complex and not yet completely defined. It is a macro planning tool which provides a ‘snapshot’ of the opportunities available. The purpose of using R.O.S. is to ensure that a range of recreational opportunities is available on lands managed by the Department. The R.O.S. classifications and maps provide a basis from which to make decisions about which resources have priority for management (Department of Conservation, 1992b).

There are drawbacks, however, in using R.O.S. for making decisions about resources which may have cultural heritage values as well as recreational importance. The process requires detailed and accurate data collection. This may be a problem when dealing with huts for several reasons. First, an accurate base of information is needed. This means that an inventory system, such as the database, RECORD, must be continuously funded to ensure information is up-to-date. Second, even at this level of base information, some recognition of heritage values is needed. Thus, the whole process of deciding which resources have significance because of their association with the past continues.

The Recreation Opportunity Spectrum is useful for making decisions. The relative values of areas of land are assessed in comparison with the idea of ‘wilderness’. This is a useful system for the Department of Conservation because the decisions and their rationale are made explicit. However, because the framework of R.O.S. is oriented towards ‘recreation’ and ‘wilderness’, there is no recognition in its current usage for the recognition of values other than those associated with natural areas. The fundamental principles and framework of R.O.S. have a natural bias (Marriot, 1990). This means that not only will cultural heritage resources be overlooked, but so will any values associated with areas special to tangata whenua.

The perspective that natural resource values have priority over all other values is perhaps not as much of a problem as portrayed. The spectrum of experiences used in R.O.S. are not conclusive nor are they based on an absolute scale. The importance of ‘wilderness’ is a cultural phenomenon, because the idea that wilderness is important has developed over time, and is not easily definable: There is no specific material object that is wilderness. The term designates a quality ... that produces a certain
mood or feeling in a given individual and, as a consequence, may be assigned by that person to a specific place (Nash, 1967:1). It can be seen that ‘wilderness’ is a somewhat abstract, and yet, it is on this concept which the R.O.S. system is based. This means that the gap between hut management, where decisions are based on the values associated with the wilderness, and cultural heritage management, where decisions must be made according to associated cultural value, are not so great - both these assessments are based on cultural values.

**Historic huts**

The West Coast Conservancy of the Department of Conservation has a number of huts which are considered ‘historic’. Nominations for Chancellor and Almer Huts to be classified under section 35 of the Historic Places Act 1980 are being processed. Section 35 of the Act gave the New Zealand Historic Places Trust power to classify buildings according to their historic significance or architectural quality. A four level classification system was made explicit within the Act:

The Trust may from time to time classify buildings according to their historical significance or architectural quality, as follows:

(a) Those buildings having such historical significance or architectural quality that their permanent preservation is regarded as essential:

(b) Those buildings which merit permanent preservation because of their very great historical significance or architectural quality:

(c) Those buildings which merit preservation because of their historical significance or architectural quality:

(d) Those buildings which merit recording because of their historical significance or architectural quality (s.35(1)).

Chancellor Hut has been nominated for a ‘B’ classification because:

*It is the oldest hut in the Southern Alps still on its original site and the least modified of those built prior to World War II. It has survived nearly 60 years in an extremely harsh climate and has played an important role in the development of mountaineering, ski mountaineering and tramping in this area of the Westland National Park*.16

If we accept that people tend to write the things which are the most important first, then an analysis of this statement identifies that the age of Chancellor Hut is more important than its lack of modification, durability and role in the history of mountaineering and tramping (Plate 2.10, page 26).

---

Almer Hut is considered significant because it is a fine example of a high level hut. It is demonstrably superior in sturdiness and comfort to pre-Second World War huts, which reflects the then advantages of building airlifted prefabricated huts. With the introduction of the helicopter and the development of diaphragm building systems, hut building has again changed considerably and Almer Hut remains a virtually unaltered example from a short but significant part of hut building history.

Similarly, the importance of Almer Hut is firstly related to its role in mountaineering history, secondly, its durability and thirdly, its construction method.

Garden Gully and Meikle's Huts are also considered 'historic' huts, although they have not been nominated for classification. Garden Gully Hut seems to have been conserved primarily because of its unusual construction method, secondly because of its historical associations, and thirdly because of its age (Plate 2.11, page 26). Meikle's Hut is important because of its history, then its links with the relics of the whole area, its age and then its durability.

This brief analysis of the criteria associated with the four 'historic' huts in the case study can be graphically illustrated in a matrix (Table 2.1, page 28).

---


18 This differentiation from other recreational huts means that funding for repairs and maintenance are from the historic resources section of the West Coast Conservancy Business Plan, rather than the general recreation section. The 'historic' label also means that it does not matter whether or not the hut is used. Any maintenance of the hut attempts to be 'in keeping' with its age and appearance - similar techniques and materials are usually used in repairs.

19 The hut appears to have lasted remarkably well for its age, but in fact, it was extensively modified and rebuilt by the New Zealand Forest Service during the 1980s (see Hut Stories - Appendix B).

20 The matrix approach is a useful way to make criteria explicit.
### Table 2.1 Matrix of criteria

This matrix depicts significant features of 'historic' importance assessment. Thus, patterns can be seen: place in history was a primary concern when deciding significance (Almer and Meikle's Huts); while age and the durability of the hut in its original condition were secondary concerns. It is also important to note that a list of criteria was not used for these assessments, so because Meikle's Hut is the only one associated with relics in the area, it does not mean it is the only hut surrounded by relics. Rather, it suggests that relics were not considered to be significant in the assessment of the other huts.

There are significant problems in relying on lists or inventories when deciding what resources are important:

*People like to write lists of things. List all the gold mines, all the saw mills ... but, unless you've been to each one of them and had a look at each one of them, it doesn't matter what you write about them, it is your personal evaluation of what you know which gives some sort of criteria to what is the best - or not so much best, that's another problem.*

The person doing the evaluation is usually concerned with its significance in West Coast and Aotearoa-New Zealand history, architectural and technological importance.

As stated earlier, evaluating and deciding which huts are considered to have value because of their association with the past is generally *ad hoc* and on a case-by-case basis. No rational planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Chancellor Hut</th>
<th>Almer Hut</th>
<th>Garden Gully Hut</th>
<th>Meikle's Hut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Durability</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction</strong></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associations with relics</strong></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Original form</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 The criteria ranking is for each hut. It does not illustrate a ranking between huts.

techniques, such as R.O.S., are used for evaluating historic resources. An evaluation of the 'historic' significance of a hut requires someone in the field to recognise the possibility of historic value. A hut which may have some historic value is assessed by one of two conservation officers from the historic resources section of the Conservancy. Conservation Officers use their personal knowledge of the huts and other historic resources within the Conservancy to base their assessment. Because assessments are undertaken in this way, inter-conservancy differences will invariably occur. Once the comparative value of the resource is decided, it is managed according to the assessment. This may mean 'do nothing', take no account of any links with the past, or 'preserve', ensure that any management takes account of its 'historic character'.

Despite this seemingly narrow assessment process, there has been a consistent approach to historic resource management in the West Coast Conservancy, because the two Conservation Officers responsible have been working together for about 15 years. However, difficulties arise when the Conservation Officers are too busy to assess a hut as soon as required. There may also be problems because of the inherent values involved in deciding importance.

*Measures of importance are value judgements, shaped by deeply embedded orientations we hold toward the world around us. These values are not often explicitly recognised, yet they form the basis for our evaluations of what is right and wrong, appropriate or inappropriate, acceptable or unacceptable. They are often so ingrained that we never stop to think about them, where they came from, what they imply for our behaviour, or that legitimate alternative prospects exist* (Stankey, 1982:25-26).

A bias is illustrated within the West Coast Conservancy by proposing three huts (Almer, Chancellor and Defiance) for New Zealand Historic Places Trust Classification. No other huts in the Westland National Park, nor in the West Coast Conservancy of the Department of Conservation were considered at the time of classification. These three huts had personal importance for those advocating their classification.

---

23 They began work with historic resource management for the New Zealand Forest Service.

24 Defiance Hut is no longer used for recreational purposes and is not included in any hut inventory. The hut was moved from its original site on a ridge near the Franz Josef Glacier in the late 1970s. It now sits behind the Franz Josef Glacier Visitor Centre. Plans for it include its use as a mountaineering museum.

A personal approach is also used at Head Office level. The Department has made a commitment to conserve about 20 recreational huts as historic resources. The procedure for listing huts on the register at Head Office requires staff from field centres around the country to tell the Senior Conservation Officer (Historic Resources), about them. He then decides whether they should be included on the register according to what he has been told and what he knows of the significance of the other huts on this list.

This personal evaluation method, at face value, seems impractical for a nationwide conservation programme, because it would appear to be impossible to ensure consistent evaluation throughout Aotearoa-New Zealand. However, it is important to reiterate that personal bias is inherent in any evaluative, resource assessment process. The key to an acceptance of personal assessments seems to be an affirmation of the evaluation by others.

The real essence of this issue is perhaps a difficulty in scale. There are assessments of the value of a hut for the nation, and then there are interpretations of its importance for the local community. This issue of national versus local interpretations is explored in greater depth in Chapter Five, but it is appropriate to suggest here that culture begins at the local level, and it is at this level which it is accessible and important for the community. This means that regional variations in resource evaluations are inevitable, but there is room, and needs to be flexibility, in accommodating a number of assessments of importance.

Chapter conclusion

There are many meanings associated with back-country huts and they can perhaps be seen as a range from use/functional meanings, including those which can be constructed by external knowledge and indicators, to those which are only sensed and felt. The nature of the meanings determines the future of back-country huts on lands managed by the Department of Conservation. The Department of Conservation cares for huts as functional, useful resources, as symbols representative of a particular era, or as illustrating an unusual construction technique or style, while people who visit and use the

---

huts seem to appreciate them through emotions, feelings and experiences, not necessarily by means of obvious indicators.

The simplistic perspective of the meaning and value of huts adopted by the Department of Conservation is inadequate because the meanings people associate with huts are not simple. They are complex ideas formed through experiences, personal knowledge of history or are associated with the idea of huts as cultural symbols. Furthermore, there are likely to be regional and local variations about the importance of huts as cultural heritage resources. While it may be difficult for the Department to take into account all the meanings discussed in this chapter, especially because some are personal and rely on individual experiences, an awareness and acknowledgement of the complexity of this issue is essential.

These different meanings are not necessarily a problem, but if the Department of Conservation does something to back-country huts which affects the meanings they have for visitors to the huts, then there may be some conflict. The meanings associated with huts are not straightforward as they depend in part on the individual experiences and the social conditions of those involved. However, the notion that huts have some value and meaning because of their connection with events and activities in the past is prevalent throughout this research. The basis and importance of the relationships people have with the past is examined in the following chapter.

Such as renovating the interior, or demolishing and replacing a hut with a new one.
Chapter Three - Cultural Heritage: Theory and Literature

Chapter introduction

Some of the meanings ascribed to huts are strongly influenced by their associations with people and events of past times. In this chapter, these relationships and associations people have with the past are discussed. They involve complex processes, so an analysis of these relationships is necessary if we are to understand the connection between huts, cultural heritage and the past.

The past

Associations with ‘the past’ seem to be prevalent within meanings of huts, but even the idea of the past is questioned. Willmot (1985) has suggested that the past does not exist. His argument was that because we live in a flat time world, our total reality is only an instant in time:

*The things we call objects from the past are in fact objects of the present. Albeit they may have been constructed, or come into being at some past time. They represent evidence that a past has existed but we can never know such things as they were in the past* (Willmot, 1985:41).

Despite this reasoning, it is argued that there is a difference between a literal and conceptual interpretation because the past exists in relation to the conception of humans (Veyne, 1971; Blatti, 1987). The past as an idea is emotionally neutral (Fowler, 1989) and it *embraces everything that ever happened* (Gardiner, 1990:2). It is neither good nor bad until we intervene. This intervention attributes value and is articulated in the stories that are constructed about the past (Fowler, 1989).

Knowing the past

How can we be sure events or incidents really happened? Events and activities of the past cannot be validated by observation or experiment as in traditional reductionist methods of scientific enquiry (Lowenthal, 1985). This means the past is explored through present perceptions of the evidence of its existence: memories; written records; oral tradition; and in tangible, physical remains (M'Bryde, 1985). Lowenthal (1985) usefully summarised this to suggest that we have an awareness of the past from memory, history and relics.
**Memory**

Memories are essential to our perception of the past - we build them from past sensations and experiences, to repossess the past. Johnson et. al. (1982:241) stated *memory is the sedimented form of past events, leaving traces that may be unearthed by appropriate questioning*. Memories are recalled by the individual, so memory selects, distorts and alters the events of the past, while less than pleasant aspects of the past are often forgotten. Thus, an area for concern is the *whole way in which memories are constructed as part of a contemporary consciousness* (Johnson et. al., 1982:219). Nonetheless, memories inspire confidence, because we believe they were recorded from observations at the time and they are the only direct access to the past that we have (Lowenthal, 1985; Smith, 1985).

**History**

Memories are personal, but recalled collective memories become history (Lowenthal, 1985). Gardiner’s (1990) definition of histories includes both the stories themselves and the explanations and interpretations that are associated with them. Lowenthal’s and Gardiner’s definitions are similar to those put forward by Binney (1987), Willmot (1985) and Veyne (1971)28. Smith (1985:75) however, had a narrower view, suggesting that history is *the art of using written records to construct a past* (emphasis added). History can be recorded in written form, but this definition does not take into account the recording of the past by societies which did not, and do not, have a written language.

There are two forms of telling history in Aotearoa-New Zealand: Maori oral narratives and Pakeha written texts. Some Pakeha historians have tended to question whether oral historians can retain the integrity of the past, if such stories are not fixed in written form. Paradoxically, Binney (1987) questioned whether European historians can retain the integrity of oral histories when they are transmitted into written form. Her argument is that histories derive from a particular time, place and culture, any translation out of context may result in lack of integrity or authenticity. But this only confirms that telling history, whether oral or written, is never neutral: *It is always the reflection of the priorities of the narrators and their perceptions of the world* (Binney, 1987:28). Thus, it seems

---

28 Binney (1987:16) stated that *history is the shaping of the past by those living in the present*, Willmot (1985) suggested that it is the stories which are constructed about the past that tend to be called 'history', while Veyne (1971) proposed that history is an account of past events.
appropriate to define history by what it does, the stories which describe and explain the past, rather than how it does it.

Histories are selective and they reflect the values, interests and biases of the story-teller. This is because the story-teller chooses aspects of the past to tell: *historians make implicit or explicit judgments* (Thompson, 1988:5). It is the selection of what is investigated and chronicled which makes history a contentious subject because what is remembered, recorded or chronicled is selective (Gardiner, 1990).

The academic discipline of history has been somewhat divided over the last 30 years about this selection of history (Wilentz, 1989). This segregation is about the ‘old’ history versus the ‘new’ history. The idea that political events and institutions shape and define the past, giving it form and meaning is the ‘old’ history, while the ‘new’ history is history with the politics left out. This ‘new’ history is said to be more analytical, concerned with the lives and experiences of ordinary people than the old history. However, disagreeing with an over-emphasis on new history, Himmelfarb (1987) argued that as political institutions reflect social values and norms, there can never be history without politics. Thus, the Department of Conservation’s national policies and the overall political context are examined although this dissertation deals with individual aspects of huts as cultural heritage.

**Relics**

Natural features and human artifacts can be tangible relics. Relics vary greatly in scale and include cities, houses, furnishings, landscapes, mementoes, souvenirs and photographs. Lowenthal (1985:240) suggested that monuments, ancient buildings, attics and museums provide settled landscapes with a *palpable human past*. This means that relics must have some human connection to be meaningful. However, the value of huts as relics depends on our perceptions of them and our perceptions depend on how they look and how much we know about them. If it looks old then we presume it is from the past and we may ascribe value to it. Likewise, we may be told that a hut is old and we may then think it is valuable (Lowenthal, 1985).
Relics contribute to our sense of place. Buildings are built with sticks and stones, but meaning is attributed to them through their interpretation (Tuan, 1980). We are aware of their links with the past through our own memories, the look of age or a collective history. All these require a selection of a past, and this constitutes interpretation.

The past is part of the present because of memory, history and relics. These are inter-connected because, although memory is wholly personal and history is a collection of these memories, relics provide tangible links with the past. Huts in the back-country are relics of past times. Some may look old and guesses may be made about their significance, while others may need an account of their past to become meaningful. However, the common link with all huts is that people’s memories are needed to interpret and confer value on them.

