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The landscapes spanning north to south along the hinterland and mountains of New Zealand’s South Island are a fast evolving focus of national contestation over their use, aesthetics and value. This region known as the ‘high country’ provides an interesting backdrop to my research into the dynamics of protecting ecological values alongside a socially and politically powerful agriculture. Neoliberalism, as an objective of political-economic restructuring since 1984, has significantly impacted on how the high country is conceptualised spatially. Instigated in 1989, the policy of tenure review is an on-going process. It has entailed converting the generally large Crown perpetual pastoral leases (originally totalling 303 properties) on a voluntary basis, to privatised freehold held by the original lessees in exchange for the return of land holding Significant Inherent Values, foreseen to require extrinsic protection, and public access values, to Department of Conservation control and management. The process has operated to alienate vast areas of leasehold from crown management control, which in some regions and on some landholdings has facilitated landscape transformation and different productive models.

The thesis discusses the orthodoxy central to tenure review, which sought to separate the protection of ecological values and public access from productive use. In particular, the study foregrounds thinking in contemporary, constructionist geographies and social theory acutely aware of the issues stemming from Western environmentalisms that rely on the resilient duality erected between nature and society. Such logic systems conceive of ‘nature’ contained within one sphere, and the economy, society and politics in another and subsequently seek isolation between the two. However, this fails to understand or make room for complex interactions and linkages between nature and society within ever increasingly ‘hybrid’ landscapes. Emphasising Bourdieu’s methodological principles, a locally grounded research approach was employed to understand how ‘the landscape’ is socially constructed and valued within a defined geographical region. Three basins within the mid-Canterbury high country were selected as the case study region for research. A rich sample of ethnographic data regarding values, inter-subjective experiences, attitudes towards tenure review and changing productive and protective habitus was explored by interviewing 84 participants from farming and conservation groupings involved within the region.

Early in analysis it became clear that negotiation of values and knowledge claims was occurring locally between actor groups. However, at a macro-level, tenure review, as a politically contested and difficult process of separation is transforming at least two sets of processes: 1) relationships with nature and the landscape, which has previously been held
as a relatively integrated pastoral system; 2) dividing between production and protection interests is modifying the habitus of practice and relationships between ‘productivist’ and ‘protectionist’ interests. In this thesis I argue that both processes are complex but tenure review has operated in a way that further alienates powerful productivist and protectionist orders within the current constitution of New Zealand society. What analysis highlighted is that division with tenure review categorises separated spaces as either 'for production' or 'for protection', leading to narrowed habitus that may undermine the potential to look towards or maintain more sensitive forms of production. An impasse arises, where ‘locking away’ purified nature in externalised parks and reserves may negate social responsibility for ‘other’ natures, especially those produced from and more obviously ‘human impacted’.

Concluding the thesis, the important argument gained from concepts of hybridity and multi-naturalism, is that removing humans and production from ‘nature’, will not necessarily ‘save’ or restore pre-human nature, as is politically mobilised in some conservation discourse. But removing humans will transform and direct nature in a different, human influenced trajectory of change (Braun, 2006b). This is because humans are intricately tied with biophysical nature in complex material, social-semiotic and political ways. As Harvey (1996: 186) asserts, removing humans from nature would be “disastrous for all species and all forms [of life] that have become dependent on it”. Hence, by acknowledging how all global natures are hybrid in form postmodern eco-politics becomes about navigating diverse trajectories of social-spatial change. Interrogating tensions between productivist and protectionist objectives, as dominant interests within high country space, is therefore important for promoting socially justified and supported conservation outcomes.
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Chapter 1

Contest Over High Country Space

1.0 Setting the Scene

A short drive northwest up the Rangitata Gorge in Mid-Canterbury, between Mt Peel and Mesopotamia Stations, alerts one to the intensified politics that have characterised high country land management recently. The significance of the private property signs in the opening image (Figure 1.0) becomes clear, representing firmed boundaries between landholders, the New Zealand public and conservation interests. Six of nine originally pastoral leasehold ‘runs’ have erected clearly visible private property, anti-trespass, and more sinister, ‘surveillance operating’ signs on gates and fences, and this is a similar story for many other high country areas.

Defended boundaries depict social tensions. As a leaseholder explained to me at the 2010 Federated Farmers high country conference in Christchurch, “one private property or working farm sign goes up and everyone in the valley puts one up”. He perceived that relations between conservation and farming had degraded to a situation of ‘tit-for-tat’ and defensiveness. Conservation is looked upon grudgingly, the pastoral lessee explained, because farmers feel disenfranchised from it, understanding themselves to be perceived as “destroying the landscape” by conservationists. The landholder understood this deterioration as contrary to the traditional ethos of high country land management under the pastoral lease, where he argued that most landholders happily allowed access to leasehold properties.

The leasehold system had relied on courtesy and sometimes public access was a tense issue. However, for many lessees there existed a traditional understanding of the landscape as ‘shared’, whereby the mode of leasehold tenure under which the high country was managed lead to a sense of public responsibility on the part of leaseholders. At the same conference, speaking with the wife of the previous informant highlighted a change to this ethos. She stated that following the completion of their tenure review, “DOC [the Department of Conservation] do what they do on their land and we can just farm”. She referred to how their production objectives were now more secure and isolated from “interfering greenies telling us what to do and how to do it”. This insight inspired the title

---

1 This point was emphasised by the landholder, and reiterated in four media articles, by Wallace (2004, 2005a, 2005b) in the Otago Daily Times and Benny (2016), in the NZ Farmer publication.
to the thesis and it depicts an interesting, but also misleading politics and constructed relationship between production and protection interests within high country space. This thesis examines this relationship deeply.