**Heritage**

The Department of Conservation has a number of ‘historic’ huts, and yet it also has responsibilities to protect the heritage of Aotearoa-New Zealand. How is heritage any different from knowing the past through memories, histories and relics? These questions beg statements about the definition of heritage.

Dictionary meanings can provide valuable information about the common usage of heritage. The *Chambers Twentieth Century Dictionary* (1972), for example, differentiates between history and heritage: *History* is an account of a past event, whereas *heritage* is that which we inherit. Similarly, the *Collins Dictionary and Thesaurus* (1987) states that heritage is (1) *something inherited at birth* or, (2) *anything that has been transmitted from the past or handed down by tradition*. We can see that heritage, by these definitions, refers to things we are purposefully left with.

Legislation and conventions also provide definitions of heritage. All legislation in Aotearoa-New Zealand, until the Resource Management Act of 1991, used ‘historic’ to label significant resources...

---

29 The Department’s mission statement is: *to conserve the natural and historic heritage of New Zealand for the benefit of present and future generations* (Department of Conservation, 1991b:n.p.).

30 Heritage in this case means the resources associated with human activities, rather than those associated with natural features.
from the past. However, the Resource Management Act 1991 included reference to heritage, stating that it replaced the use of ‘historic’ in the Historic Places Act 1980. ‘Heritage’ and ‘historic’ now have identical legal meanings. A historic place is one which has an association with the past and which demonstrates or provides evidence of any cultural, traditional, aesthetic, or other value of the past (s.2, Historic Places Act 1980). Similarly, the 1972 United Nations Convention for the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage, defined cultural heritage as physical remnants of humans, including relics, artifacts, monuments, buildings and sites. Thus, heritage resources need only a loose connection with the past. However, everything has a past per se, so in practice, it would seem that legal definitions need further refinement.

Despite the concise dictionary definitions and the loose, but accepted, importance of resources with links with the past, explicit scholarly definitions of heritage are scarce. For example, Davison (1991:4) suggested that heritage is what we value in the past, while Hewison (1987:32) proposed that it is anything you want. Many other authors discuss heritage but do not provide succinct explanations of the concept. From their discussions, however, some common features of heritage can be identified.

Heritage often refers to remains of the past which are preserved because of their link with history, and includes myths, legends and chronicled histories of a people (Davison, 1991; Russell, 1991; Lowenthal; 1985). Heritage is, therefore, tangible, although in the case of myths and legends, not physically touchable, but not all old buildings, structures and histories are heritage. This is because heritage has a positive connotation. It is beneficial - the things we consciously decide to keep, not the things from the past that we simply have by accident, or that we explicitly reject (Fowler, 1989; Rickard and Spearritt, 1991; Lowenthal, 1985). This idea that it is beneficial suggests that heritage provides some kind of psychic compensation and is part of nostalgic yearnings for aspects of the past (Davison, 1991). When the present and future seem unpalatable, we can look back on the past with fond memories, forgetting its unpleasant aspects by focusing on particular places or things that remind us of that past (Davison, 1991; Lowenthal, 1985; Davis, 1977).

---

One of the reasons heritage is beneficial is because identity is based on what has gone before. It is *implicated importantly in the continuities and discontinuities we experience in our sense of self* (Davis, 1977:419) - we are rooted in the present by our links with the past. The continuity of heritage is important - it is not necessarily the distant past that gives us a sense of belonging and identity (Fowler, 1989) but: *near continuity is emotionally more important than remote time* (Lynch, 1975:61).

Belonging in a community involves *detailed awareness of the history of a locality over a long period of time, of its continuity as a place or community* (Thrift, 1980:855). In contrast to many objects that are considered 'historic', heritage need not represent the 'best examples of' pattern. It is the near, known past which is important for our well-being, not so much the noble, unknown objects of a previous past (Lynch, 1975).

**A sense of heritage**

Heritage has been defined as something which we want to keep, suggesting that it is tangible - a story which can be manifested or an object. Implied within this definition, however, is that these places, stories or objects mean something. Meaning, as discussed in Chapter One, is essential to our understanding of the world around us.

The idea of meaning or a 'sense' of place evolves through emotions, memories and experiences which are rooted in day-to-day living or doing. However, Pred (1983) argued that an individual's past social interaction or societal rules and projects are also implicated:

> Dominant institutional projects greatly affect the similarity of daily paths, and thereby the similarity of internal experience and sense-of-place, because their underpinning explicit or implicit rules require that participating individuals expend their labour power or in some other way engage themselves in activity in a given manner, at a given time and place, rather than doing something else, somewhere else, during the same time period (Pred, 1983:52).

The view that senses of place are constructed through culture - political, historical and social institutions - does not mean that an individual's meanings are not significant. Rather, it is important to acknowledge that meaning does not exist in isolation, but is intertwined with other activities, routine practices and movements. Experience is needed to create a 'sense of place' at a hut, but this experience does not have to be an actual visit. A story about a hut or an account of its past means a hut can develop meaning for those who have not or cannot visit it. Huts are not just significant for trampers, climbers and hunters who are able to visit them, but they can be meaningful for people who
have an interpretation of their significance and as a group, are also symbolic and representative of the culture of a people - as suggested in the discussion of huts and iconography in Chapter Two.

Thus, when looking at accommodating the issue of meaning and sense of place within the hut evaluation process, the issue must be approached on an appropriate scale. This issue of degree of importance is discussed in depth in Chapter Five, but it is useful to mention here that the Department of Conservation cannot always take into account every individual's wishes when it comes to hut management. The Department's approach to identifying 'historic' huts can be partially explained by Tuan (1975b).

Tuan suggested that there are two types of place: (1) those visual 'public symbols'; and (2) those known after time - which he calls 'fields-of-care'. Public symbols have high manageability because they often cater to the eye (Tuan, 1975b:236). This means they are relatively easy to identify by external criteria, such as their formal structure, physical appearance and 'articulate opinion'. In contrast, fields-of-care are not easily identified by external criteria, they are only known from within: The emotion felt among human beings finds expression and anchorage in things and places (Tuan, 1975b:241). Fields-of-care are places which are known through experience and feeling. Many people who visit and use back-country huts seem to appreciate them through emotions and feelings, not necessarily through any visual indicators. On the other hand, the Department of Conservation seems to focus on the 'public symbol' type of place.

The view that huts are cultural heritage resources which are 'places' is central to the arguments in this dissertation, but as discussed, deciding which huts are important for these reasons is problematic: heritage is difficult to define; and 'places', although existing as public symbols, are also often created through an individual's experience. The Department of Conservation's interpretations of meanings of huts are affected by its political, administrative and economic framework, and this influences its decision-making about the future maintenance and up-keep of huts. Similarly, the conservation officer assessing the meaning and value of huts for the Department of Conservation influences by both the Department of Conservation's framework and his or her own sphere of experience.
Conflicts can occur when the individual tramper who may want to visit and use a hut for its emotional significance, has his or her experience changed by the Department's approach to managing and maintaining the hut. A hut which has little obvious importance from a recreational and historic perspective may actually be quite significant for an individual or group for whom the hut encapsulates many happy memories from previous trips. However, the notion that the hut, which is a tangible link with the past has little meaning is not new. There are many different attitudes on the value, role and place of history and heritage, because despite similarities in lifestyle and social institutions and controls affecting many people, experience is an individual phenomenon.

Issues concerning a sense of heritage are important because they provide some explanation for questions and problems which appear when managing huts as cultural heritage resources. Practical ways of dealing with these issues follows later in this dissertation, but at this stage it is useful to consider another crucial factor in heritage management - that of culture.

**Culture, identity and heritage**

The discussion of Pred (1983) concerning place has already acknowledged that aspects of the past and ideas of heritage are culturally dependent, so a brief discussion about *culture* is essential at this stage. Comer (1991) argued that culture is a duality. He suggested that one aspect of culture has something to do with artistic expression and creative activity. The other aspect of culture concerns ways of living and the organisation and nature of social experience. While both these definitions are valid, the one most suited to this discussion is the latter, which defines culture as the norms and mores of a group of people (Novitz, 1989).

Determining the 'culture' of a people is complex, despite this definition. The usual strategy for understanding a culture tends to involve finding something distinctive about it (Novitz, 1989). Thus, certain behaviours, events and objects identify a particular culture because they are different from those found elsewhere. The ways in which people view their past are reflected in the objects that are preserved (Mulvaney, 1985). These things become cultural property, and thus: *culture becomes the property which proves the existence of a group* (Fitzgerald, 1991:202). The identification of cultural property is a mark of possessiveness, while cultural identity and cultural property are essential for self-
affirmation and self-esteem (Fitzgerald, 1991). However, identifying culture is not straightforward. Novitz (1989:286) suggested that the search for cultural distinctiveness and identity is, in the broadest sense, a political, but not a scientific quest. There are no objective, widely accepted criteria, but cultural identity is determined by those who search for it.

Sites and artifacts become symbols of collective cultural identity. Cultural property is associated with times past, but it is not necessarily something that can be put in a showcase. This is because it is something that, for a particular people, is a living thing which enables a people to achieve confidence in itself and is, thus, able to imagine a future (Stétié, 1981:8, cited in M'Bryde, 1985:4). Thus, huts in the back-country are cultural symbols. Trampers, climbers and hunters identify with the huts because they are meaningful and suggest belonging and identity for them as a group.

Cultural identity is important, but it is also essential to realize that perceptions of culture change from different positions within society:

A Maori may choose ... to emphasise her Maori identity, her tribal identity, or the identity of her local marae. Alternatively, she may find her identity as a woman, as a worker, as a mother, or as a New Zealander more important. Each identity she chooses to emphasise will link her with a group of people and distinguish her from others (Willmott, 1989:8-9).

There are many different cultures in Aotearoa-New Zealand, so: The challenge is how to nurture a strong national identity, yet still recognize a variety of interest groups, ethnic styles and the persistent need for minority identities which carry with them a degree of self-esteem, dignity and pride (Fitzgerald, 1991:211). The issue of a national ‘culture’ is a difficult one because huts in the back-country may be seen primarily as meaningful for a small group. But, as illustrated in Chapter Two, huts can be put in a context which gives them meaning within the whole history of Aotearoa-New Zealand. Huts can be part of a national identity - they are reminders of various parts of Aotearoa-New Zealand’s past. It is useful then, to look at perceptions of people of Aotearoa-New Zealand to provide insight into the ‘national culture’.

The identity of a culture is associated with symbols of the past, myth and narrative. In narrative, Aotearoa-New Zealand people have been labelled apathetic and indifferent by Palmer (1987), bureaucratically obedient by McGill (1985) and passionless by MLauchlan (1976). The labels suggest
that nothing positive has been identified about the culture, but rather than accept these authors' characterisations, symbols of the past that have been singled out as special to give us an insight into this culture can be identified.

Some of the largest things which are preserved are buildings, thus, it is appropriate to examine some of buildings and sites labelled 'historic' and important for the national culture of Aotearoa-New Zealand. Three (of four) published registers of classified buildings and structures available were examined. All the A and B classified structures in Auckland and Northland were classified either because of their role in industry, or because they showed significant construction techniques or distinctive architectural style - no 'humble' structures representing ordinary people were considered nationally important (New Zealand Historic Places Trust, 1989a). A and B classified buildings in Otago and Southland did include some 'cottages', as well as the grandiose homes and industrial buildings. However, the importance of the cottages was generally because of their links with important people - it was not because they were part of the undistinguished past of ordinary Aotearoa-New Zealand (New Zealand Historic Places Trust, 1989b). Some 'humble' dwellings were classified as nationally significant in Canterbury and South Canterbury. For example, a worker's cottage in Kaiapoi has a B classification because it is a visual link with the life styles of pioneers (New Zealand Historic Places Trust, 1988). Thus, from this brief review, the New Zealand Historic Places Trust classification process considered architecturally significant or rare structures to be most important, rather than those representative of particular pasts.

The Trust recognised, in 1991, that its classification procedure was biased, so the selection process now takes into account concerns for historical, social and cultural significance, as well as architectural importance when classifying structures. Just as the 'new' historians argue for the lives of ordinary

---

32 I assume these authors are talking about the dominant European/Pakeha culture of Aotearoa-New Zealand. There are many distinctive elements of Maori tanga.

33 The New Zealand Historic Places Trust is responsible for preserving the heritage of New Zealand (s.4 and s.5, Historic Places Act 1980). A and B classified buildings were looked at because their preservation is regarded as essential for the heritage of New Zealand.

34 The types of structures which are classified are discussed in no particular order.

people to be counted, it is gradually becoming accepted that symbols of ordinary life are a legitimate part of the history of Aotearoa-New Zealand. This approach accommodates concerns of social heritage, rather than just overall national historical importance.

Huneke (1982) recorded a history of huts in the Snowy Mountains, in Australia. He recognised the meaning and role of ‘ordinary’ people for the cultural heritage of Australia, writing: a story of ordinary people, folks like you and me, people who drive rather than being driven, who eat fish and chips on Fridays rather than pass Acts of Parliament. It is a history of huts and hovels rather than grand mansions and National Park inaugurations (Huneke, 1982:ix). Huts in the back-country are also seen as symbols of the past of an undistinguished culture. They are part of the past of ordinary people, unlikely to be linked with significant architects, but mostly constructed from whatever materials were available and by whatever method was appropriate at the time.

Preventing the demolition and removal of some huts in the back-country and conserving them as cultural heritage resources may mean that they can continue to be appreciated as they were in 1939:

*Huts built by sheepman and prospectors have acquired merit in tradition. Pioneers built these huts in the early days, and succeeding generations have appreciated their shelter. Quaint, crude, often ramshackle, the huts may be more hospitable than luxurious hotels* (Pascoe, 1939:146).

Similarly, Powell (1970) proposed that it is huts and people who give meaning to being in the hills:

*It came to me what shelter means in the mountains. Huts, tents, shelter rocks, were more than stops along the way - places where men stayed to eat and sleep, leaving them to hunt deer, cross passes or cut transient steps up summit ice. Shelter in the hills meant more than cleaning a rifle, mapping the cross-country tramp, or resting for the climb.*

*In huts or under bivvy rocks men were relaxed .... By the fire they bragged like Norsemen, argued like Jesuits, sang like minstrels, and dreamed like poets .... Such hospices were the beginning and the end of mountain life with the minutes of action sandwiched in between ...* (Powell, 1970: excerpt from book jacket).

Huts provide a tangible reminder of the people who lived and visited the back-country. Interpreted by memory and history, these huts have meaning for people today. They are symbols of, and have importance for, a particular culture.
The value of cultural heritage

The perspective that cultural heritage is important, which has been advocated throughout this dissertation, is not universally accepted. Popper (1957), for example, believed that concerns for history stifle and limit the actions of people in the future. He criticised historicism and methods which predict the future that are based on past events and institutions. He argued that the future growth of scientific knowledge cannot be predicted by rational or scientific methods derived from past experience.

The arguments made by Popper are refuted by a number of writers. Smith (1985), for example, said that because Popper assumed innovative knowledge operates uniformly over the whole field of scientific knowledge, we should not take his arguments as confirmation that history cannot influence events. History can influence events, but perhaps we should be warned not to allow hopes and fears for the future to affect the quality of ... judgements (Smith, 1985:80).

Similarly, Popper’s argument that concerns for history limit the future can also be refuted. Tuan (1980) maintains that features of the past support an individual in a society because their existence enables the person to assume a certain status within a group. Correspondingly, Lowenthal (1985:41) proposed that: an ability to recall and identify with our own past gives existence, meaning, purpose and value. Thus, rather than limiting options for the future, maintaining huts as cultural heritage resources ‘ground’ us in a community, and people in the back-country have a tangible link with people and activities from the past. Despite this argument, Popper’s comments are still useful because they remind us that an overemphasis on huts and history representing the past may repress future creativity and development. They warn us of the implications of unthinkingly following the actions and behaviours of those before, and becoming trapped in the past.

---

36 This is a belief that natural laws govern historical events (Popper, 1957).
37 See for example Smith (1985), M'Quarie (1976), Mussachia (1976) and Himka (1975).
The development of European/Pakeha perspectives of the past

The way history is viewed and relics interpreted is influenced by our perspective on where 'the past' fits into our lives. To some, such as the early Judaeo-Christians, the past was insignificant compared to the importance of God, who they believed had placed people at the centre of creation - people were regarded as superior to and apart from all other forms of life (Glacken, 1967). Later, a dualism was created which resulted in a strong division between past and present (White, 1967). Rather that seeing aspects of the past as integral in everyday life, this dualism is still seen today in Aotearoa-New Zealand. Selected objects and buildings which are considered important because of their association with the past are kept separate from everyday living. For example, people are not allowed to stay overnight in Waihohonu Hut, the oldest hut in Tongariro National Park because of its 'historical importance'.

An ethos of Christianity continued into the Dark and Middle Ages although these times were characterised, not by a duality, but by the fact that there was no perspective on the past as we know it. Most of the people of the Dark and Middle Ages had no awareness of the past - it was not incorporated in the present (Glacken, 1967). The Renaissance of 1300 to 1600 A.D. saw an awareness of the past become apparent (Lowerithal, 1985; Lynch, 1975), and this period also saw the development of the scientific method. Scientific method influenced approaches to historic research because accuracy and authenticity became ideals (Daifuku, 1986), so that rationality and scientific method superseded any acceptance of the intangible aspects of the past (Lowenthal, 1985). The power of scientific method still rules. The Department of Conservation's operations are governed by a yearly budget - all conservation initiatives must be measurable, they must have economic value. Rather than accepting that old, rundown huts have value as a link with the past, or help people identify a place, these types of huts must have 'proven' worth. Their value and meaning must be tangible, articulated and accepted by decision-makers.

Acknowledgement and awareness of different perspectives of the past is important for this discussion of huts as cultural heritage because they give a context for many of the decision-making processes which are seen today. For example, decisions about whether a hut is important because of its link
with the past are left to 'the expert' - the historic resources conservation officer - while clear divisions between past and present can be seen in the way huts are seen as either functional or 'historic'.

A Maori perspective

The previous discussion outlines perspectives which are part of the European/Pakeha cultural tradition but: *(i)n many traditional societies (and cultures) the past was never a separate, divisible entity* (Groube, 1985:52). For Maori, the past is linked with land, which gives identity and continuity. The value of land in Aotearoa-New Zealand today is usually, among European/Pakeha, linked to economic value, but to Maori, it is more than this: *it is beloved and revered as the ever-living mother* (Yoon, 1986:19). These intense emotional and spiritual links with the land provide a sense of belonging and represent ancestors for Maori (Walker, 1989). However, when it comes to choosing a past in Aotearoa-New Zealand, a European/Pakeha viewpoint may still dominate. One of the reasons for this is that significant aspects of this cultural past can be isolated and identified (Groube, 1985), while a Maori perspective suggests that aspects of the past are more integrated with everyday life, an approach with which many people are uneasy.

Huts in the back-country are symbols of a European/Pakeha culture, although they may be sited in places which may have meaning and value for Maori. Differences between a European/Pakeha view of the past and a Maori perspective are important because they illustrate that a separation between past and present is culturally specific. It is important to be aware that the methods and procedures dominant in Aotearoa-New Zealand are based in a European/Pakeha tradition and may not be appropriate for judging other cultures. This point is particularly important when placed in the context of the current, and possibly future, Maori claims for Crown land under the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975. Huts are scattered throughout Aotearoa-New Zealand's back-country and may, in the future, be in the care of tribal groups, such as Ngai Tahu. Then, decisions will need to be made about whose cultural definition of significance and meaning are taken into account in resource evaluation.

---

38 For example, Locke Stream Hut sits alongside the Taramakau River. The Taramakau River/Harper Pass/Lake Sumner route was used extensively by Maori in pre-European times (Brailsford, 1984).
Changing the past

Concerns for continuity and identity in a group or community may lead to the retention and maintenance of relics which have significant associations with people and activities from the past. However, their survival may also lead to assumptions that the past was stable, whereas relics really only identify a particular window in time. Relics are unable to invoke the past on their own - they require memory and history to accompany them. Because of this interpretation, the significance of relics is limited to, or by, the past it discloses. So, although the past is connected to these themes, our memories alter and yield to transform what we learn from the relic to suit our own needs (Lowenthal, 1985). Furthermore, once a relic has been identified, the next step is labelling it because: Labelling a relic affirms its historical significance (Lowenthal, 1985:271). Labelling a hut as a 'historic' resource means it can be assumed to have importance in Aotearoa-New Zealand history.

Recognising, identifying, labelling and perhaps promoting a cultural heritage feature may lead to more visitors. Managing the impacts of visitors becomes important when the resource seems incapable of coping with the existing or projected demand for it (Brown, 1982). Lowenthal (1985:275) proposed that display arouses the impulse to conserve, but also increases the need for it, so although protection may detract from the authenticity of the relic, without such protection, the relic may vanish or decay sooner. Public viewing can also threaten historic sites, buildings and artifacts. This paradox occurs when managing natural areas for preservation, and to date, it has not been resolved. At times, it is accepted that use can be made of preserved areas. At other times, duplicity occurs and problems are created for land managers (Devlin and O'Connor, 1988). Options for management can be simply categorised as either preservation or conservation.

'To preserve' means to suspend the decay and destruction of an object from the past. The preservation of a relic suggests that we have a heritage which is unchanged because it segregates the tangible past by shielding it from physical change (Lowenthal, 1985). Conservation means to protect, but to accept a certain inevitability in the deterioration of relics. Conservation measures acknowledge that some change is unavoidable and may also allow adaptive re-use. Thus, the basic resource will be retained, but some change and use is also permitted (Lynch, 1975).
Preservation dampens creative use of things from the past because of a fear of altering the distant past (Lowenthal, 1985). Conservation, in comparison, suggests that a flexible approach to choosing our past is taken. What may be appropriate for the present generation may not sit easily with future people. Thus, conservation practices enable people to appreciate and experience the past, and have continuity with relics which are meaningful at that time (Lynch, 1975).

Concerns about management options become more complex when it is considered that, although the past is needed to validate the present and confirm our identity, recognising the past also alters it: Interaction with heritage continually alters its nature and context, whether by choice or by chance (Lowenthal, 1985:263). Any recognition of huts as cultural heritage resources - identification, display, protection reconstitution, moving, or readapting - involves altering the very meanings which led to their significance.

Chapter conclusion

This chapter has illustrated that the past involves everything, although it is only known to us through memory, history or relics. Memories are recollections of an individual's past, but these memories become other's histories, so histories are accounts of the past, whether oral or written, and are told from particular viewpoints. Back-country huts as relics require memories and histories if they are to have value. They require this interpretation to link them with the past. Furthermore, it is essential to recognise that an acknowledgment of the pasts of huts and their value as cultural heritage resources implicitly involves altering and changing the past.

Concerns for the past are important, but its manifestations in the present are reflected and illustrated in a number of ways, because they are subjective and culturally specific. Our choices of histories and huts as cultural heritage are influenced by our perspective on the value of the past. Managing these huts as heritage resources becomes important when threats to their survival outweigh the benefits of their existence, while management style and approaches to maintenance become critical when it is
realized that the meanings of the hut may change with restoration or renovation. However, management approaches which follow conservation principles are more suited to cultural heritage resources than preservation because they allow the past to be changed and be adapted to current needs.
Chapter Four - Protecting the Cultural Heritage of Aotearoa-New Zealand

Chapter introduction

As the cultures and societies of Aotearoa-New Zealand developed, so too did ideas that there was a past worth preserving. Protection of important features and symbols of Aotearoa-New Zealand’s past were first mandated in the Lands Acts of 1877 and 1885. These statutes were mainly concerned with the preservation of the natural landscape. The first legislation which specifically made provision for the acquisition of lands with scenic or historic interest was the Scenery Preservation Act 1903. From these beginnings, legislation dealing with the protection of Aotearoa-New Zealand’s natural and cultural resources continue to be enacted. In 1987, the Conservation Act legislated for the restructuring and amalgamation of a number of government agencies to ensure conservation concerns came under one agency, the Department of Conservation, which provided for the preservation and conservation of natural and historic resources. In this chapter, the role, purpose and practices of the Department of Conservation are examined.

The Department of Conservation

The Department of Conservation was established on 1 April 1987. It drew together the conservation elements of various Government departments to form a central body which would act as the focus and champion of conservation interests (Environment 1986, 1985:27). Many of these other departments then ceased to exist. The elements drawn together in the Department of Conservation included the New Zealand Wildlife Service and the New Zealand Historic Places Trust from the Department of Internal Affairs, environmental forestry from the New Zealand Forest Service and national parks and reserves from the Department of Lands and Survey (Devlin, et. al., 1990). Figure 4.1 (page 50) graphically illustrates the redistribution of environmental administration and management responsibilities after restructuring in 1987. The shaded areas represent the disbanded agencies, and the arrows show the redistribution of their responsibilities.

This provision was because of concern about the destruction of Maori fortifications during this period.
The duties of the Department of Conservation reflect its diverse background. It deals with conservation issues at a number of levels, from local to global. It cares for threatened species, coastal and marine systems, and historic resources on its estate, and manages protected land and administers national, maritime, forest and conservation parks, wilderness areas, reserves and marginal strips (covering nearly one third of the area of Aotearoa-New Zealand). These roles are not isolated from people however, so the Department is also involved in outdoor recreation and tourism issues, such as the management of back-country huts. At an international level, the Department of Conservation is associated with global environmental issues, such as opposing drift-net fishing and promoting conservation and sustainable development (Department of Conservation, 1991b).

The New Zealand Historic Places Trust is a separate organisation from the Department of Conservation, although they are closely aligned. They are both under the direction of the Minister of Conservation, and the Director-General of Conservation is a member of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust Board. However, apart from these statutory links, the associations between the Department of Conservation and the New Zealand Historic Places Trust are generally informal - staff of the Department of Conservation are often involved with the Trust in their personal time.

---

40 Including protection and recovery work such as special breeding programmes, controlling cats and rats, and transferring endangered species to predator-free, off-shore islands.

41 Such as work on reducing coastal pollution and identifying coastal resources.
Legislative framework


Central to the purpose of Department are these interpretations:

Conservation means preservation and protection, for the purpose of maintaining their intrinsic values, providing for their appreciation and recreational enjoyment by the public, and safeguarding options of future generations.

Preservation means the maintenance, as far as practicable, of its intrinsic values.

Protection means maintenance in its current state, including restoration to some former state and augmentation, enhancement or expansion.

Historic resource means a historic place within the meaning of the Historic Places Act 1980.

Natural resources means -

(a) Plants and animals of all kinds; and
(b) The air, water, and soil in or on which any plant or animal may live; and
(c) Landscape and landform; and
(d) Geological features; and
(e) Systems of interacting living organisms, and their environment; - and includes any interest in a natural resource (s.2, Conservation Act 1987).

Thus, among other things, the Department of Conservation is required to protect, maintain intrinsic values, and restore, enhance or expand natural resources or places which demonstrate values of the past, and are associated with the past. But all resources have a past, per se, and nearly all natural resources fit the description within the Act. It is not appropriate that all resources should be conserved: therefore some rationalisation of resource conservation is required.

The Conservation Act 1987 itself does not differentiate, or provide a system for deciding which resources have more value and should be conserved. Although this dissertation concentrates on the Department of Conservation and huts as cultural heritage, an overview of some of the legislation dealing with cultural heritage management - the Historic Places Act 1980 and the Resource Management Act 1991 - is given. They provide some guidance for prioritizing buildings, sites or structures which have an association with the past.
The Historic Places Act was first enacted in 1954 but was re-written in 1980 because the New Zealand Historic Places Trust lacked power. The 1980 Act aimed to strengthen the powers of the Trust and to balance private and public interests (Grove, 1982). Its purpose is to preserve the historic heritage of New Zealand, continue the New Zealand Historic Places Trust and to establish the New Zealand Historic Places Board of Trustees. New provisions relating to buildings and new concepts associated with historic areas and traditional sites were included, such as the four-tier classification system set out in section 35 (see discussion in Chapter Two, page 25). Section 36 (1-2) provided that buildings in the two highest classes (A and B) could be subject to Heritage Protection Orders (provided in the Resource Management Act 1991) which means that the building can not be demolished, altered, or extended (s.37, Historic Places Act 1980).

Decisions about what buildings are considered to be significant were made by a specially appointed committee under the original 1980 Act, the Building Classification Committee. Some of the problems with this process related to the slowness of classification. This slowness reflected the use of a part-time, unpaid under-resourced committee (Lochhead, 1986). This procedure had an architectural, rather than a historical or social bias, so in 1991 the Buildings Classification Committee was disbanded and new procedures were put in place. Now, a building is assessed by permanent staff in the ‘Building’ section of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust, the Classification Group. They base their decisions on the information presented in an application form, which has a number of questions about the history and condition of the structure.

A review of the Historic Places Act 1980 was initiated alongside other environmental law reforms during 1988. It was reviewed because the Department of Conservation and the New Zealand Historic Places Trust felt that the Act gave inadequate protection to the sites, places and objects which are part of the cultural, physical and spiritual heritage of both Maori and Pakeha (Department of Conservation, 1988). It was seen to favour private, rather than public rights (Moore, 1989). Despite the review in 1988, the Historic Places Bill was not drafted and presented to Parliament until June 1992. The delay

---

42 It was defenceless if a property owner opposed its recommendations. The Trust had no rights of compulsory acquisition and no means to ensure an important building was not demolished or allowed to fall into disrepair (Perry and Galletly, 1984).

was caused, in part, because the massive review of environmental law (resulting in the Resource Management Act 1991) took precedence.

The Historic Places Bill has a different definition of ‘historic area’ than the 1980 Act and it appears to be narrower and more restrictive. However, it does extend the scope of the definition of ‘archaeological site’ and also presents a simplified system for registering places with historic significance, and a more inclusive register of historic and culturally important sites and areas. This new system will replace the four-level classification system in the 1980 Act with a register which records the existence of category I and category II places. Places which are classified A and B under the 1980 Act will be category I, and C and D structures will be category II (s.83, Historic Places Bill 1992)\(^4\). The Bill will also empower the New Zealand Historic Places Trust to place interim protection on places or areas which are being investigated for registration which should alleviate some of the protection problems with the 1980 Act. The Bill included strong ties to the Resource Management Act 1991. The mechanisms of the Resource Management Act 1991 are crucial to enforce protection of heritage resources, while the Historic Places Bill, once enacted, should provide for registration and classification. There should be better integration between the two systems because of consistent terminology and approaches to protection.

The Resource Management Act 1991 gives some protection for cultural heritage resources in general, largely because it recognises that cultural heritage is part of the environment, not something separate from other environmental issues which are important to people’s well-being. This recognition of the value and place of cultural heritage means that the effect of an action on our cultural heritage should be taken into account just as any effect on water or air quality would be. Despite this concern, ‘heritage’ per se, is not defined. Referrals to heritage within the Act infer a definition, but its use is not consistent throughout the legislation. Section 189, Subsection One states that the reason for a heritage order is for the purpose of protecting -

\(^4\) For discussion of the classification system, refer to Chapter Two, page 25.
Thus, a definition may be extrapolated from this to suggest that heritage is a place with historical, cultural or spiritual interest, value or appeal. However, in the same section, but different subsection of the Act, a broader interpretation of heritage may be extracted. A place which can be protected by a Heritage Protection Order\(^4\) may be of special interest by having special cultural, architectural, historical, scientific, ecological, or other interest (s.189(2), Resource Management Act 1991). This implies that heritage includes things with scientific or ecological value, as well as cultural or historical value. This irregularity may present problems when deciding if a resource is eligible for further protection under the Act, although it may also assist, because a broad definition may be appropriate for dealing with heritage features than a narrow, more restrictive one. It should allow a greater range of features of the past to be protected than perhaps can be allowed by the label 'historic' under the Historic Places Act 1980, but much of its protective measures are, as yet, untried in the judicial system.

Analysis of the Historic Places Act 1980 and the Resource Management Act 1991 is applicable within a discussion of the Department of Conservation's legislative framework. They can provide some statutory guidance in dealing with cultural heritage resources on lands managed by the Department, while also outlining one of the difficulties in legislating for cultural heritage conservation - few conclusive definitions exist. Huts which are considered to be cultural heritage resources can and have been classified under the Historic Places Act 1980\(^6\). Classification, as a protective measure, should not be necessary for huts on Department of Conservation land because the purpose of the Conservation Act 1987 is to provide for the protection of cultural heritage resources. However, classification may be useful because it can indicate the relative significance of a particular hut in comparison with other classified buildings in Aotearoa-New Zealand.

\(^4\) A Heritage Protection Order is designated under the Resource Management Act 1991, but is used in conjunction with classification under the Historic Places Act 1980. It gives greater protection than classification alone, largely because of the strength of the Resource Management Act 1991 (such as threats and fines), in comparison with the Historic Places Act 1980.