Eight months after attending the conference, in December and January 2011 a major access dispute arose in the Rangitata Valley. The clash over public access to Forest Creek pitted the Department of Conservation (hereafter, DOC) as well as public access and hunting interests against the pastoral lessee, Donald Aubrey, who was also vice president of Federated Farmers at the time. The issue came to a head when Aubrey blocked public access across his property, Ben McLeod, to the DOC estate 12.5 kilometres up Forest Creek. He had also allegedly removed DOC signage and a car park on the contested strip of land. Aubrey did this, he argued, on the basis that trampers and hunters had consistently strayed beyond the difficult Forest Creek access easement, causing stress to the sheep which had purportedly led to a break in the fleeces of his merino clip for Icebreaker,² causing economic loss. This followed previous issues with stock poaching on the property.

The Forest Creek boundary issue agitated some members of the hunting lobby. On fishnhunt.co.nz, a hunting lobby blog, ashfishman, stated on 29 January, 2011:³

Another bloody greedy cooky acting as law unto himself ... Looks like a job for the wire cutters. Might pop down during the week and shoot some of his stock.

Assuming that the Pastoral Leasehold is public land, he appealed to Kate Wilkinson, Minister for Conservation at the time, to:

get this greedy, ruthless arrogant Pratt off our land and re-establish access …

we've all seen the creeping encroachment that occurs when some land hungry English Estate wannabe's decide that the public can get screwed … They're farmers, not landed gentry. (emphasis added)

While the blog member’s attitude may appear over the top, it is useful for highlighting contestation that has surrounded high country land management. An evenhanded understanding of issues was quickly lost in a cloud of anger and for this reason various other blog members rejected his standpoint. They perceived that his opinions further antagonised the situation and gave credence to the representation of hunters in the farming community as rebellious and arrogant, furthering justifications for landholder resistance to hunting access. Furthermore, a number of contributors to the public forum shared

---

² Icebreaker is a brand of New Zealand Merino wool clothing. The brand has developed international success from the fibre commodity that has traditionally been derived from high country pastoralism. The harsh climate and stress on the sheep grows a notably fine, high quality and warm product and the marketing approach has focused strongly on the majestic landscapes of the central South Island ‘high country’.

significant sympathy for the position of landholders. Several stressed how many lessees were proactive towards public access and land custodianship, arguing the need to not tar all leaseholders with the same brush, due to an issue with one landholder with a political profile.

The comments of forum user *Ashfishman* provide a useful vignette into understanding some of the issues addressed within this thesis – where ecological conservation / preservation, public access and a historically powerful agriculture are intricately linked within high country social-space. The forum entries depict how one member of the hunting community understood the high country farming community, which reflects a broader discourse regarding class structures in New Zealand’s historical and contemporary social fabric. Part of the reason why debate over high country space is so heated is because to some members of the public, high country farmers represent a landed class of elites. They are perceived as a group of approximately 300 farming families who have been supported by the State in their capture of economic wealth both historically and through contemporary tenure review reforms (see: Brower, 2008a; 2008b; 2006).

Brower (2008a, 2008b, 2006) examined the issue of elites capturing economic wealth from the tenure review process. Brower (2006a) provided an excellent overview of the colonial dominance and authority that farmers have historically enjoyed within the high country and also within higher level national politics. Inarguably, landholders in the colonial settlement of the high country, along with many other agricultural regions of New Zealand’s low country, resembled an agricultural gentry class (Eldred-Grigg, 1981; McAloon, 2010). Practices of establishing large stately homes on the back of exuberant international wool commodity prices, the setting up of prestigious private boarding schools, and spring time horse racing and other pastimes enjoyed by high country farming families show a way of life not experienced by many other groups in New Zealand’s settler society. The Gaelic names for many of the streams and other geographical features within the high country region tell of the colonial worker underclass. These social representations of High Country land owners as landed gentry continue to be held by some sections of the public. However, these representations may betray a sensitive understanding of the complex and sometimes dire economic situations that many early high country farming families found themselves in, such as being forced from the land by the dreaded rabbit pest, or bankrupted when various ‘wool booms’ transformed, often rapidly, into economic strife. Whether such stories of wealth and gentry status apply to today’s high country, as they once did, is a contestable point. The families remaining on properties today as fourth
of fifth generation leaseholders exemplify perseverance. Family histories and coloniser diaries are full of periods of adversity and genuine cash positive ‘wealth’ was never a tangible reality for many high country lessees. However, many were and remain asset abundant, controlling often large perpetual leasehold properties.

Brower (2006; 2008a) also provided an in-depth examination of a sample of tenure review outcomes, predominantly from the Queenstown Lakes and Central Otago regions – beautiful places of exceedingly special aesthetic landscapes, which remain in high demand by both national and international amenity migrants (Woods, 2006; Moss, 2006a; 2006b). Brower took an approach that critiqued tenure review from what she proclaims to be the cold, clean cut view of land law and economics (Brower, 2006). She concluded that as public land, leased to landholders, farmers receiving significant Crown recompense from tenure review of pastoral leases represented the working of a bureaucracy captured and manipulated by a powerful class of agricultural elite. This conclusion deeply offended high country lessees, some of whom had completed review, others whom were mid-way through the process, and many whom had not volunteered their properties into the process of neoliberal tenure reform. Backlash came from the leaseholder argument that by providing pastoral lessees with a clause of perpetual renewal within the Land Act 1948, the Crown had alienated the land to the extent that it was not ‘public’. Pastoral leases were therefore understood as aligned with the rights attributed to freehold, not statehouse rentals (Armstrong et al., 2008). However, issues were less about the level of Crown payout at the conclusion of review, but the development that farmers (subdivision, intensification) could undertake on freehold land following tenure review, compared to the restrictive pastoral lease. These developments were lucrative in the Queenstown Lakes Region.