\(^6\) Waihohonu Hut in Tongariro National Park has an 'A' classification.
Administrative structure

The Department of Conservation has both policy formulation and implementation functions (Boston, 1991). Head Office staff in Wellington co-ordinate national policies and research, while most ‘hands-on’ conservation work is controlled through the network of 14 conservancies and field centres throughout Aotearoa-New Zealand (Department of Conservation, 1991b). Within this structure is a different, overlaying division of responsibilities. These are segmented into key parts: education and interpretation, recreation, tourism, wild animal control and historic resources. These wide ranging responsibilities may present problems when prioritizing resources. For example, wild animal control work must be evaluated against the advocacy and education work of the Department.

A basis of efficiency and accountability

In 1984, the newly elected Labour Government began to radically restructure and check the intervention of Government in the economy. These reforms were based on a belief that if the economy was left to market forces, low rates of interest and inflation, economic growth, stability and high employment would develop (Consedine, 1989). Their rapidly enacted and unflinching monetarist policies had a traumatic effect on the society of Aotearoa-New Zealand (Whitwell, 1990). It meant that: the goals of the state have been merged with those of business. Everything in our society has been reduced to monetary values, and the state provides no alternate values or goals for New Zealand (Consedine, 1989:184). The fourth Labour Government reorganised and restructured government agencies on the basis that they should be more accountable, efficient and provide better policy advice, and the National Government, elected in 1990, continued this process47 (Boston, 1992). All government departments were included in the push for accountability and efficiency. The Department of Conservation must therefore be ‘transparent’ and ‘efficient’ in its approach to environmental management (Cocklin, 1989).

Approaches to management within the Department reflect this priority. There need to be decisions made about which resources are more significant and valuable, and priorities allocated. Each conservancy has a yearly budget - the Business Plan - which outlines its targets for spending and

---

47 The National Government actually took the objectives of accountability and efficiency in government agencies further. It targeted spending on social services, such as health, education and welfare (Boston, 1992).
proposals for generating revenue, while a Conservation Management Strategy\textsuperscript{48} for each region must be operational by 1995. The strategy outlines the management for the following ten years, although the conservancy is also strongly directed and constrained by its business plan. This means that projects which will take longer than one year to complete are likely to have difficulties appropriating funds from the budget. Formulating the \textit{West Coast Ten Year Plan}\textsuperscript{49} means that resources must be known, evaluated and prioritized, so that those which are more 'important', 'significant' or 'valuable' are cared for. Thus, the recreational functions of back-country huts must be evaluated against their contribution as cultural heritage resources. However, as demonstrated in Chapter Two, the Department's approaches to assessment and evaluation do not readily account for the range of values.

Another illustration of the drive for accountability is that targets are measured in quantities, rather than by quality of performance - the Corporate Plan specifies targets to be achieved for the year. For example, one of the performance measures for species protection in 1990 was 'the number of marine mammal rescue operations undertaken' (Department of Conservation, 1990). However, these operations are unpredictable and dependent upon the behaviour of the animals, so it seems unreasonable and short-sighted to rely on this type of performance measure. The demands for decisions to be made on a basis of monetary values are not limited to the Department. The Minister of Conservation advocated his Government's market approach at a conference of the Federated Mountain Clubs:

\textit{One of the major challenges that you must come to terms with is the need to understand and turn to your advantage the ideas and concepts of economics. Make no mistake about it, that is the battleground on which the future of the national estate will be fought} (Marshall, 1991b:6).

Thus, interest groups are also encouraged to accept principles of 'value for money' and 'efficiency'.

\textsuperscript{48} The Conservation Law Reform Act of 1990 legislated a strategic planning approach for the Department of Conservation. The purpose of a Strategy is to identify areas where conservation management plans exist and also the areas where it is intended to implement plans (Department of Conservation, 1991a).

\textsuperscript{49} The \textit{West Coast Ten Year Plan} is the name used by the West Coast Conservation Board for their conservation management strategy. The name is seen to be more appropriate and 'user friendly' than \textit{West Coast Conservation Management Strategy}.
A natural and scientific model

Cultural heritage is a variable, dynamic and culturally specific set of phenomena, and any attempt at managing cultural heritage should acknowledge this basis. However, the underlying model of the Department of Conservation is one which has an essence of scientific principles and a natural resource bias.

The scientific model was illustrated by Murray Hosking, Deputy Director-General speaking for the Department of Conservation, at the 1987 New Zealand Historic Places Trust Conference:

There is a common philosophical commitment to protection and conservation in the planning systems which have been developed to identify and manage protected natural areas. These systems ... can be applied to historic and cultural sites. ... I am realistic enough to know that the development of such methodology will take time and care, but the wider scientific and management resources of the department can greatly assist the process (Hosking, 1987:27).

Thus, the Department of Conservation expected that cultural heritage management could be assessed and administered in a similar way to natural resources. The methodology mentioned by Hosking is based on the use of landscape or vegetation units which can be described and compared and looks to preserve representative units. Allen (1988:145) suggested that such a system of assessment on the basis of an aggregate of values is useful at the data gathering phase because: At present there is no systematic way that the distribution of sites from one region of New Zealand can be compared with another, except in terms of density/unit area. However, the problem with this method is that there is likely to be a loss of distinction between the natural and cultural/historical environment: Comparison with contemporary eco or land systems leads inevitably to determinative conclusions about New Zealand's human history (Allen, 1988:146).

Besides a reliance on scientific principles, the Department of Conservation also has a natural resource bias. This means that when comparing natural and cultural resources, the natural resources are likely to take precedence. This bias is reflected in legislation underlying the Department and in the actions of the Minister of Conservation.

The Conservation Act 1987 has provision for the Minister of Conservation to confer additional specific protection or preservation requirements. There are four particular designations for this purpose, but three of these - ecological area, sanctuary area and wilderness area - are specifically for the protection
of natural resources. The fourth, the conservation park designation, is to protect both natural and historic resources, and then to facilitate recreation and public enjoyment. There is no special protective status for cultural heritage resources within the Conservation Act 1987. Classification of buildings and structures under the Historic Places Act 1980 is possible, but this is then subject to the foibles of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust. This may be a problem because the classification process is still slow, despite the new procedures in place (see Chapter Three, page 41), and the decision about what is significant is ultimately left to the New Zealand Historic Places Trust. Huts may not be seen as significant resources for Aotearoa-New Zealand by the Trust and may not be classified.

The Minister of Conservation also appears to reflect the Department’s concern with natural resources. In his end of 1991 press release, the Minister, Denis Marshall, listed the achievements of the Department. These included saving endangered bird species, introducing tough, new penalties for trading endangered species, discovering new populations of Archey’s frog, working towards preserving marine eco-systems, and protecting some native forests (Marshall, 1991a). There was no mention of the Department of Conservation’s role in protecting Aotearoa-New Zealand’s cultural heritage.

The most recent example of this bias towards natural resources by the Department of Conservation is contained in a document which discusses the results of a Heylen questionnaire (Department of Conservation, 1992a). The questionnaire surveyed attitudes and perceptions of the Department of Conservation’s staff, associates and members of the public, about the role and future of the Department. The document seldom mentions the historic resource conservation role of the Department: definitions do not acknowledge any historic resource work - they consider only biodiversity, ecological processes and special natural places, while the one comment on historic outcomes emphasizes Maori pasts, largely ignoring the role of Pakeha/European pasts in Aotearoa-New Zealand. On the whole, this document highlights that the Department’s concern is with natural resource conservation, with historic or cultural resources being granted a lesser priority.
Conflict and confusion

There are conflicts and competing operations within the Department of Conservation. Conflict is illustrated when huts on lands managed by the Department of Conservation are examined. The original reason for huts being in remote areas are varied. They may have been built by miners or cattle musters in the early twentieth century, or they may have been placed on the edge of a major tramping track by helicopter. Whatever their original purpose, most of the huts in the back-country are now seen as shelter for trampers, climbers and other visitors to those areas. They are recreational facilities and have value as capital assets. However, some huts are linked to significant events and periods of history, or are representative of a certain building type or they may contribute to the character of an area. This means that they can be considered cultural heritage resources and should be managed accordingly. Despite this, the huts' role as shelter means that they are usually managed as facilities and little account is taken of any less obvious values in their management.

The marginalisation of cultural heritage within the Department of Conservation may also be partly attributed to perceptions about the importance of 'wilderness' and natural heritage. Managing huts as cultural heritage resources requires managers to intervene in the structure and fabric of the hut. Rotten wood piles supporting a hut must be replaced if the hut is not to fall over. Broken windows must be repaired to ensure the hut does not deteriorate further, but it does not matter, in physical terms, if the state of the area surrounding the hut is altered. In contrast, management of natural resources such as native forests or wildlife species require managers to manage and deal with the environment, rather than the resource itself. Tree and bird populations do not usually deteriorate if left completely alone (except perhaps, in the case of small, endangered populations of some species such as black robin or kakapo). These are different attitudes to management, but they can both be accommodated within the Department of Conservation framework.

Chapter conclusion

The Department of Conservation has a statutory obligation to conserve both the natural and cultural heritage of Aotearoa-New Zealand, but its framework and operations marginalise the conservation of cultural heritage resources. Dealing with huts as cultural heritage highlights the problems because the benefits of their conservation elude standard evaluation practices based on natural resource
management. Similarly, the principles and reasons for cultural heritage conservation do not fit easily in the management environment which demands efficiency and accountability. To add to these complexities, it may be fair to assume that there is confusion amongst managers within the Department. They see their role is to be primarily concerned with the natural resources in their care because there appears to be another organisation, the New Zealand Historic Places Trust, responsible for cultural resources. However, dealing with huts as cultural heritage resources on land managed by the Department of Conservation highlights that the Department is not primarily responsible for natural resource management because the New Zealand Historic Places cares for the cultural heritage. There are a range of values associated with huts including recreational and cultural heritage, and their management within the Department of Conservation must reflect this range. In the following chapter, ways of dealing with huts as cultural heritage within the framework and operations of the Department of Conservation are considered.
Chapter Five - Managing Huts as Cultural Heritage Resources

Chapter introduction

There are many meanings associated with huts in the back-country and some are related to events and people from the past. Taking into account these meanings in the management process is not easy because they can be difficult to identify and define. However, the management of huts on lands managed by the Department of Conservation has become important because huts and their cultural heritage values are not adequately supported by the Department’s framework, policies and operations. The approaches used by the Department of Conservation for assessing and evaluating importance and value are flawed because they see huts either as functional shelters, or important in the ‘history’ of Aotearoa-New Zealand. There is no recognition that huts are places which are constructed from an individual’s experiences, emotions and feelings, or are a particular kind of icon. Alternative approaches to assessing and evaluating the meanings and significance of huts are reviewed in this chapter, which also considers the implications of the management process on the cultural heritage meanings associated with huts.

Alternatives to assessment and evaluation

Deciding which huts have importance as heritage involves an acceptance and acknowledgement of their cultural values. Current methods used by the Department of Conservation do not necessarily reflect an awareness of the many and varied meanings of back-country huts. Other methods for assessment can be used, although each has limitations. The methods discussed in this section are: prioritizing huts according to their national significance; using the community to decide what is important; assessing value according to specified criteria; and using a thematic analysis method.

Nationally important symbols

Basically, the idea of prioritizing the management of huts means caring for the ones which are the most important. The difficulty is deciding ‘important for whom’. The Department of Conservation is required to promote the conservation of natural and cultural heritage resources, so ideally, all resources which could be considered ‘heritage’ would be conserved. However, this is not possible, so it is
resources which are significant for the whole of Aotearoa-New Zealand which take priority. The resources which have importance for the whole of Aotearoa-New Zealand must be recognisable as nationally important. Tuan's (1975b) analysis of 'places' and his distinction between 'public symbols' and 'fields-of-care' (see Chapter Three, page 38) is useful here. 'Public symbol' types of places could be assessed as nationally important because they are easily identifiable.

The New Zealand Historic Places Trust classification process is geared towards these nationally important symbols, and it is also used for huts managed by the Department of Conservation. Chancellor Hut, for example, has been proposed as a building which merits permanent preservation because of ... [its] very great historic significance or architectural quality (s.35(b), Historic Places Act 1980) because it is the oldest hut in the Southern Alps still on its original site\(^{30}\) - the age and location of the hut is easily identifiable and communicable. So, it does not seem to be such a problem to recognise the importance of some huts to the national culture, but this national culture is the conglomeration of the nuances, the artifacts and the patterns of many people. Handler's (1987) argued that national heritage policies are tantamount to hegemony because they tend to over-ride the attempts of different localities which often struggle to maintain unique cultural identities because of financial hardship, and so are unable to resist the domination of 'modern Western culture'.

Thus, it is important to focus on the fact that culture begins at a 'grass roots' level: There is a need to study the social and cultural characteristics of a local area in history not only as a story of continuity but also as an illustration of and a component part of wider social processes (Thrift, 1980:855).

Many of the huts in the back-country are not easily recognisable as 'nationally important' but they do have importance for their local community. One way to ensure that the significant huts of a local community are cared for is to involve its people in decision-making. A community's sense of identity and feelings of continuity within a culture are associated with relics from the past, and huts are part of this culture.

Community participation

Some forms of community participation in decision-making are integral to the management planning process of the Department of Conservation and its predecessors\textsuperscript{51}, but are usually in the form of calls for written submissions, although on occasions, public meetings are also held. However, the Department of Conservation has recognised that participants from the community in the traditional process represent a narrow section of society, as identified by James (1990)\textsuperscript{52}, so in the preparation of conservation management strategies, the Department intends to seek participation from people using methods other than formal hearings (Department of Conservation, 1991a).

The Department of Conservation's present structure allows for community consultation methods other than submissions to management plans. There are Conservation Boards in each conservancy and a New Zealand Conservation Authority. Members of both the Conservation Boards and the New Zealand Conservation Authority are appointed by the Minister of Conservation. The purposes of the New Zealand Conservation Authority, according to the Conservation Law Reform Act 1990, include advising the Minister, approving conservation management strategies and plans, investigating issues and proposing changes in land status. The New Zealand Conservation Authority is supposed to be both a check on the Minister of Conservation's power and a forum for public input at the highest level. Conservation Boards have similar functions, but influence decision-making at a regional level.

The New Zealand Conservation Authority and Conservation Board systems are susceptible, however, to the power and strength of Government, as shown by the consent given to the Milford Track Race\textsuperscript{53}. The fact that the Minister of Conservation allowed the race, over-riding the mechanisms in place for checking his power, demonstrates that the current mechanisms do not always reflect the wishes of the public. The decision made by the community representatives was over turned.

\textsuperscript{51} The New Zealand Forest Service and the Department of Lands and Survey.

\textsuperscript{52} She identified that participants were inclined to be 'over 40, male, pakeha, tertiary educated, a professional manager or administrator with a high income'.

\textsuperscript{53} An application for a concession to run a race along the Milford Track in 1993 was turned down by both the Southland Conservation Board and the New Zealand Conservation Authority. The Minister of Conservation allowed the race to go ahead, although it has since been cancelled (The Press, 17 October 1992:1).
Arnstein (1969) proposed that there is a ‘ladder of citizen participation’ (Figure 5.1). The ladder is based upon the power of citizens decisions, relative to the power of the organisation which allows citizen input. There are extremes of non-participation to full citizen control.

 Arnstein’s typology is useful because it illustrates degrees of citizen power. Perhaps the power of the Southland Conservation Board involved in the Milford Track issue can be categorised in terms of tokenism, although in other issues the Board may be relatively powerful. Despite these problems, a public participation approach may be useful because at best, it allows members of a community to make decisions about the cultural property of that community.
Traditional Maori approaches to decision-making are worth considering in this context. They use a succession of hui44 at various locations, to discuss key issues. Hui are based on rituals which include calling, wailing, chanting and oratory, but the key point for this discussion is: anyone who wants to speak their mind can do so .... The chairman acts as an arbitrator rather than an impartial enforcer of rules, and offers compromise solutions when the discussion has reached an impasse (Salmond, 1987:209). Many of the principles fundamental to this approach could be applicable in a European/Pakeha decision-making context because they are based on the concepts of co-operation, compromise and respect rather than confrontation and domination which seem to be prevalent in a Pakeha/European dominated system. These principles and this approach could be adopted by a community to provide a practical method for deciding which huts had cultural heritage value. It would be useful because sensitive issues of cultural heritage could be discussed in a forum where all statements are heard and taken into account.

A form of community participation in hut management has been used in Australia since the 1970s. The Kosciusko Huts Association advises the New South Wales National Parks and Wildlife Service on the use and development of the huts, carrying out maintenance, undertaking historical research and promoting the cultural heritage of the mountains (New South Wales National Parks and Wildlife Service, n.d.a:5). Under the 1982 Plan of Management for Kosciusko National Park, the Kosciusko Huts Association plays a co-operative and consultative role in all aspects of park management that have implications for huts and hut users (New South Wales National Parks and Wildlife Service, n.d.b). Members of the Association share the maintenance and restoration work on huts with other interested individuals and groups, and the New South Wales National Parks and Wildlife Service.

In Aotearoa-New Zealand, interest groups had a major role in building and maintaining huts on public lands. Tramping, mountaineering and hunting clubs were instrumental in erecting huts in the back-country. However, with the formation of the Department of Conservation, the interest groups’ roles diminished and the Department took responsibility for hut management. Despite this trend, an organisation was formed during 1991 which was a) to promote the history and well being of Defiance

44 Hui is a general term in Maori for any kind of meeting, usually a ceremonial gathering on a marae and includes funerals, weddings, twenty-first birthdays, unveilings of memorial tombstones, as well as tribal gatherings and meetings of organisations and groups (Salmond, 1987).
Hut and other historic huts and sites in the South Westland area and b) to display and portray the history of glacier guiding and mountain activities of the South Westland area. The Friends of South Westland Mountaineering have no legal role in the management of historic huts, although staff of the Department of Conservation are involved in the group. How successful this group will be in influencing hut management on lands managed by the Department of Conservation remains to be seen.

The Department of Conservation is a national organisation, but its administrative structure is arranged to deal with local, regional and national issues. This should work in the favour of community involvement with the future of back-country huts, but should also be helped by the fact that some community consultation procedures are already in place - the New Zealand Conservation Authority and Conservation Boards. Despite these measures, the issue of scale is important here because the importance of a hut depends on its significance relative to the values of other huts - it may not be significant for the whole of Aotearoa-New Zealand, but it may be important in regional history. The New Zealand Conservation Authority can be involved in nationally-important huts, while the various regional Conservation Boards could deal with huts which may have regional importance. The roots of culture, however, lie with the local community. Their cultural heritage may include some of the huts in nearby valleys and mountains. It seems appropriate that the people of small, local communities have some involvement in the management of their heritage.

There is another dimension to this community participation process and it involves re-defining 'the community'. Huts can be part of the local history, therefore they are part of the heritage of the locality near their site, but huts also have other interested communities. Tramping, hunting and mountaineering clubs are associated with huts in the back-country, and so these communities should be included in the decision-making process.

The problem may become 'who is not involved', but there is no easy answer to this. I believe that all people who consider a particular hut to be part of their cultural heritage should be able to be involved.

---


in the assessment and management process, but it does not seem possible to evaluate the relative importance of any particular group any more than you can definitely assess the cultural heritage value and meaning of huts.

Using the community to decide which huts are significant to them and are in need of conservation seems straightforward enough, but as discussed previously, deciding the culture of a people is difficult. Furthermore, Mennell (1979) maintained that finding out about communities' needs is problematic because needs are not necessarily overt or recognised by community members. Mennell introduced the idea of a three-dimensional view of cultural 'needs' because it recognises that the problem of unexpressed cultural 'needs' may be much more deep-seated than seems to be implied (1979:249). This view proposes that we may be so conditioned that we may not even recognize our needs.

Applying Mennell's analysis to back-country huts suggests questions such as: How will communities be able to decide which of the many huts associated with their local culture should be conserved in some way? How do they know what their cultural heritage is? Mennell does not provide answers to these questions, but his analysis and discussion sanctions the perspective that we can never really choose our cultural heritage. Integrating this view into management strategies suggests that reviews of decisions should be built-in - perhaps after 10 years - because communities need to re-assess their, or their predecessors, evaluation of the conservation of particular huts as cultural heritage. Despite this process, communities still need to evaluate the significance of huts as cultural heritage resources. One way to guide and assist their decision-making is to use agreed criteria.

**Criteria**

Heritage is culturally defined - it changes depending on who is interested, or who is concerned. Thus, there may be problems with one person or group making a decision about a resource which has collective ownership and meaning. One way to assess different meanings and thus management priorities, is to use a checklist of criteria, but developing such a checklist is not straight-forward, as the following examples show.
Huts could be ranked according to age, authenticity, association with surrounding area or representative of a significant time in the history of Aotearoa-New Zealand. Older huts may have a high priority because old is often associated with importance. The five oldest huts in the case study are shown in Table 5.1.57

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Oldest hut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Blue River (Blowfly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=</td>
<td>Top Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garden Gully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nolan’s Flat Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chancellor Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Douglas Rock Hut</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 Oldest huts

This list shows that Blue River (Blowfly) Hut would be the most significant because it is the oldest. However, it was extensively modified sometime during the 1980s, so perhaps it would be better to rank huts according to age and authenticity. Table 5.2 lists the five oldest huts, in a fairly original condition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Oldest huts in original condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chancellor Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Meikle’s Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adam’s Flat Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Whataroa Junction Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Locke Stream</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 Oldest huts in near original condition

One problem with this list is deciding where a hut such as Nolan’s Flat Hut should be categorised. It was originally built in 1926, but was moved piece-by-piece in about 1950. The hut is the same as it was prior to its moving, so, does this mean it is in its original state? Similarly, Garden Gully Hut is

57 Five huts were chosen as an example.
difficult to categorise because it appears authentic, but is essentially a replica. Fitting these two huts into this criteria (age and authenticity) is difficult.

Plate 5.1  Blue River (Blowfly) Hut

Plate 5.2  Top Hut
Plate 5.3  Whataroa Junction Hut

These huts have been considered in isolation from their surroundings so far, but they could also be assessed according to their association with other relics in the area. Huts such as Top, Garden Gully and Meikle’s would be high in this evaluation because of their position in well-worked gold fields which have much debris. However, Chancellor is an old hut, in a near original condition, which, because of its situation in a harsh, alpine environment, and the activity associated with the hut means that there are few, if any, human-made relics in the vicinity.

Huts may also be important for people other than users. There are many people in Aotearoa-New Zealand who do not visit remote areas. These people still contribute to the conservation of resources, so huts could also be evaluated according to their value as relics from significant era in the history of Aotearoa-New Zealand. Highest ranked huts could be considered to be important to all the people of Aotearoa-New Zealand. From this perspective, Chancellor Hut may be important because it was built for the expanding alpine tourism trade in South Westland. However, this may not always work.

Many of the deer culling huts are unlikely to be considered important, largely because of negative
connotations associated with deer culling in the 1950s, and yet they are representative of a significant time. This criterion may favour 'popular' times, allowing a denial of the past for other times.

Thus, there are a number of difficulties with this checklist approach - which criterion is most important? How many criteria should be met before the resource is considered 'significant' or 'important'? These are not the only problems however. Criteria are used to assess ecological importance in the Protected Natural Area (P.N.A.) programme, which has a number of different assessors throughout the country. Assessors have found that the checklist and scale of importance are not absolute. As the survey progresses, the assessors become more selective as they come to know which types are represented elsewhere58. These problems illustrate the need for flexibility in a system: either to allow criteria to be refined; or, in the case of cultural heritage, to be changed as perceptions of what heritage is changes. Basically, there is need to acknowledge that objectivity is spurious, and that there are no absolutes.

Despite these problems, criteria could, perhaps, be used for evaluating huts as cultural heritage, but there would need to be a number of provisos: criteria would need to be able to change over time - cultural heritage is a dynamic, moving concept, so any process would need to accept this; huts should not need to meet say five out of a possible ten criteria, but rather, criteria could be used as a reference to possible values; and the process would also need a continual funding commitment, otherwise it may be that in a few years time, only the huts near Auckland, or wherever the programme began, have been assessed.

The basic difficulty with using criteria to assess cultural heritage values is deciding what criteria are significant and deciding their relative importance. Kerr (1985:8) argued that it is undesirable to seek the universal application of standard criteria, but that general criteria can be used. His suggestions for general criteria are:

1. Ability to demonstrate ... philosophy, custom, taste, design, usage or association with events;
2. Associational links - those not related to any surviving or discoverable evidence;
3. Formal or aesthetic qualities - these are assessed under conventional headings, such as scale, form or materials.

These general criteria can provide a framework for guiding decision-making, and take into account some of the less obvious meanings important when dealing with cultural heritage values.

**Theme analysis**

The idea of using a variety of criteria to assess cultural heritage significance can be developed further. Sites and areas can be evaluated according to specified or general criteria, then assigned to the theme or sub-theme in which it is most important. The United States National Parks Service used this method because the *National Park System should protect and exhibit the best examples of ... important landmarks of our [American] history* (National Parks Service, 1972:iii)\(^9\). The aim was to present a *balanced and complete representation of the Nation's historical heritage* (National Parks Service, 1972:vii). The National Park System was surveyed to identify any gaps: *Each historical area of the National Park System was carefully evaluated and assigned to the theme, subtheme, and major facet in which it was most important* (National Parks Service, 1972:viii-ix). The basic assumptions were outlined\(^60\) and are significant because they describe critical issues which underlie the whole study: evaluations did not take into account any historic value in places which were not classified as historical; an arbitrary decision was made about which theme within an area was most significant; and all major facets were considered to be of major importance, despite the study stating that this was not necessarily appropriate. The assessment seems flawed by these assumptions because a supremely reductionist approach appears to have been used.

Despite the problems illustrated specifically by the United States example, theme analysis can provide a useful approach because it can at least take into account the broad, all-encompassing nature of...
heritage. The New Zealand Historic Places Trust proposed adopting a thematic approach to assist with assessment of representations of Aotearoa-New Zealand history in 1987. It was thought that this analysis of history would be a useful tool in assisting the development of a balanced approach to historic place management. Twenty-one master themes and 101 sub-themes were devised for the history of Aotearoa-New Zealand. The master themes were: discovery, settlement, indigenous plants, cultivation, wild animals, livestock, commerce, mining, engineering, transport, communication, politics, justice, religion, war and peace, knowledge, arts and crafts, health and welfare, women's history, leisure, and human association (A full list of the themes and their associated sub-themes appears in Appendix C). The process was assessed in a type of pilot study which was reported to be satisfactory, but this proposal has not been followed by further work. The reasons for this are unknown.

Theme analysis could be a useful approach for prioritizing hut management according to particular cultural heritage themes, but there are still difficulties. They are similar to those which are apparent when using any criterion system. Someone must assess significance and assign the area or site to a theme or sub-theme. This approach also relies on obvious indicators or known histories of places, so again, less tangible meanings may not be taken into account. A second problem is that this system was used after places have already been classified by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust, so it incorporates their inherent biases and preferences. Third, this type of system relies on continued funding to keep assessing and evaluating. Continual funding has been a problem for the Protected Natural Area programme, so it is likely that it could be a problem for any historic place theme analysis programme also. Finally, two of the problems which are associated with using the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum are apparent in theme analysis as well: 1) the finished study will only provide a snapshot of what is happening - it will not account for continual changes, additions and alterations to sites; 2) it only recognises particular types of meanings - in historic theme analysis, only historic meanings are accepted, while with R.O.S., only recreational experiences are acknowledged.
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Despite these difficulties, theme analysis may be a useful strategy because, similar to the use of general criteria, it provides a broad framework for decision-making by communities. Theme analysis enables a community to evaluate its resources as representations of particular pasts. A practical approach to its use would continue to use the themes list constructed by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust, rather than producing a completely new one. Although some of the problems associated with using a list such as this are critical, strategies which lessen some of the immediate difficulties can be formulated.

Firstly, the list of themes and sub-themes are essentially categories under which common features are grouped. They should be seen as a place to start, but are not necessary complete: it may be possible to add categories which incorporate some of the lesser known values of huts. Secondly, one of the flaws in the United States application of theme analysis was that it took into account only classified areas. Adopting a less restrictive approach to categorisation, such as allowing any hut which can be associated with a sub-theme to be included. Furthermore, all the identifiable meanings should be categorised. This would ensure that huts were not just analyzed solely for their ‘most important’ value.

The whole analysis of huts with cultural heritage significance within an Aotearoa-New Zealand themes list is inherently reductionist, which has been implied as a weakness. However, it is inevitable that there is some kind of reduction of complex issues into less complex constituents. The key points are to accept that difficulties are inevitable, as in any method of evaluation and analysis, and ensure that the goal of theme analysis is to present a balanced and representative snapshot of areas with specific meanings, rather than an all-encompassing answer to difficulties in cultural heritage evaluation.

**Repairs and maintenance**

Assessing the cultural heritage values of huts in the back-country is one component of cultural heritage management. Maintaining huts is another. There are a range of options which specify approaches to maintenance and care of huts as cultural heritage resources.
One possibility for the Department of Conservation is to persist with its present approach to the maintenance and repairs of huts - some huts which are used frequently will continue to be repaired and maintained as required, while other huts which are rarely used will be left. Leaving some huts alone because they are little used is not necessarily a problem in terms of their value as cultural heritage resources. Sometimes the most significant thing about a hut is that it exists; being able to stay in it may be of secondary importance.

Demolishing and removing all traces of huts which are not used is another option, rather than leaving them to deteriorate. Some huts would be demolished because they are no longer necessary as recreational facilities if few people use them as they are in remote and inaccessible places. Perhaps in recreational terms it is reasonable to conclude that if a hut is no longer necessary for shelter, it is acceptable to remove it. However, people do not necessarily have to have a furnished hut to ascribe some meaning to it. Just traces of other people in a remote, perhaps wild, place can make it interesting to some visitors to these areas.

A push to demolish and remove huts from remote areas may be motivated by concerns other than frequency of use. It can also be related to a fundamental concern that humans are intruders in the wilderness, so, if wilderness areas are left alone, they will return to their former, pristine state (Griffiths, 1991). However, the difficulty with this idea is that: there are no primeval, non-human landscapes (Griffiths, 1991:23). This issue has been the focus of some debate in Australia.

Old huts on public land in Victoria were threatened with removal because of their association (for Park Managers) with an unpleasant history: The history carried unwelcome and contradictory messages for a flora and fauna reserves: that this bushland had been 'disturbed', that much of the site of this 'original remnant of vegetation' had previously been cleared, and that the abused bushland could regenerate so quickly (Griffiths, 1991:16). Despite these concerns, Griffiths (1991:32) suggested that cultural heritage is important: You can get too preoccupied with the exotic and rare ... In some cases, it is just as important that we maintain local associations or regional variety or national abundance. Thus, demolishing and removing all traces of former human inhabitation denies the
present community any chance of associating huts in the back-country as part of their culture, while a quest for pristine wilderness is unrealistic and unattainable.

Perhaps the opposite approach to the demolition of huts is to preserve them in their original form. The assessment process may identify a hut with some value as a cultural heritage resource and then the management process attempts to preserve and prevent any change in appearance. Chancellor Hut is being 'preserved' - any repairs and maintenance of the hut will be in a similar style and use similar materials as in the original. However, a 'preservation' approach towards cultural heritage resource management is flawed because it means that a static picture of the past is preserved, whereas change is inherent in cultural heritage - it is a dynamic, moving, phenomenon and it is appropriate that changes in huts reflect the needs of people at specific points of time. Many of the meanings are not dependent upon an unaltered relic. But having said this, I accept that the value and significance of some huts is strongly tied their physical appearance. Thus, it may be appropriate that a 'preservation' approach is taken with some huts, but it should be used in a 'balanced' way. For example, the floor of Locke Stream Hut is significant, but the construction method used for the rest of the hut is quite ordinary. In this case, perhaps effort should be put into preserving the floor, but if alterations need to be made to the rest of the hut, such as a more efficient fire, then they should be achieved without extensive attention to historic detail.

Plate 5.4  Locke Stream Hut
A more balanced approach towards managing huts with cultural heritage significance includes some modification and alteration to their structure and appearance. The idea that modifying and altering a hut so it is perhaps a little more appealing and comfortable than it was previously in not necessarily wrong in terms of cultural heritage values. The values and meanings are not so much linked to an immaculate appearance as they are to people's experiences and explanations of the hut. Modifications and alterations are more likely to be accepted as the process of cultural heritage. This option ensures that the hut remains and is a tangible reminder of the past, but it is also a functional move - both recreational and cultural heritage values are recognised.

Meanings and values may also be developed or enhanced by some interpretation of the pasts associated with the hut. This may be in a simple form such as histories or stories of people and past activities in the hut book or perhaps display boards attached to an inner wall. Douglas Rock Hut may have some mention of Charles 'Mr Explorer' Douglas and his links with the hut site and area, while the hut book in Lawyer's Delight Hut, site of the first hut built in the 1930s by possum trappers, could perhaps include some account of its links with these times.