I return to the analysis of Brower in Chapter 2, however, her argument is amplified by acknowledging that considerable land intensification has been occurring on freehold land in high country regions recently. Some of this freehold was received from completed tenure reviews, however, much was historical freehold and accumulated returned servicemens’ landholdings, university lease and in actuality, considerable development has been occurring on land retained as pastoral lease. Different parts of the high country have been converted into dairy as farmers have been squeezed by debt and generally lower incomes. The situation has become more complicated as new interest groups have made claims to high country space, such as the Walking Access Commission, Ngāi Tahu and various other groups. Addressing these claims from alternative interests was part of the mandate for tenure review. However, what my own research suggests is that concentration
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on political-economic and legal factors, as Brower and others have, yields only a partial view on how we might understand the impacts of these changes (political-economic, legislative with tenure reform) upon the lived experience of the farmers, despite the public holding strong views about this process. Further, from my own experiences working previously for DOC and also through knowing many lessees, farmers views about how the high country should be valued and utilised are not only in economic terms. Most actively acknowledge that other actors hold values around landscape, and many hold a sense of responsibility towards ‘sustainability’.

The thesis advances the argument that while it is important to consider the economic and political drivers of landscape transformation, ultimately to understand the dynamics at work we need to also augment or perhaps go beyond economistic and legal tools of analysis. In doing so, the thesis suggests a different way of understanding the politics of high country landscapes, which draws to a greater extent on post-structuralist inspired accounts. Understanding the transformation of the high country in this way not only provides a more nuanced and ultimately more accurate understanding of the motivations and aspirations of high country farmers, it also has significant bearing upon how we may move forward with how conservation policy is framed and boundaries constructed in the future.

1.1 ‘Stable’ land use and the pastoral lease

In terms of spatial definition, the high country is the vast region of hill and mountain land extending the backbone of New Zealand’s South Island (Figure 2.0). ‘High country’ is a spatial definition conventionally used to describe the alpine environs above 900 metres altitude, traditionally referred to by pastoralists in the region as ‘top country’ or ‘the tops’ (High Country Accord, n.d (d); High Country Committee, 1992). It is a geographically diverse region, but the landholdings in which these alpine areas fall are known as high country ‘runs’ or ‘stations’. For the purposes of this study, I expand the definition of high country to also include the expansive grassland and inter-montane basin landscapes that characterise the national imagery of the interior South Island. In total, the land area of the region equates to approximately 6 million hectares – 2.5 million hectares of which have traditionally been farmed under a mode of extensive pastoral grazing, increasingly more intensively in some regions with irrigation and other intensive technologies (Swaffield and Brower, 2009; Pawson and Brooking, 2002). Such productive changes are challenging historically resilient understandings of the high country as a space characterised by golden
brown grasslands, farmed non-intensively under a State controlled leasehold system that maintained an aesthetically homogenous grassland character (Ralston, 2014a). However, this grassland character and colonial cultural landscape replaced a previous layered history of indigenous Māori associations and values (Kawharu, 2009; Moon, 2013; McAloon, 2002; Anderson, 2001; Evison, 1993; 1987; 1986).

Figure 1.1: The spatial definition of the high country and indicative location of pastoral leases (McFarlane, 2011; Department of Conservation, 2011).

From the early 1850s high country land was rapidly appropriated from Ngāi Tahu, the historic guardians of Te Wāi Pounamu (New Zealand’s South Island), by nominal Crown purchase and through what was understood as the ‘Waste Lands Board’ (administered under the Waste Lands Act 1858, see Appendix 2a). The title of ‘Waste Lands’ depicts the historical social frame and the colonial pastoralists’ understanding of the high country, as a soon-to-be productive space. This period began a history of colonial pastoralists overlaying existing cultural landscape layers with a dominating Euro-centric productivism, upon which a pseudo British class system began to establish (Pawson, 1992; McAloon, 2002). As the Māori people were assimilated into colonial society as British subjects, their values and cultural connections to high country space were marginalised and erased.4 To

---

4 Initially gradual with the breaking-up and development of the rural sections, the Māori historic environment has been all but displaced and destroyed by overlays of Euro-centric use values and social-cultural meanings.
European settlers, the hinterland and highlands represented spaces devoid of people and as requiring the “civilised hand of the European” (Taylor, 2000: 59), to make the land productive in support of nation building and empire (Brooking and Pawson, 2010; Moon, 2013; McAloon, 2002a; 2011). The perception of waste lands provided a motivating construct behind agricultural development, securing the wealth and social status of some colonial pastoralists and also the legitimacy of the high country as an agricultural space. However, over time the dominance productivism has ordinarily held within high country space has become challenged by protective and preservationist claims (Mark, 1980; 1984; 1990; 2004; Dominy, 2002). Productivism for the purpose of this research is defined with its roots firmly in political economy. It is the modern, Fordist economic belief in sustained economic growth and the capitalist emphasis on productive development as socially beneficial (Walford, 2003). In New Zealand, productivism often remains framed narrowly around primary products and grass-based agrarianism (Rosin, 2012; Hendy and Callaghan, 2013).