Plate 5.5  Lawyer's Delight Hut
A dilemma

The range of management options presented is just a selection of the spectrum available. There are many alternatives which use aspects of these approaches - perhaps a section of a hut may be preserved because it illustrates some particular type of construction technique, but a new section could be built to ensure that users of the hut have a comfortable and furnished facility. However, it is also important to discuss the implications of managing cultural heritage resources.

What constitutes cultural heritage is dynamic and changing, and their meanings as cultural heritage are vulnerable to change and alteration, whereas, in contrast, management implies 'doing something' definitive and fixed. The management of huts involves actively deciding future approaches to huts, whether action is in the form of intervention or not. The key here is that there are always implications in assessing the value of the resource, because: interaction with a heritage continually alters its nature and context, whether by choice or by chance (Lowenthal, 1985:263). Interacting with the meanings of the hut cannot be avoided when evaluating its importance. In fact, it is a paradox. Managing cultural heritage fundamentally changes it and yet, not managing it may mean it disappears, burns down or disintegrates. Without these cultural heritage resources we may feel disjointed or disassociated from our surroundings, so the whole issue of cultural heritage management presents many dilemmas.

Chapter conclusion

Hut management is a process and the first stage concerns deciding which huts have cultural heritage values, and the second deals with actually doing something about them. Assessing and evaluating meanings is not straightforward, but it is important that the methods used can accommodate the variety of meanings which can be associated with huts. The culture of the local community associated with a hut or group of huts is important and community members can be involved in decisions on the future of their heritage. Various approaches to community participation in the decision-making process are already in use by the Department of Conservation, but care must be taken to ensure that these, and other methods, do account for the wishes of the community and are not simply exercises in tokenism. The Department of Conservation can perhaps provide a framework as guidance for the community by using general criteria, perhaps as well as using a thematic analysis approach, whilst allowing for local interpretations and priorities.
Once decisions have been made about which huts are culturally significant, decisions need to be made about what should be done with them. A range of management actions are available, and these range from 'doing nothing' (apart from recognising any cultural significance) to complete preservation. These management processes, however, infer that any management of a hut inherently changes its nature. The concept of cultural heritage is dynamic, changeable and culturally specific. Any approaches to its management must recognise this and of the inevitability of changes in some of the meanings of the hut. It will no longer just be an 'old hut' in the back-country, but will be labelled a 'cultural heritage resource'.
Chapter Six - Conclusions

The concept of cultural heritage

Dealing with the concept of cultural heritage in a practical way has been the focus of this dissertation, but understanding why cultural heritage is important is essential to achieving this aim. Cultural heritage enables us to feel belonging in a community and instills a sense of place because we associate emotions, sensations and events with locations. These meanings are constructed through the individual feelings and experiences of the person, as well as their social, political and historical background. Cultural heritage resources are those which arouse a positive feeling of place, they are tangible, such as myths, narrative and objects, and they have an association with the past. The important aspect of their link with the past is that cultural heritage resources are not necessarily the same as historic resources. ‘Historic’ implies a particular link with an event in history, whereas cultural heritage there needs only to be an association with the near, known past. It is imperative that resources which are ‘old’ are not automatically assumed to have pre-eminence as cultural heritage. Meanings and a sense of place develop in association with an accessible past, rather than necessarily having associations with ‘the oldest’.

The Department of Conservation, huts and cultural heritage

Huts in the back-country are part of our heritage - they are associated with past times and some have positive meanings for people. But there are many huts and financial resources are scarce. Decisions must be made about their future - priorities for management must be allocated. The case study of 15 huts on the West Coast found that the Department of Conservation views huts in one of two ways: either they are recreational facilities and require many visitors to warrant maintenance; or, they are ‘historic’ and demonstrate an essential link with Aotearoa-New Zealand history. This approach fails to recognize that huts have many more meanings associated with them than these.

The Department of Conservation’s recognition of huts as ‘historic’ can be partially explained by Tuan’s (1975b) analysis of places as either ‘public symbols’ or ‘fields-of-care’. Whereas ‘public symbols’ are relatively easy to identify, huts which are ‘fields-of-care’ types of places are less
recognisable. The Department associates national importance with an ability to identify obvious meanings. Thus, a discussion about the relative scale of importance is useful because it reiterates that dealing with cultural heritage resources and prioritizing their management requires an appraisal of their value.

The value of resources is a relative term - the importance of Chancellor Hut, for example, is assessed in relation to the importance of Whataroa Junction Hut. Chancellor Hut may be seen to be more important than Whataroa Junction Hut because its design is unusual and has significant associations with the development of mountaineering and tourism in Aotearoa-New Zealand, while Whataroa Junction Hut can be seen to be important in the history of the local community of Whataroa because it is associated with gold mining in the area, and is linked with the well-known Nolan family of South Westland. There is a hierarchy in the evaluation of importance. Some resources can be seen to be significant for the whole of Aotearoa-New Zealand, whereas others have particular importance for a local community or lower in the hierarchy still, a family or individual person. Legislation governing the management of cultural heritage reflects this stratum. For example, the Historic Places Act 1980 specifies that resources are to be assessed for classification according to their national, regional or local significance.

The identification and management of huts as cultural heritage resources by the Department of Conservation are not just affected by this idea that meanings will be obvious. They are also influenced by demands that decision-making and spending be accountable to the general public and reflect the a prevailing belief in scientific method. These influences mean that evaluating their significance requires benefits and advantages to be made explicit - Chancellor Hut is the oldest, or the floor in Locke Stream Hut is the only example of its kind. One of the difficulties with this is that these recognisable values are not necessarily the ones which are the most important for the people whose cultural heritage it is. Thus, allowing people to participate in decision-making about the future of their resources may allow some of the less well-known meanings of huts to be taken into account.

A positive approach to defining huts as cultural heritage means that some huts in the back-country can be retained, rather than perhaps being demolished and removed, because they have little use as shelter.
Deciding which huts should be retained requires an understanding of the nature of cultural heritage, an assessment of the value of the hut, and knowledge of where the evaluation fits in the hierarchy of importance.

The Department of Conservation can be seen to be primarily responsible for the conservation of symbols which are representative of a national culture. But this national culture comprises of a conglomeration of local cultures, so having national guidelines for the evaluation of important symbols may be seen to be equivalent to a domination by one cultural group, while the importance of variations in local interpretations are ignored. However, the meeting of national hegemony with local interpretations of culture (as in the Department of Conservation) need not be seen as a clash of extreme perspectives.

The framework of the Department of Conservation means that there can be both an overview of a national culture of Aotearoa-New Zealand and an acceptance of community interpretations. National guidelines such as general criteria and a theme framework can be just that - guidelines. Communities can choose their own cultural heritage, drawing on the assistance of these guidelines. This approach does not supersede the model of top-down management and suggest that all cultural heritage management should be completely devolved to communities. It accepts that the infrastructure to implement cultural heritage management strategies lies with the Department of Conservation, while allowing the people whose cultural symbols they are, to influence decision-making.

**Practical strategies**

Practical approaches for implementing these ideals include using the principles of hui to guide public meetings, allowing oral submissions, as well as written, to be included in the standard procedure. Defining the ‘community’ can perhaps be left to the people themselves, rather than specifying regional boundaries. Thus, input into the decision-making process could be from tramping, climbing and deer hunting groups, as well as historical societies or interested individuals.

Understanding and prioritising cultural heritage resources can be assisted by the use of general criteria and theme analysis. Resources should be assessed with these criteria providing a general guide as to
what is cultural heritage, and the level or scale of importance - as in local, regional or national. Thus, a Hut such as Blue River (Blowfly) may be associated with the use of the Haast-Paringa Track as the route between for cattle droving in South Westland. At a local level, the hut was lived in by Jack Farrell, a road man, who was known for his marrow wine and electric lighting. Criteria should be used in a positive way, highlighting the key associations, rather than the fact that a hut may not demonstrate a significant building design or associations with nationally significant people. For example, Slaty Creek Hut can be associated with the deer culling era, while it also demonstrates an unusual design and use of materials. Criteria should not be used to highlight that Slaty Creek Hut has little association with significant people or particular events.

Theme analysis provides a frame within which different meanings can be placed. It may enable a community to see what types of symbols and era have been conserved so far, and then decide which resources could also be consciously retained to present a balanced view of the past. Analyzing Garden Gully Hut within the themes framework sees it representing the themes of: settlement - as part of an early mining settlement; politics - as a representation of a governmental depression mining scheme; and human association - as a home. Then, if Top Hut was analyzed and was seen to represent the same themes, its conservation may not be seen to be essential if the goal of the community is to retain symbols which are representative of particular aspects of the past.

The strategy so far has ignored the idea of the hut as a recreational facility - which recognises that huts are useful as shelter in the back-country. This point is not essential for the evaluation of cultural heritage, but it is important for the multi-responsibilities and roles of the Department of Conservation. The amount of use and perceptions of its value as a recreational hut can perhaps be added to the list of general criteria. The amount of use can be assessed in general terms, such as frequent, little and so on. These are not absolute values, but neither are many of the other values associated with huts. The general criteria could be developed to incorporate a fourth:

1. An ability to demonstrate philosophy, custom, taste, particular design, usage or association with events;
2. Associational links - those not related to any surviving or discoverable evidence;
3. Formal or aesthetic qualities - these are assessed under conventional headings, such as scale, form or materials
4. Value as a recreational facility - related to the amount of use by visitors.
The fourth criterion should be seen as recognition of the environment and context of back-country huts.

Just as the cultural heritage assessment process can take into account recreational values, it is useful to explain how the recreational process can take cultural heritage values into consideration. Assessing the value of huts as recreational facilities already accommodates conceptual values, as demonstrated by an acceptance of the importance of wilderness, so integrating the perspective cultural heritage values should not be too complex. For example, it would be possible to add another map overlay to the R.O.S. mapping process, although whether the Department of Conservation chooses to do so is another matter. This map would show significant cultural heritage sites and areas, and this assessment would be used in conjunction with the other maps illustrating the wilderness/natural resource recreation opportunities. Taking into account cultural heritage meanings, as well as those associated with recreational experiences within the recreational assessment of huts should mean that huts with significance as cultural heritage, although of lesser recreational importance, are not dismissed as valueless by recreation managers.

Evaluating the case study huts

The recommendations of this dissertation have been oriented towards allowing community members to participate in determining the future of their cultural heritage. Thus, as a member of the community interested in the future of huts in the West Coast region, I present my evaluations of the huts in the case study. These evaluations are based on the four general criteria. Integral in the evaluations are practical approaches for the repair and maintenance of each hut, reflecting their relative values.

Adam's Flat Hut

Adam's Flat Hut is interesting as a remnant of the 1930s Depression mining times, as discussed in Chapter Two on page 15. However, it is in a dilapidated and run-down condition and so, in conjunction with its site on a minor track only one-and-a-half hours from the road end, it probably has little value as a place to stay. Adam's Flat Hut could be left to deteriorate further, but it would still fulfil a role as a relic of the gold mining days, while no money would be required for its maintenance.
in the future. (Although when and if it gets to the dangerous state of near collapse, it would be appropriate if it was pushed over - it would still remain as a relic, but perhaps be less recognisable as a hut).

**Garden Gully Hut**

Garden Gully Hut is already maintained to ensure it remains as a relic. It is an interesting hut because of its building style, although largely a replica of the original. It seems appropriate to continue the present approach to its maintenance.

**Top Hut**

Top Hut is in a similar position, technically, to Meikle’s Hut, although it seems to be less dilapidated and more rat-proof. It does not appear to have any significant design features, although it too, like Garden Gully, Meikle’s and Adam’s Flat Huts, is associated with gold mining during the Depression years. From this perspective, it could be left to deteriorate as a relic of these times, but because of its proximity to a well-used tramping track, the Croesus Track, it may be maintained to provide lodging for an ‘over-flow’ of people in the nearby Ces Clark Hut.

**Meikle’s Hut**

Meikle’s Hut has been identified by the Department of Conservation to have historic importance. However, despite the values associated with it by the Department of Conservation, I do not feel it needs to be maintained. It is weather-proof, but is run down and not rat-proof, so could be left to deteriorate further, and would still remain as a relic of the Depression mining years for years to come.

**Slaty Creek Hut**

Slaty Creek Hut does have an interesting construction style, being built of pit-sawn wood slabs, and it would be appropriate to see this feature maintained. However, the inside of the hut is only roughly comfortable, as a dry place to stay (as described in the introduction - Chapter One, page 1), so perhaps alterations could be undertaken without too much concern for historic interests.
Tutaekuri Junction Hut

This hut was also built from pit-sawn slabs of wood, nearly identical to Slaty Creek Hut. However, the slabs have been covered with sheets of iron which conceal this feature. Tutaekuri Junction Hut could perhaps be maintained if future use warrants it, although it is likely it will be left to decay as a relic of the deer culling era during the late 1940s and 1950s.

Crane Creek Hut

Crane Creek Hut is listed by the Department of Conservation as a recreational facility in their care, although the West Coast Branch of the New Zealand Deer Stalkers’ Association, who built the hut in 1955, still have an interest in it. The setting of the hut is impressive, as discussed in Chapter Two, page 17, but the hut itself is not particularly appealing. From this perspective, Crane Creek Hut could be left to deteriorate by the Department of Conservation. It is possible that members of the West Coast Branch of the New Zealand Deer Stalkers’ Association will repair and maintain the hut as part of their heritage.

Locke Stream Hut

The floor of Locke Stream Hut is significant, as discussed in Chapter Two, page 14, and the hut itself has interesting associations with the push for national fitness and health in the late 1930s. However, it is the floor which seems to be significant in future approaches to maintenance. The floor could be preserved as much as practicable, while changes necessary to make the hut more comfortable, such as the provision of running water or a new fire box, could be implemented without too much attention to historic detail.

Lawyer’s Delight Hut

This hut does not have any obvious indicators of its associations with people and activities in the past, even though it is on the site of the previous hut build by possum trapper during the Depression years. Approaches to the maintenance of Lawyer’s Delight Hut need not take into account any particular construction method, although some interpretation of the pasts of the hut may be interesting to visitors.
Whataroa Junction Hut

Whataroa Junction Hut provides a dry place to shelter from a storm although it is in a dilapidated condition. The hut could be left to degenerate and exist as a relic of mining in the area.

Nolan’s Flat Hut

Nolan’s Flat Hut has survived the years since its construction remarkably well - it seems to be in a reasonably good condition. It does not appear to have been built by a particularly significant or perhaps unusual technique, so need not be repaired with too much attention to these details.

Almer Hut

If the proposed ‘C’ classification of Almer Hut is adopted by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust, then it is likely to be preserved as a historic feature. However, it does not seem necessary that the hut is preserved in an unchanging and static state. It is the history and the setting of the hut which seem most important - the hut itself is actually the third to be known as Almer. My strategy for its future endorses the approach that where repairs are required, they are implemented without pedantic regard for historic detail.

Chancellor Hut

Chancellor Hut has been used as an example of where a ‘preservationist’ approach is used in the previous section. Despite the flaws in this approach, it is sometimes useful. Chancellor Hut does present an interesting example of an early alpine hut, and this is enhanced when you know it was carried to its site on the backs of men. Thus, it seems that any repairs and maintenance should replicate the original building process as much as practicable.

Douglas Rock Hut

Douglas Rock Hut is used often because of its location as the first hut on the West Coast side of the Copland Pass, a major route over the Main Divide. Although built at the same time and in the same style as Chancellor Hut, Douglas Rock Hut has been extensively modified to accommodate the current needs of users. It still has significant association with events and activities in the past, but it seems unnecessary to have any great concerns for its original appearance in the management process.
Blue River (Blowfly) Hut

Blue River (Blowfly) Hut was extensively modified during the 1980s (see Hut Stories in Appendix B), so little of its original condition is evident. The key meanings I associate with this hut are linked to its history and place, not its construction method, so maintaining this hut as a ‘static’ relic seems unnecessary. As with Almer Hut, repairs could be carried out when required.

Conservation?

The recommendations for repair and maintenance strategies for each of the huts vary from preservation, through conservation, to proposals which almost ignore the idea of cultural heritage conservation. The key to this latter approach is accepting that cultural heritage meanings are not solely linked to physical appearance. A significant hut need not look ‘old’ nor need to be built in a particular way to have value as cultural heritage. It is the associations with experiences and emotions, and events and people in the past which is important. However, some huts, such as Chancellor, Slaty Creek and Locke Stream have particular design and constructions features which have value. For these, preservation techniques can be used, while for many other huts, dealing with it as a ‘place’ - a cultural heritage resource as a whole, is important, and conservation practices - allowing some alteration and change is appropriate. There is scope within cultural heritage to allow all these variations in management.

Changes over time

Resources which can be assessed to have cultural heritage value do not necessarily remain important over time. Culture develops and so changes with the passage of time. The implications of this feature of cultural heritage is that resources cannot necessarily be considered ‘things that we want to keep’ for ever. The relative values and meanings of resources may change as different groups or generations become responsible for their management. This is not a weakness of cultural heritage, but inherent in its nature. Thus, within the management process, changes in values should be accepted within a flexible format.
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Appendix A - Case Study Methodology

The issue

The Department of Conservation has a dominant role in the management of the heritage of Aotearoa-New Zealand and in the provision of recreational facilities. Huts in the back-country are examples of structures which can be considered cultural heritage resources, but which are usually managed as recreational facilities. Problems occur when they are seen as both heritage resources and recreational facilities. Maintenance of a hut is generally determined by the number of users. High use by trampers, climbers and walkers warrants its continued maintenance. A hut with few users per year is threatened with demolition by Department of Conservation staff, because it is perceived as being unnecessary, irrespective of its actual or potential heritage value. This imbalance redressed by considering the role of back-country huts as cultural heritage. This case study enables consideration of the broad concept of cultural heritage within a specific framework - that of the Department of Conservation and its operations.

The nature of the issue means that the project can be segmented into two parts. The first involves developing an understanding of the role of huts as heritage. The second requires this understanding to be considered in conjunction with the mandate of the Department of Conservation and its philosophical and operating framework.

A case study approach

A case study approach has be taken because this reduces the scale of research into a manageable unit. The case study is not so much a method, but a whole approach to the research project. It provides a framework within which specific methods are used for specific purposes. The strength of using a case study is that the researcher can focus on something which can be understood in its complexity, but is of a manageable size (Moore, 1983).

Several weakness have been identified with case study research. One is that they lack the statistical validity of samples. This means the researcher cannot generalise from the conclusions (Yin, 1984;
Moore, 1983). This is a valid and reasonable comment, but perhaps it is appropriate to question how scientists can generalize from a single experiment. Thus, we can say that case studies, like experiments, are generalizable to theoretical propositions, and not to populations or universes (Yin, 1984:21). Another perceived problem is that case studies lack rigour. However, similar problems of bias are inherent in all research methods (Yin, 1984; Ackroyd and Hughes, 1981).

**Huts on the West Coast**

The case study was defined by the boundaries of the West Coast Conservancy of the Department of Conservation. This conservancy was selected for pragmatic reasons. Conservancy staff were supportive of the study, supplying accommodation, transport and administrative assistance, while archives and files relating to the huts were in one geographical area.

Additional use of the case study approach has further narrowed the number of huts in the investigation. The West Coast Conservancy of the Department of Conservation has 160 huts in the back-country in its care. All these huts could not be studied, and so chose to start from an inventory of the huts on the West Coast Conservancy and select huts from this list. It was estimated that 15 huts could be studied at the required depth within the time available.

Inventories are a 'traditional' part of the management planning process for recreational facilities (Nesbitt and Reid, 1989; Manning, 1986). Research by Nesbitt and Reid in Canada identified that most recreation plans depend on an inventory for much of their background research. However, Nesbitt and Reid also identified that there are problems inherent in using inventories because they often suffer from a lack of comprehensiveness and missing information.

Implicit in any inventory of huts held by the Department of Conservation is that the huts are 'usable' in the sense of providing shelter. This means fragments of huts on lands managed by the Department were not considered. This is because the primary focus is to understand the issues and concerns which arise when dealing with the concept of heritage as it related to the concept of recreational shelter. Thus, this research is about huts which are seen and managed primarily as recreational facilities, and yet which make some contribution as cultural heritage. Furthermore, the threats to huts in the back-
country which can be considered heritage are slightly different to most other heritage resources. This is because huts are threatened with demolition because of their lack of use, whereas other heritage resources, such as mining relics, remnants of timber logging and so on, are usually threatened by more natural hazards. These may include degeneration of the resource through forest regrowth or naturally induced decay, or programmes by Department of Conservation staff to ‘tidy’ the wilderness.

An inventory of huts in the West Coast Conservancy is available, although there is some inconsistency between lists generated by different people for different purposes. The most recent inventory, RECORD, is operated by DbaseIV, a data base package. RECORD is a national recreation facility inventory which was developed during 1990. The facility inventory has three major uses:

(i) As an aid to operations management.
(ii) To provide accurate information for the public.
(iii) To provide an easily referenced source of basic statistics.

The West Coast Conservancy has nearly all its recreational facilities (including huts, tracks, bridges and picnic sites) entered on RECORD, although there is not a full record of data for each entry.

Essentially, the usefulness of inventories is related to how up-to-date they are (Nesbitt and Reid, 1989). This is recognised by the Department of Conservation. For example, in a memo to Field Centre Managers from the West Coast Conservancy Recreation Planner, there was a request for further information about facilities: You will all be aware of the worth of having this information in this format - but it is only of any use if the data are up-to-date.

Accuracy and consistency of information contained in RECORD was checked against a list of huts compiled during 1989. The purpose of the 1989 hut inventory was for asset evaluation. A comparison of the two inventories showed that the lists of huts were consistent, although some of dates of construction varied. Anomalies in this category were checked with registers held by individual field centres.

---

63 Memo, 27 March 1991, File 3.1.2.5, West Coast Conservancy, Department of Conservation.

64 ibid. (emphasis added).
The qualitative methods used in this study do not rely on units sampled at random. Random sampling strategies allow generalisations to be made about populations, or units of analysis (which in this case would be huts). Ackroyd and Hughes (1981) defined randomness as values which are not biased. However, random sampling cannot guarantee that it will provide the true population value. There are still problems in answering questions such as: How large does a sample have to be for a given population? or: How can we be sure that it provides a basis for accurate and reliable estimate of the population itself? (Ackroyd and Hughes, 1981:37). Furthermore, biases are inherent anyway - researchers have influence, and do favour some and disfavour others. Qualitative sampling focuses in-depth on small numbers of units, which are selected purposefully (Patton, 1990). The logic and power of purposeful sampling is selecting information rich cases for study.

A 'criterion sampling' method was used to narrow the number of huts in the study. This sampling method means picking all cases that meet some standard - such as the age, size, or type of hut (Patton, 1990). The criterion used to select purposefully huts was that of date of construction. This is because there is an undeniable link between things considered to be heritage resources and their association with times past. Thus, selecting huts which are likely to have some history, spanning a number of years, means that differences in perception about heritage can be examined. Other criteria could have been used. For example, selecting huts which were representative of certain terrain types, geographical area or historical era. However, using more criteria to refine the case study further seemed unnecessary because the 15 oldest huts listed incorporated a range of terrain types and historical periods.

The focus of this study is huts as cultural heritage. But what must not be forgotten and what is vitally important in examining this issue, is their association with people. People ascribe value to a resource. Thus, selecting 15 huts for further study is only one part of the project. People must also be part of this study. The huts cannot have value, as cultural heritage, without memories, interpretations and histories by people. Various research methods must be used to examine the meanings associated with huts as links with the past.
Research methods

Research methods are usually divided into qualitative and quantitative categories, but boundaries between the two categories are frequently blurred. Simmons (1985) defined the categories as formal and informal methods. He suggests that formal methods are highly structured in terms of their setting and response. Informal methods are less constrained in both setting and their mode of response.

Qualitative methods of data collection allow the researcher to study selected issues, cases, or events in depth and detail (Patton, 1990:9). Such an approach contributes to the richness of data available for analysis because data collection is not constrained by pre-determined categories of analysis. Qualitative data provides depth and detail through precise description and direct quotation of situations, events, observations, people and interactions. The qualitative data are collected without attempting to fit information into the predetermined, standardised categories defined by typical survey questionnaires.

The goal of collecting data by qualitative methods such as participant observation, depth interviews and document analysis, is to build theory. This theory is grounded in real phenomena. You do not begin with a theory and prove it, but begin with an area of study and relevant issues and themes of theoretical relevance are allowed to emerge (Strauss and Corbin, 1990).

The researcher is an instrument in qualitative inquiry. Validity of the data depends on the skill, competence and rigor of the person doing the work (Patton, 1990). Qualitative investigation is a ‘scientific method’. The procedures meet criteria for good science - significance, theory-observation compatibility, generalisability, reproducibility, precision, rigor and verification (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). The issue is not whether these principles are met, but how they are interpreted and defined.

The task is to collect the richest possible data which may assist in understanding both what contribution huts make to cultural heritage on the West Coast and, what their management should be. Rich data mean (sic), ideally, a wide and diverse range of information collected over a relatively prolonged period of time (Lofland and Lofland, 1984:11). The methods used to collect data reflect this goal, and the interdisciplinary nature of the study.
The data collection process

Data was collected in three ways: 1) information related to the 15 huts in the case study was gathered through examining the huts themselves, and analyzing oral and written histories; 2) to understand the meaning and values ascribed to huts in the back-country, people who use them were talked to and; 3) the management of huts and cultural heritage by the Department of Conservation through participant observation, depth interviews and document analysis.

Hut investigations

Integral to this study is a physical investigation. Lewis (1989) suggested that a physical investigation is important because it may establish the date of building, some information about the life of the occupants may become apparent, or it may provide information for the purposes of restoration. However, he proposes that physical investigation is rarely conclusive in its own right (Lewis, 1989:4). Thus, while there will be some assessment of the physical attributes of huts, this information will be analyzed with data collected by other methods.

The approach used to investigate the physical features of the huts was not necessarily to record measurements, but to understand the context of a hut - its place in the landscape was experienced, its atmosphere felt, its physical appearance and condition seen and gain an understanding of its relationship to tracks and routes and other features in the vicinity.

Visits to the 15 huts were attempted during the summer of 1991/92 - 14 hut visits were successful. The West Coast rain and rivers thwarted three planned visits to Tutaekuri Junction Hut. Many field trips were delayed by bad weather, but this is a risk inherent in any field investigations on the West Coast.

Oral and written histories were also used in this section. The data collected by these methods enhanced my understanding of the huts and the people originally associated with them. Problems are inherent in both oral and written histories, as discussed in Chapter Two. Oral histories are often said to be less reliable than written histories. However, oral histories are no different from written histories in that both are derived from human perception and are subjective (Thompson, 1988). This means that
an oral historian should follow the same general rules as other historians when examining evidence: to look for internal consistency, to seek confirmation in other sources, and to be aware of potential bias (Thompson, 1988:102). A problem specific to this study was that it was difficult to find written information. There were few written records for many of the huts.

People and huts in the back-country

People at some of the 15 huts in the study, and at other huts in the West Coast back-country visited during site investigations were informally questioned. The main difficulty with conducting these on-site discussions was that few people were encountered. This was despite the timing of most of the site visits to the peak of the summer season. The phrase 'old huts' was used in any discussions with participants during field work, in preference to the terms 'historic' or 'heritage' huts. I consider the term 'old' to be less value-laden than 'heritage' and 'historic' and did not want to label huts and ascribe value, when exploring the concept of huts as heritage with people.

Loosely structured interviews were used to examine some of the issues highlighted during informal discussions in more depth. Nine depth interviews were conducted with users of back-country huts. The activities of participants included tramping, hunting and mountaineering. Contact with prospective interviewees was through people known to be involved in these activities, or where possible, when in a back-country hut. However, there were not often people in the back-country areas visited. People who consented to these interviews were promised anonymity. Pseudonym first names have been used in this dissertation.

There was no formal structure to the interviews, although there was a list of issues to cover in each discussion. This format allowed probes into specific issues raised by interviewees. The purpose of data gathered through participant observation and depth interviewing was to gain some insight into the meanings people attach to huts with an association with the past. Analysis of data was not expected to produce findings from which generalisations could be made.
The management of huts and cultural heritage

Observations of the operations of the West Coast Conservancy were made during the three month data collection period when based at the office. These observations and insights were examined further through depth interviews with key management staff. Through these interviews, some of the perceptions that decision-makers had about the management of huts and their link with the heritage of the West Coast were investigated. Access to the Conservancy working files during this period provided a written record and background information for some issues.

Limitations

There are always critical trade-offs in a research project and there are no perfect research designs (Patton, 1990:162). The first trade-off occurred in framing the research project. By limiting the study area to that of the West Coast Conservancy boundaries, huts are not considered in other contexts or settings, nor in other conservancies. The second trade-off occurred because the investigation was limited by time and resources. Twelve weeks were available for data collection.

Interpreting and analyzing the data

The data collection process is a means not an end in itself. The challenge is to make sense of the amounts data collected, reduce the volume of information through analysis, identify significant patterns, and to construct a framework for communicating the essence of what the data reveals. However, there are no formulae for determining significance, no way of perfectly replicating my analytical thought processes, and no straight forward tests for reliability and validity (Patton, 1990).

The concept of 'meaning' provides a practical framework for interpretation and analysis of material collected during fieldwork. The central research question concerns understanding and evaluating huts in the back-country of Aotearoa-New Zealand, with regard to concepts of cultural heritage. Thus, huts are places which mean something to people. Material was analyzed drawing on inferences made by people which indicate meanings huts have for them. Part of communicating findings is describing the setting, providing a background for the reader (Patton, 1990). However, even though description provides a framework for the reader, it must also be realized that an investigator's description implicitly involves interpretation and analysis (Geertz, 1973).
Appendix B - Hut Stories

Garden Gully Hut

Gold mining hit the Blackball and Moonlight Creeks in the winter of 1865. The construction and development of the Croesus and Moonlight Tracks fluctuated with the changing fortunes of the valleys. Dennis (1981) says that the final sections of the Croesus Track was cut by 1881. The track is for the most part, a magnificent old benched tracks, carefully built out of hard ancient greywacke to stand the test of time and the passage of many feet (Dennis, 1981:60). Garden Gully Hut is the only one of five still standing in the clearing. They were built there during the Depression for quartz prospectors. Permanent occupation of the huts was between 1931 and 1937.

It takes about two hours to walk from the Smoke Ho car park at the Blackball end of the Croesus Track to Garden Gully Hut. The hut is five minutes along a side track off the Croesus Track. The hut is sited in a clearing, known as adjacent to the Roaring Meg Stream. The Croesus Track crosses the Paparoa Range between Blackball and Barrytown. The hut and track is accessible in all conditions, although travel across the open tops is not recommended during bad weather. All creeks and streams are crossed by swing bridges put in by the New Zealand Forest Service.

The hut is low-walled, iron roofed with a long overhang. The overhang is to protect the canvas clad walls. It is not known how much of the present Garden Gully hut is the original materials. From a New Zealand Forest Service report in 1984, it seems as if much of the hut was rebuilt. The report advocated rebuilding:

An inadequate foundation, the makeshift nature of framing repairs and exterior patching argue against renovations. Rebuilding in the same constructional style but substituting vertical batten and board for canvas will still retain the early character of the area.

The hut is a well-maintained reconstruction. A number of other relics in the area are also sign posted and have good tracks and bridges going to them. Garden Gully Hut is referred to as a ‘historic hut’ in

---

65 This section does not include the history of Adam’s Flat Hut because this was detailed in Chapter Two, page 15.

66 New Zealand Archaeological Association Site Record Form S44/36.

the West Coast Conservancy Business Plan 1991/92. This means repairs and maintenance costs are charged to the Historic Resources Section in the Business Plan. The hut is visited approximately four times per year.  

**Top Hut**

Many miners huts once stood alongside or adjacent to the Croesus Track. Top Hut and Garden Gully Hut are the only two still standing. It is presumed to have been built by miners during the depression, but could be located on the site of earlier huts. The area was mined for many years. Gold was first discovered in the Blackball Creek during November 1864 (Eastwood, 1986). However, the exact date mining leading to the construction of Top Hut is not known. The track to Croesus Knob was built by about 1899. There was quartz mining, assisted by an aerial tramway, at Croesus Knob.

Top Hut is located at the side of the Croesus Track. It is about 10 kilometres along the track, from the Smoke Ho car park end and is just above the bush line at about 1000 metres above sea level. It has an open fireplace, three sacking bunks and a table. The framing of the hut is conventional and the exterior walls are covered with corrugated steel laid horizontally. The walls are lined with 145 millimetre tongue and groove.

Top Hut was restored by the New Zealand Forest Service at about the same time as Garden Gully Hut. The north wall was replaced because some crude modifications had been carried out at some time. These modifications had shortened the hut by one metre. The chimney was in a state of virtual collapse. *Limited repairs can be effected to restore this hut to a comfortable and reasonably authentic replica*.