Post - World War Two was a period of dramatic change, and also economic prosperity for agricultural colonies like New Zealand and Australia. This was a period in which productivism became firmly entrenched in New Zealand’s social fabric supported by a discourse of farming as the life-blood of New Zealand society (Le Heron, 1989; Pawson and Brooking, 2002; Moon, 2013; Rosin, 2012; Haggerty et al., 2009; Dominy, 2002; 1995). The institution of the Land Act 1948, the historical legislative juncture from which this study begins, signified security of leasehold tenure for high country landholders, and subsequently, the firming of an agricultural class and power hegemony within the high country. It followed a sequence of colonial lease and licence arrangements that failed to provide security to agriculturalists. Competitive land accumulation is a notable factor in the early establishment of agricultural lands in New Zealand (Peden, 2011a; Dominy, 2001). In the high country, external interests and neighbouring landholders could outbid existing leaseholders at rental review to secure early leases when they came up for tender (Peden, 2011a; 2011b). The lack of security underpinned an exploitative mode of subsistence agriculture, as no incentive in the tenure system existed to care for the land (Brooking, (Hamer, 1990). Referring to Parker (1849: 15-16), McClean (2007: 8) explains the “[p]rosperity of the country was deemed to be linked with progress of town planning, survey, property marketing and land clearance” and therefore, “to hold up this process by protecting Māori sites in the landscape was deemed anti-progress, anti-prosperity”.
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Hodge and Wood, 2003). Examining several diaries of colonists’ within the period following settlement in the high country, political and economic insecurity was a clear issue for colonial pastoralists. The flux and flow of colonial markets led at times to economic success but also collapse, and similar trends of an erratic economic trajectory have occurred throughout the history of high country agricultural development (See also: Peden, (2011a); Brooking (1996)). Such economic processes have been coupled with dramatic ecological transformation at an expansive scale (Clarke, 1949; Holland, 2000; Holland, 2013; Holland, O’Connor and Wearing, 2002).

The clause of ‘in perpetuity’ within the Land Act 1948, which provided 33-year leases with perpetual rights to renewal, has historically attributed security to equities invested in leasehold properties. A letter in 1941 to Robert C. Todhunter, from Thomas D. Burnett, Member of Parliament for Temuka and leaseholder of Mount Cook Station (see Appendix 1a), shows the pressures which led up to the Land Act 1948, which created the perpetually renewable Crown Pastoral Lease. Burnett states,

The industry is slipping badly; we are continuing in it because mainly our equities are locked up in it, and too because so many of us love the life and know no other. Unless the State equalises the enormous increase in running costs by reduced rentals and help us to stand up to the rabbit pest and weeds, there may be wholesale relinquishments after the war. The authorities are not meeting reasonable requests for reasonable rentals and have dug in their toes to a degree that makes us believe that their actions are ruled chiefly by obstinacy and autocratic office dictation. And they have broken their promise regarding high country appointments to the Canterbury Board. (Burnett, 1941)

The significance of Burnett’s perspective is threefold and conveys similar tensions to those occurring in the contemporary high country context. Economic equities within the land are often made explicit and defended by landholders in contemporary representations and assertions to control space. Within Burnett’s narrative there is also an impression of the passion for place and ‘way of life’ that continued to establish in the minds and subjectivities of lessee families at this time and which linger today, regardless of how productive practices are transforming (Morris, 2009; Haggerty et al., 2009; Conradson and Pawson, 2007;...
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Dominy, 2002; 1995). Furthermore, within Burnett’s letter there is also explicit recognition of the trials of obtaining a livelihood from the high country and therefore the need for rental security. However, for the purposes of this study, the key tensions highlighted by the quotation are between leaseholders and the State. This tension historically reoccurs in the transformation of the high country, as a landscape where diverse interests contest a productivist history. Contemporary landholders are wary of the State. As is illustrated in media discourse, throughout the duration of tenure review there has been struggle between the Crown, interests of the broader New Zealand public and landholders (see: Piddock, 2010; Littlewood, 2010a; Littlewood, 2010b). The high country has increasingly become a conflicted social-political terrain.

In 1948, the Land Act recognised the need for the State to retain an interest in the management of high country lands, increasingly acknowledged as friable. In the lead up to the Land Act’s enactment, concern surrounded erosion (Mather, 1982a; 1982b; Whitehouse, 1982; 1984; McCaskill, 1978; McCaskill, 1973). Fear of wide spread soil loss and a similar situation to the 1930s mid-Western United States ‘Dustbowl’ occurring in the high country was an influential discourse behind establishing the 1948 Act, which sought to establish fair rents to encourage lessee stewardship. This mechanism also facilitated State oversight in the integrated management of the high country as a productivist pastoral space. I emphasise pastoral space, because as per the Land Act 1948, the mode of land use (and therefore, the landscape) was restricted to pastoral grazing by stock, cattle, sheep (merino and half breed) and occasionally deer, following live capture and the establishment of the industry in the 1960s. Emphasis was put on pasture improvement / development and stock husbandry (care and genetic improvement) (Allan, 2008; Allan and Keoghan, 1994; Floate et al., 1994).

Significantly, leaseholders were not permitted to interfere with the subsurface of the land without prior consent from the Commissioner for Crown Lands via Crown Lands Advisors. In the employ of the State, Lands Advisors liaised with lessees about land management. Understanding this underpins a claim that is important to reflect on throughout the thesis - that with the pastoral lease there existed an accepted, shared interest
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7 Dominy (1995; 2001; 2002) examined elements of this argument. Concepts of social and economic resilience became especially pronounced with the drastic impact that war had on high country valleys from 1918 until the beginning of ‘Long Boom’ in the 1950s. Explained further in Chapter 2, the Long Boom was a period of wealth, that began to plummet in the 1970s and 80s, prior to neoliberalisation of New Zealand agro-economy.

8 For example, erecting fences, ploughing and burn off were restricted activities for pastoral leases under the Land Act 1948. However, with the solidification of freehold, this is different, with the Resource Management Act 1991 assessing on an effects basis, all production options are potentially permissible.
in the management of leasehold properties. In good faith and with a view to sustaining production, Crown lands advisors managed land use, stocking rates and changes (which could negatively influence environmental conditions) collaboratively with leaseholders. Over a history of association and shared interest spanning from 1853, the succession of various lands advisors established strong relationships with lessees. However, tenure review renegotiated this long-standing interplay between the State and leaseholders.

Increasingly, tensions have surrounded the State’s mandate for high country land. At times, tenure review was perceived as a State administered land grab under the apparently benevolent guise of conservation opportunity and protecting ecosystems in several media (National Business Review, 2005a; 2005b; Broad, 2005) and academic critiques (Round, 2009; Quigley, 2008). Tenure review is also understood to be a mechanism of land reform that is transforming the nationally valuable cultural landscape of the high country (Forest and Bird, 2013; 2006; Ell, 2005; 2002; 2001; Brower, 2006; 2008a; Maturin, 2004). In several articles, this landscape debate is framed in terms of a “golden grassland heritage” (Mark, 2004: n.p), which initially ecologists like Professor Alan Mark and Dr Kevin O’Connor considered the process would protect (Mark, 1990; 1980; O’Connor and Scott, 1996; O’Connor, 1998; 1987; 1986). The result of leasehold management was the establishment of a distinctive, broad-scale pastoral grassland system, maintaining the high country’s perceived ‘landscape character’ (Ralston, 2014a; PCE, 2013; 2009; Lucas, 2008; Blogisthmus.com., 2012; Parry, 2009; CBCM, 2004; Swaffield and Brower, 2009; Swaffield and Hughey, 2001; Brooking, Hodge and Wood, 2003). Importantly, the pastoral mode has maintained a relative stability across high country space since settlement, where other lowland farming regions have undergone constant and dramatic change. Separation between freehold land and public conservation land with tenure review however, has activated the previously latent potential for transformation. In the present study examining complexities associated with the separation logic of tenure review provides the ability to understand the high country landscape’s contemporary social-political constitution as a result of the process, which has now spanned nearly 25 years.
1.2 Contested Outcomes

To be specific, the objectives of tenure review have unfolded as a methodology of splitting land between private and public ownership (PCE, 2013; 2009; Woolaston, 2012; Mcfarlane, 2011). Generally, the outcomes of tenure review have been the transfer of high altitude mountain land to Crown control. This land is of little grazing value, but was also well represented in the public conservation land held by the Crown prior to tenure review (Walker et al., 2006; Stephens, Walker and Price, 2008). Concurrently, much lower altitude basin country has been freeholded into the ownership and control of lessees who volunteered for the tenure review process, or those who subsequently purchased freehold from previous landholders following the completion of tenure review. Operating as a split mechanism, the process satisfied the lessee claim for investment flexibility on freehold title, and also the Crown’s aspiration to remove itself from the expense of being the high country landlord, a result of neo-liberalisation (Armstrong et al., 2008). The process also offered the potential to secure the protection of Significant Inherent Values (SIVS) and public access. However, the way these objectives have been achieved, and the unforeseen impacts of “cutting up the high country” (McFarlane, 2011: ii) have increasingly become the focus of public and political consternation.

The Crown Pastoral Land Act (CPLA) became law in 1998 and sought to achieve redistribution of rights in a streamlined manner, emphasising good faith negotiations between the Crown and lessees. Land with defined SIVs, or land required for providing a public access network, became public conservation land or was sold to landholders at market valuation with protective covenants and easements. Values on each property differed markedly. Therefore, individual negotiations were complex. In some cases the lessee would pay the Crown for the transfer of values (what Brower, 2008 suggested to be a nominal amount), or the Crown would pay the lessee in recompense for their financial interest in property returned to the Crown for conservation purposes.

Political, public and academic scrutiny has focused on whether the process has been successful, or as an on-going reform, is working appropriately (McFarlane, 2011; Ewers et al., 2006; Walker et al., 2006; Brower, 2009; 2008a; 2008b; 2006; Swaffield and Brower, 2009). Where land holds clear ‘either or’ value for economic use or protection, the process of negotiating what was retained by landholders as freehold and what went to public conservation ownership was straightforward. However, much of the high country under pastoral lease was characterised by a greyness of definition regarding its ‘naturalness’ and values. Referring to the objectives of tenure review under the CPLA 1998 (see
Appendix 1b), the imprecision with defining what constitutes a SIV in Part 2 (b)); and subsequently how such values should be protected in a manner that is “ecologically sustainable” (defined in Part 2 (a)(i)) has been a cause of conflict that has undermined effective outcomes from the process in many cases (McFarlane, 2011; Armstrong et al., 2008; McFarlane, 2011; Swaffield and Brower, 2009; Swaffield and Hughey, 2001).

The Act prioritises the restoration of SIVs to Crown ownership and control (Part 2(b)(ii)) in order to make easier the securing of public access and enjoyment of reviewable land (Part 2(c)(i)) along with the freehold disposal of land without SIVs (Part 2(c)(ii)). This meant that tenure review manifested locally as a division of the landscape, between the predominant values of economic use, ecological protection and access. However, much literature, including Bryan (2012), Adams (2004), Cronon (2002; 1996; 1995; 1992), Braun and Castree (2000) and Braun (2006a) examines how conservation logic that advocates the separation between nature and society is socially and politically troublesome. Such a duality operates as a nexus to conflict between social groups, especially, when reform has destabilised: 1) the agricultural hegemony that has remained stable across space for upwards of 160 years; and 2) a tenure platform on which an integrated and relatively low intensity model of land use had established. Intense contest has surrounded the process, focused on issues with the re-negotiation and allocation of values and land categories. The intent of this thesis is to open up a discussion on the politics associated with the separation logic central to tenure review. Examining issues associated with the logic hopes to provide a more nuanced understanding of the relationships between various high country interest groups which have become strained over the duration of tenure review. Importantly, providing a sensitive and well balanced examination of issues within this resource management space will hopefully influence improved high country landscape management policy and outcomes in the future.