**Meikle's Hut**

The Moonlight Valley was discovered by George Fairweather Moonlight in 1865. Moonlight was a legendary prospector and explorer. Nolan (1975:56) states that the Moonlight gold field was *perhaps his greatest discovery*. Quartz crushing in the valley was never successful, but alluvial mining

---


provided steady returns for many years. The Moonlight diggings were the oldest and most durable in the Grey River region (Dennis, 1981).

Meikle was a subsidised prospector who worked a number of claims in the region during the depression. The New Zealand Archaeological Association records state that Robert Pirrie and Bill Meikle occupied the hut now known as Meikle's Hut. A Department of Labour report from 1936 lists a Ben Meikle as one of three men who managed to do well enough to be taken off relief.

Meikle's Hut is located just above the Moonlight Track. It is about two hours walk along the benched track from Anderson's car park. It is slightly concealed on a small terrace. It has two bunks, a small table and a fire place.

_Slaty Creek_

Slaty Creek Hut sits among beech trees where Slaty Creek meets the Waiheke River. The route to the hut follows the Waiheke River and is impassable if the river has risen due to rain. If the river is low, the trip from the car park at Waiheke Downs station to the hut takes four to five hours and is reasonably easy walking along river flats, requiring frequent river crossings.

The hut has four bunks, a bench and stools and an open fire. It is a slab hut, built c1952 for the deer control operations of the Department of Internal Affairs. The deer control programme was restarted after world war two in the late 1940s. Cullers were paid a bounty per tail. Neither the skins nor the meat was wanted and cullers could be fired if they tried to keep the meat or skins - their purpose was to kill the deer. The hut was built by a couple of cullers during winter. The hut served as a base for a culler for his particular block. Slaty Creek Hut is thought to have replaced another hut built by a chap called 'Climo', who was culling in the valley during the late 1940s. Climo's hut is thought to have burnt down, and so was replaced by the New Zealand Forest Service.

---

Tutaekuri Junction Hut

Tutaekuri Junction Hut is at the confluence of the Trent and Tutaekuri Rivers. It is a slab hut, similar to Slaty Creek Hut, but flat tin has been nailed over the slabs to as a preservation measure by the leaseholder. The hut has four bunks and an open fire and is similar to Slaty Creek Hut. It is recorded as being built in 1952\textsuperscript{72}.

Crane Creek Hut

Crane Creek Hut was built in 1956 by the West Coast Branch of the New Zealand Deer Stalker’s Association (N.Z.D.A.). It was pre-cut and flown in. The hut was initially an eight foot by eight foot hut, but was added to in the early 1980s. It now measures 16 feet by eight feet. It is situated in the Rochfort basin, at the head of Crane Creek, above the bush line. It takes three to four hours to walk to the hut, along an often steep and muddy at times. In some places it is overgrown and hard to follow.

The hut was built by the New Zealand Forest Service and the N.Z.D.A. The New Zealand Forest Service hoped recreational hunters would have an impact on the numbers of deer, while the N.Z.D.A. thought the basin was a safe place for their junior members to hunt, although there were not a great many deer in the area: \textit{they could only get lost if the did something very silly - which they did of course}\textsuperscript{73}.

Locke Stream Hut

This hut is on the Harper Pass Route. The route follows the Taramakau River, crosses the Main Divide at Harper Pass, and goes through to Lake Sumner, following the Hurunui River. Locke Stream Hut is the hut closest to the Pass on true left bank of the Taramakau River. It is an 18-bunk hut, built in about 1939 or 1940. It is thought to have been built by Sam Burrows or Burrowes. The wood was cut from the surrounding bush and the floor finished with an adze\textsuperscript{74}. Locke Stream Hut has also

\textsuperscript{72} New Zealand Forest Service Central File 4/10, "List of buildings and environmental huts as at 1982", p.4.

\textsuperscript{73} D. Liddell, pers. comm., 16 February 1992.

\textsuperscript{74} R. Patterson, pers. comm., 30 January 1992.
been known as Number Four Hut and Welfare Hut\textsuperscript{25}. These names reflect its status as the fourth of five huts built for the Department of Internal Affairs, in response to the 1937 Physical Welfare and Recreation Act (Buchanan, 1978).

\textit{Lawyer's Delight Hut}

Lawyer's Delight Hut is on the shores of Lake Kaniere, at Lawyer's Delight Beach. It can be reached by boat or by foot, along the Lake Kaniere Walkway. It takes about one hour to walk there along the walkway, from the Dorothy Falls road end. The hut is lined and has four bunks and a fire place. It is a replacement of the first hut built on the site in the 1930s. The first hut was built by possum hunters, who were trapping during the Depression. Doctor David McQueen accidentally burnt the hut down in about 1955. It was rebuilt in the same year by Ron Ross (Senior). Material was taken to the site by boat\textsuperscript{26}. It is thought that the beach and bay acquired the name Lawyer's Delight by being the favourite place of a lawyer from Hokitika during the 1920s.

\textit{Whataroa Junction Hut}

Whataroa Junction Hut was built in about 1935 by a gold miner named Thompson. Thompson was not well liked by the other miners, but he was befriended by Steve Nolan's father. Mr Nolan would drop off provisions to Thompson as he went past on horse back. Thompson appreciated this gesture so much that he left the hut to the Nolans when he died. The other miners wanted it, but they had given him a hard time. It was in the wrong place for the Nolans however, so they did not use it much and they allowed other miners to use it in later years.

This hut is at the confluence of the Whataroa and Perth Rivers, two hours from Highway Six. The hut is a corrugated iron hut with a dirt floor in a dilapidated condition. Black polythene has been used inside to provide some weather proofing. There is a bench, a fire place, rubbish and frames for four bunks, although the sacking has rotted.

\textsuperscript{25} M. O'Reilly, pers. comm., 16 January 1992.

\textsuperscript{26} D. Ross, pers. comm., 17 February 1992.
Nolan's Hut

Nolan's Hut is in a small clearing, on the true right of the Perth River. It takes three to four hours to walk in to the hut, from the main road end. The route follows the Whataroa River Valley until its confluence with the Perth River. The Whataroa River is crossed by a swing bridge near the confluence, then a high level track goes up a ridge between the two rivers and down to the Perth River after a one hour walk. The hut is approximately half an hour along the side of the river. It hut has four wooden slat bunks and foam mattresses, a table, stools, hut book, billies and, surprisingly, an axe and a broom.

Steve Nolan, who at 72 years old still has the cattle grazing lease for the valley, related the story of building the hut. The hut was built in about 1926 by Steve's father and one of his brothers. The hut was used as a base during the first two winters when the Nolans chopped the bush for the cattle. Before and just after the second world war, the hut was used by track cutters and deer cullers. Later, gold miners stayed in the hut because there was gold nearby in the river. Wood, iron, nails and so on were transported most of the way to the site by a sleigh made from a fork in a tree. The sleigh was pulled by a horse. Steve's father wanted the hut up in the bush because there was a ready supply of wood but the brothers' wanted the hut on the river flat where there was rata for fire wood. However, their father won and the hut was built up above the flat in the bush.

In about 1950, the hut was moved to its present position on the flat, by another of Steve's brothers and Jack Meurk, a gold miner. This was because it was not practicable to have the hut up in the bush when they left their horses down on the flat. Getting their horses involved using a rough, steep track. The hut was moved, piece by piece, iron sheet by iron sheet and rebuilt.

Almer Hut

Almer Hut is on a ridge on the true right above the Franz Josef Glacier. Access to the hut is usually by helicopter, a ten minute flight. Originally, access was always by foot, but this is difficult now because the glacier has broken up in recent years.

The hut has two rooms. The main room has six bunks, a table, seats, benches, cooking facilities, first aid kit, some cooking implements and utensils and a mountain radio. The other room has four bunks, cupboards and some reading material. The present Almer Hut is the third shelter to be known as Almer. The first shelter, a bivouac, was completed in 1915. This was suitable for only one climbing party and was buried each winter, under metres of snow. The bivouac was replaced by a hut in 1929. Materials for this hut, weighing nearly five tonnes, were packed to the site by foot. This hut had to be replaced by 1952 because the weight of the snow had burdened the structure.

This third Almer Hut is sited on a more exposed ridge, 200 metres above the site of the old hut. The site was chosen by guide Harry Ayres. It was hoped that the wind would play a bigger part in taking the snow away. Four men did the foundations for the hut. This required an enormous amount of stone work and rock shifting. Material to build the hut was air dropped from an aerovan, piloted by Bill Hewett. The material was in bundles and each had a big parachute. Very little was broken or went missing (McCormack, 1991). Building the hut began in March 1952 and was completed by the end of 1953.

The Almer Bivouac made the crossing of Graham Saddle and ascents of many peaks at the head of the Franz Josef Glacier much more accessible and comfortable. The present Almer Hut is still used as a base for climbing and ski-mountaineering.

**Chancellor Hut**

Chancellor Hut is on the true right of the Fox Glacier, on Chancellor Ridge. It takes about six hours to walk to the hut. The route involves crossing the glacier a number of times and some rock scrambling. Some navigation skills for crossing the glacier are required, although parts of the route is marked by cairns. The hut is approximately 1250 metres above sea level.

---
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The hut is two-roomed and has six bunks in each room. The main room has a table, seats, cooking facilities and utensils and a mountain radio. The walls are lined with congoecum, the original lining. The other room was the 'women's room'. This was so that guides and women party members did not share a room, although there was an inner connecting door.

Construction of the hut was begun on 1930, and completed early in 1931. The purpose of the hut was to improve access to mountains and passes within the Westland National Park. Money for the hut was granted by the Department of Tourist and Health Resorts, although the initiation for the hut came from the Graham brothers. The Grahams' had a hotel and guiding business in South Westland.

The Department of Tourist and Health Resorts had a standard hut design and this was used for Chancellor. All material for the hut was carried to the site. This included a chimney and fire place even though the nearest firewood was miles away:

A curious thing about the Chancellor Hut is that it has a large fire place, just like its sisters in the forest. Its nearest sister however, with scenery of the ... combustible sort, nice and handy, is the one at Cone Rock, which is about four miles distant on an airline, and 4000 feet nearer to sea level.

The chimney was removed by Westland National Park staff during the 1970s.

**Douglas Rock Hut**

Douglas Rock Hut is cited on the side of the Copland Track. The track, beginning at highway six, is on the true right of the Karangarua River and follows the Copland River from its confluence with the Karangarua. It takes about six hours steady walking to reach Welcome Flat Hut and the hot pools. The Copland Track crosses to the true left of the Copland River, just after Welcome Flat. The track leaves the banks of the river and goes up on higher terraces and through the bush. Douglas Rock Hut is about three hours on from Welcome Flat. It is approximately a thirteen hour trip from Douglas Rock Hut over the Copland Pass to Hooker Hut in the Mount Cook National Park. This trip also requires some skill and experience in snow, ice and exposed places.

---


The Douglas Flat Hut has just one room. At one end are two large sleeping platforms. There is a table and seats, a range/stove, a mountain radio and some utensils and plates. The hut was built in 1931 or 1932, when the bivy rock could no longer cope with the numbers of people seeking shelter. The timber for the hut was pit-sawn near the site, while iron and the windows were packed by horse. George Bannister, a guide for the Graham brothers, was in charge of the operations.

By the late 1970s, the hut was inadequate for the numbers of people using it: Since the hut was built ... the increase in the numbers using it has changed, and at present there are at times, such as Xmas holidays etc., too many persons for the existing facilities. Douglas Rock Hut was extensively modified. The wall dividing the main room and the women’s room was removed and sleeping platforms built, and the inner walls were lined. The hut is visited at least twice a year for maintenance. There is little concern for its original character and condition in approaches to maintenance because of the modifications.

Blue River (Blowfly) Hut

The Blue River Hut is sited at Blowfly Flat, five minutes off the Haast-Paringa Cattle Track. The hut is about one and a half hours easy walking from the Paringa end of the track. It has eight bunks, a stove/range, a table, some pots, utensils and plates, and reading material and a verandah. The kitchen area is at a lower level to the rest of the hut.

Some of the Haast-Paringa Track was a Maori trail, but the cattle track was constructed in 1875 by the Westland County Council. The track allowed increasing numbers of cattle to be taken to the sales at Whataroa and was also an important link between settlers in the Haast area and the rest of Westland. The track was used for cattle until 1961. The main road extended only a few kilometres south of

---

82 The bivy rock is a large overhanging rock providing some shelter from the weather.


84 Letter from Ranger Fullerton to the Chief Ranger, Westland National Park, 10 June 1977, cited in Westland National Park file 6/5.


86 New Zealand Forest Service, n.d.
the bridge over the Paringa River until the mid-1950s. At this time, work began on a road between Paringa and Haast. This road was officially opened in November 1965.

The exact date of building the Blue River Hut is not known, although it may have existed by 1908 and it was mentioned in a book written by A.M. Moreland, published in 1911. Miss Moreland was not impressed with the hut:

*It was nothing but a corrugated-iron box, eight or nine feet square, with a rude bunk, covered with fern, at either side; between them was a dirty cupboard smeared with candle grease, which served as a table; a stool by the wide hearth and two old billies completed the furniture ... A more truly uninviting place would be hard to find* (Moreland, 1911:77-78).

The cattle track was susceptible to slips, so permanent road men were stationed to maintain the track. One of these, Jack Farrell, lived at the Blue River Hut. He was there for many years, and had electric lighting (via a water wheel) a grew a profusion of marrows - for his special brew of marrow wine.

Blue River Hut has also been known as Blowfly Flat Hut and Jack Farrell Hut.

---

87 An article written in 1908 mentions the construction of two new huts with paddocks, sited near swamps (*Through the Haast Pass, West Coast Times, 2 September 1908.*)

88 From a short history based on the recollections of Kevin Nolan of Okuru, date unknown, cited in the *Haast Field Centre Collection*, Department of Conservation, Haast) and the *Haast-Paringa Cattle Track Information Pamphlet*, New Zealand Forest Service, Haast, no date.
### Appendix C - Themes in Aotearoa-New Zealand History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 - Themes</th>
<th>Level 2 - Subthemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discovery</td>
<td>Homelands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explorers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boundaries and Subdivisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land disputes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous plants</td>
<td>Gardens and gathering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivation</td>
<td>Cereal farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orchards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild animals</td>
<td>Fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hunting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whaling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduced animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>sheep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dairy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beef cattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other livestock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dairy factories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freezing works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Processing plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>Formal monetary and regulatory agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warehouses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>Coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Chapter Five, page 73, for the context of this appendix.*
| 9 | Engineering | Notable advances  
|    |             | Public utilities  
|    |             | Workshops        |
| 10 | Transport   | Accommodation    
|    |             | Air              
|    |             | Sea - ocean, coastal, lake and river  
|    |             | Foot - foot, packhorse  
|    |             | Rail - railway, industrial tram, street tram, cable  
|    |             | Road - horsedrawn, motor        |
| 11 | Communication | Post  
|    |             | Publishing       
|    |             | Radio            
|    |             | Telephone        |
| 12 | Politics    | Government       
|    |             | Departments      
|    |             | Issues           
|    |             | Political parties  
|    |             | Politicians      
|    |             | Unions           |
| 13 | Justice     | Maori justice    
|    |             | courts           
|    |             | Institutions     
|    |             | Crimes           
|    |             | Police           |
| 14 | Religion    | Buildings of worship  
|    |             | Homes            
|    |             | Missions         
|    |             | Training         
|    |             | Sacred places    
|    |             | Religions        |
| 15 | War and peace | Peace making  
|    |             | Memorials        
|    |             | Armed forces     
|    |             | Land wars        
|    |             | Tribal warfare   
|    |             | Effects of war   |
| 16 | Knowledge   | Schools          
|    |             | Tertiary education  
|    |             | Universities     
|    |             | Repositories and research  |
| 17 | Arts and crafts | Literature  
|    |             | Architecture     
|    |             | Visual arts      
|    |             | Performing arts  |
|   | Health and welfare | Aged  
|---|-------------------|-------
|   |                   | Handicapped 
|   |                   | Medical 
|   |                   | Welfare  
| 19| Women's history  | Careers  
|   |                   | Politics  
|   |                   | Justice  
|   |                   | Religion  
|   |                   | War and peace  
|   |                   | Knowledge  
|   |                   | Arts and crafts  
|   |                   | Leisure  
|   |                   | Health and welfare  
| 20| Leisure           | Recreation  
|   |                   | Sport  
|   |                   | Adventure  
| 21| Human Association | Home  
|   |                   | Family  
|   |                   | Community  