**Research questions and theoretical scope**

The thesis poses three research questions that frame the objectives of analysis. 1) ‘What do concepts drawn from social constructionism, such as theory around ‘social space’, hybridity and the relational co-production of nature, add to the assessment of high country space?’ For example, how does such thinking inform us about the tense relationships surrounding tenure review and landscape management, between advocates for the high country’s protection as a ‘natural space’ and those who live and work there as a social and economic space? 2) ‘What are the critical issues with relations between conservation and agriculture objectives in the local study context?’ The particular
focus of this question surrounds how tenure review, as a structural transformation, has influenced social and productive praxis and the relationship between conservation and farming as powerful social orders. Highlighted are issues associated with division and subsequent changes to spatial scale, social resistance and defensiveness towards constructed ‘others’ within the local context. 3) The third question asks: *What is the ethical import and political potential of challenging dualistic constructs between nature and society in terms of building a platform to allow for the negotiation of plural spatial meanings and fostering social learning?* This question signifies the reconstructive phase to the thesis, looking at how the debate can be progressed beyond politicised tensions between production and protection interests, following the critique of dualistic conventions advanced by tenure review. From each question arise a series of empirically grounded arguments set up in the following chapter as I explain the theoretical grounds to the research intervention.

In order to investigate the research questions, I approached the study in a way that has been broken into three broader theoretical components. These inform the structure to the three analytical chapters (5, 6, and 7), which ‘deconstruct’ issues with tenure review in a local case study, and Chapter 8 as a ‘reconstructive’, integrating discussion. Each analytical chapter applies and expands different theoretical strands. Social constructionism is the critical theoretical field in which this research is couched. 9 The research contributes, primarily, to the body of constructionist literature that takes issue with the dualism erected between nature and society in social thought and conservation practice. Following the seminal essays of William Cronon (1995) and Richard White (1995) in the book *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*, focus in conservation geography and environmental history has remained on the tensions associated with such dualistic constructs; based on normative Western concepts of nature and the place of society outside of nature’s realm. 10 In advancing the argument about the consequences of this epistemological position for our understanding of ‘nature’, I focus, in particular, on how dualistic constructs retained in conservation practice such as tenure review, impact on human ‘others’ interacting within local social-spaces. I examine the contest that stems from
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9 As is developed in Chapter 2, within constructionism as an epistemological framework, emphasis is placed on plural, relationship dependent understandings of landscapes and nature. There is particular interest in the diversity of social values systems and attitudes within local spaces, complicating duality frames erected between nature and society, production and protection, rural and urban, us and other, local and non-local.

10 Examining the issues of boundaries associated with dualistic constructs is central to theoretical and empirical scholarship in geography (including, Bryan, 2012; Braun, 2008a; Braun and Castree, 2000; Zimmerer, 2010, 2007; 2006, 2000) and beyond, for example, in environmental history (Cronon, 2007, 2002 1992) and sociology (Gieryn, 2000; 1999).
tenure review, which through division polarises inherently ‘situated’, tacit knowledge cultures (Tsouvalis, Seymour and Watkins, 2000; Harraway, 1991; Pedynowski, 2003; Chambers, 2009), that correspond with competing moralities and partial social visions for the high country; as a complexly valued ‘social-space’, or what White (2004) addresses to be a ‘hybrid landscape’. I apply this thinking within the mid-Canterbury study region, chosen as the case study to the research. This context continues to be under active division with the erection of physical (material) and cognitive (psychological) boundaries between land categorised for natures’ protection and that, which is ‘for production’.

Throughout the thesis evidence is provided as to how the process of tenure review degenerated to an over-simplistic policy dichotomy, framed around this notion of nature as needing to be separated and bounded free from social influence. An exploration of Bourdieu’s sociology of practice (Bourdieu, 2000; 1998; 1990; Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2007), and the work of others who have applied Bourdieu’s concepts becomes important. I extend the interrogation of the dualism between nature and society in a way that seeks to understand how changing spatial scale and tenure platform, influences the practice and habitus of landholders and attitudes towards constructed ‘others’ operating in high country space. For example, Morris (2009) gave considerable thought to how decreased scale is transforming farmer subjectivities and productive practices with a significant area of land from each property being returned to the Crown following tenure review. Yet no theoretical thought has so far been given to how this process of scale transformation links to the duality between nature and society that was advanced by tenure review. Additionally, there has been neglect in thinking about how division inflamed relations associated with the high country as a complex, hybrid social space. Consequently, the study contributes to the body of research in rural and conservation geographies and beyond that applies Bourdieu to questions of social and landscape transformation (both physical and meaning/representational change) (see: Brockington and Duffy, 2010; 2004; Zimmerer, 2007; Woodhouse, 2006; Olwig, 2005; Tsouvalis, 2000); and change to rural production systems (Burton et al, 2012; Burton and Paragahawewa, 2011; Burton, Kuczera and Schwarz, 2008; Haggerty et al., 2009; Burton, 2004a; 2004b).

Constructionism and Bourdieusian thinking provide the grounding to an empirical project, as theoretical bodies that share strength with interrogating the conventions of division with tenure review. Deconstructing the dualistic logic of tenure review and
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11 The concept of a ‘hybrid landscape’ (White, 2004) is aligned with current thinking around the hybrid nature and more-than-human geographies. It is expanded on throughout the study, following its development in Chapter 2.
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highlighting issues with outcomes from the process, however, does not take the analysis far enough. I use empirical critique and theory in unison to gain alternative understandings and to suggest potential ways to reshape a manifestly different, less antagonising landscape politics, where space is recognised as dialectical with society, co-produced and therefore, complex. Hence, it is a reformed politics that rejects reliance on the dualistic defence of static spatial categories of land that is ‘protected’ and that which is ‘productive’.

The argument towards a more pluralist and locally sensitive spatial politics is augmented by recognising that high country space is increasingly ‘carved up’ by tenure review. Conservation land is perceived ‘opened up’ for ‘nationalised’ protection and public access, in contrast to areas that are “freed up” (Littlewood, 2013: 2) from DOC control, or alternatively, ‘locked up’ and ‘privatised’ for production. The pre-existing mode of leasehold tenure is increasingly being extinguished, along with cultural and productive practices, symbolism and romantic imagery that the resilient cultural landscape entailed.

The present thesis examines these debates. Before opening the pages of theoretical and empirical research, a brief review of media coverage and institutional discourse provides a background that begins to set the parameters of inquiry in the following chapters.

1.3 Establishing the logic to the thesis:

The current research project began with an in-depth review of institutional discourse and media coverage from the period of time 1985 to 2014. Examples from this analysis are applied throughout the thesis to examine higher level representations, discursive changes and for contextualising ‘local’ understandings and claims within a broader context of institutional, social-cultural and political economic change. In particular, I investigated media coverage, with an emphasis on rural and regional newspapers over 13 years between 2000 and 2014, exposing a range of themes and subthemes that are outlined in Appendix 1c. This was a period of time when politics around tenure review were intensifying. More recent media coverage illustrates the potential of obtaining freehold land rights with tenure review. Over the aforementioned time period, there was growing fear, evident in the national media, that the high country cultural landscape will be “destroyed” (Rural News, 2005).

These are each examples of tropes that emerge from media coverage associated with the outcomes and still latent potential existing in the continuing policy of tenure review (see for example: Littlewood, 2013; McFarlane, 2011; Rural News, 2005; NZPA, 2004; Piddock, 2011; 2010; National Business Review, 2005a; Rural News, 2005a). Division / separation of values was at times justified due to the alleged benefits of ‘nationalising conservation values’ in parks and reserves. However, this is a contested issue as bounding may modify what occurs on the ‘other’ land, privatised as fee simple freehold. This is a significant aspect of empirical inquiry in subsequent chapters.
Thinking retrospectively about the changes that have occurred in some regions of the high country, the traditional pastoral model is perceived as being comparatively low intensity compared with alternative, contemporary modes (see for example Maturin, 2009 and McFarlane, 2011). Such issues of transformation and decline are recognised in recent discourse from independent non-governmental organisations (NGOs), the Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (hereafter, Forest and Bird). An article in the ‘Guardian Farming’ newspaper depicts continuing tensions associated with biodiversity loss from intensive development. Tenure review is cited as the foremost factor in the “perfect storm of vegetation loss” in the high country (Ralston, 2014a: 16-17). The article perceives that the value of the high country landscape lay in it being relatively intact, with a remnant level of indigenous biodiversity retained due to lease management and lower intensity grazing. Ralston addresses the situation of decline sensitively, showing understanding of multiple contributing factors to landscape transformation. She states,

The high country lost huge tracts of forest in early fires; tussock grasslands and scrublands replaced forest in much of the land east of the divide. Tussock hillsides, fans and matagouri flats were used for extensive grazing of sheep. Some lower land was cleared and developed with improved pasture, but in most areas a lot of native vegetation and high country “character” has survived this regime. (Ralston, 2014a: 17 emphasis original)

However, Ralston’s opinion and that of Forest and Bird who she represents as New Zealand’s primary pro-ecology preservation lobby group, makes explicit how legislative change with tenure review has impacted on landscape and biodiversity values, extending the history of decline.

In particular, Ralston (2014a) emphasises how tenure review has resulted in advancing the further loss of native biodiversity. However, from the perspective of protecting indigenous species, Forest and Bird continues to advocate separation and the establishment of more high country parks as the ultimate goal of ecological preservation. Within Ralston’s article there exists an ideological quandary that ties intricately with the critical discussion in this thesis which, develops from the social constructionist lineage of thinking critical of boundaries being erected between nature and society. Forest and Bird advocates for the construction of parks and reserves to preserve nature, separating ecological values from production values. But, such an ideology was intrinsic to the logic of tenure review as a neoliberal land reform that in several media articles is suggested to
have influenced the productive practice of farmers towards more intensive production (see for example, Piddock, 2010; Littlewood, 2010a; Littlewood, 2010b; Vance, 2011; Scoop, 2005). I revisit the inconsistency of advancing the separation of land into parks and reserves, but failing to acknowledge the impact this bounding and spatial change has on other/productive land use categories in subsequent chapters. However, there are two themes: 1) issues with outcomes from separation, and 2) conflict and polarisation, which emerged clearly in the analysis of media coverage and require brief explanation. Each of these two themes contributed to the broader conceptual rationale to the research, which seeks to highlight a negotiated ways forward and to advance landscape management away from conflicted and polarised positions.

Peripheral interests
Relating to the first theme, issues with outcomes from separation, the Crown Pastoral Land Act 1998 articulates the inclusion of other considerations within the submission process and negotiation of tenure review objectives. These include, the public, non-indigenous Fish and Game values, Māori considerations, public amenities and cultural landscape values.

However, stakeholders external to Land Information New Zealand (LINZ), DOC and lessees, could only submit their concerns to the production of a resources report at the earlier stages of a tenure review proposal. Subsequent negotiations were centralised and undertaken between Land Information New Zealand, lessees, a team of valuation specialists and a centralised unit of DOC, distanced from the regional and local conservancy level at which conservation practice is implemented. For this reason, considerable institutional, media and academic discourse and social disquiet has surrounded the extent to which alternative values for high country space were under-represented in tenure review outcomes (Sage, Graeme and Maturin, 2005; Beer et al., 2006; Cumming, 2008; LINZ, 2009; Armstrong et al., 2008; Swaffield and Brower, 2009).

Media coverage highlights criticism that SIV’s were not being protected (Connell, 2005; High Country Landscape Group, 2003; Sage, 2006); and that important landscape and cultural values were not given ample priority within the negotiated split that prioritised production and ecological values (High Country Coalition, 2005). At different periods, tenure review was perceived skewed towards production interests or protection interests, as an imbalanced process (Sage and Maturin, 2007; Sage, 2006; Sage, 1995). This dynamic
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13 The emphasis on cultural and amenity values is interesting for it signifies social, cultural and amenity concerns within the consideration of ‘landscape’. This is a discussion examined more fully in Chapter 2.
aligned with different political impetus over the time period that tenure review was ongoing (Wallace, 2009). Interests, such as Fish and Game argued that they were externalised from the process. Fish and Game perspectives in particular highlighted the difficulty of seeking to conserve culturally valued species, like deer, tahr, trout and salmon as resources for hunting and fishing that are not indigenous, with a reform process focused primary on protecting indigenous ecology and production as a split method (Hollows, 2005a; 2005b; 2003). This connects with the perceived “nativism” (Littlewood, 2010d: n.p.) or native bias aligned with DOC’s “preservation ideals” (McCrone, 2010: C5), as explicit critique in media articles. Such ideas of nativism become a theme of focus in subsequent chapters, connecting the theoretical framework to empirical discussion. Such nativism relates to themes of ‘cleansing’ and the removal of social use from the high country, which emerged as a strong theme within the media analysis (Hutching, 2004a; Todhunter, 2005). In several articles landholders voiced upset at the removal of historic homesteads, fences and pastoral heritage as a result of tenure reviewed land being returned to DOC control (Littlewood, 2010a; Todhunter. 2005; Wallace, 2005a; 2005b; 2004b; 2004c; 2004d; 2004e; 2004 f; 2004g; 2004h; Ansley, 2005; Rural News, 2005a; 2005b; Cronshaw, 2004; Hutching 2004a; 2004b; Edlin, 2004).

Importantly, scrutiny is brought upon the park ideology at the core of tenure review, where social struggle surrounded the split methodology and the priority that was given to the narrow trifecta of economic use, ecological protection and public access. A distinction between ‘DOC land’ and ‘farmland’ was made in various media articles with different concepts of ownership and control (Dean, 2011; The Timaru Herald, 2010; The NZ Herald, 2004; Hayman, 2003). It was stated at this time that 2.2 million hectares of some of the most beautiful and conservation valuable land had to be “unravelled from out-dated Crown leases” (NZPA, 2004: n.p.), and placed under explicit mandate of protection within the conservation estate. However, this Labour government impetus was tangled into a polarised discourse in farming lobby and National Party coverage, highlighting tenure review as an insatiable ‘conservation grab’ (Wallace, 2004a; 2004b; Withington, 2004; Hutching, 2004; ODT, 2004; Bristow, 2004).

What the review of media and institutional discourse achieves to begin the thesis, is to illustrate the potency and antagonism that has surrounded tenure review and high country land management at the national and regional levels. It also highlights the significance of the current study, which seeks to untangle this social-spatial conflict and examine its various elements in depth. Division, or the dualism erected between
production and protection categories (and hence, nature and society), is an underlying, antagonising theme in considerable grey literature and institutional discourse (Emerson, 2011a; 2011b; Forest and Bird, 2005a; 2005c; 2005f; 2010High Country Accord, nd. (b); High Country Trustees, 1997; Simpson, 2005; North Canterbury Fish and Game, 2007; Ell, 1994); and academic discussion around tenure review (MacFarlane, 2011; Norton, 2008a, 2008b; Brower, 2008a; 2008b; 2006; Round, 2009; Morris, 2009a). However, the logic of separation within tenure review is frequently given little critique, for it is an often-assumed normative logic to divide nature from society in order to advance ecological protection goals.\(^{14}\) Importantly, the conceptual framework that reviewing media and institution discourse and understandings of polarisation and conflict provides, speaks to the theoretical and empirical concentrations of the study, explained in the following chapter.

Clearly, connections exist between tenure review, social struggle and the assertion of physical (within space) and cognitive (within the mind) boundaries between conservation and farming (Bryan, 2012). Locally, the process reveals an economic and spatial transformation that is suggested to be modifying social practices and interactions between diverse groups of various political affiliations. Tenure reform manifests as a political clash over the definition and allocation of spatial values (Redford and Sanderson, 2000), which in a modernist ideology are perpetuated as an either/or dichotomy between protective good and productive necessity (Castree, 2009; Howitt and Suchet-Pearson, 2006). The overall logic of the thesis and its theoretical and empirical import is now clarified by explaining the movements through its chapters.
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\(^{14}\)Norton and Miller (2000) and Norton (2004) examine issues associated with this, drawing attention to how division undermines the potential for integrated, well-connected and high biodiversity rural landscapes.
can be enhanced by understanding interpersonal subjectivities and how localised discourses clarify or complicate issues with tenure review that are frequently generalised. Exploring the work of Massey (2005; 1995), the theoretical approach negotiates between macro-level critique and intersubjective complexities existing within local places. To this end, the lens of social constructionism is useful, and scholars within this lineage of thinking continue to critique Western-centric environmentalisms that divide and bound nature at a distance from society. It is argued that such an ideology is socially alienating. Constructionist scholarship also emphasises localised complexities to inform higher-level ideas of spaces and identities, highlighting epistemological pluralism. In light of Braun (2006a; 2006b), this position relates to adopting a localised, values theoretical analysis as the core empirical platform to the study.

Chapter three establishes a normative framework. By examining Bourdieu’s sociology I highlight how his theoretical approach aligns with Massey’s strategy of negotiating between macro (structural) and micro (agency) levels of critique. Furthermore, the philosophy of Bourdieu has been applied in diverse contexts, but is especially fruitful for thinking about rural transformation. Each theoretical tool examined in Chapter 2 and 3 apply to interrogating the conventions of division between and the bounding politics implicated with tenure review. By integrating constructionism (Chapter 2) and Bourdieusian theory as lenses, I conceive the platform for critique; deconstructing the logic of tenure review and the issues that have led to social unrest. Referring to Figure 1.3 (overleaf), the objective of deconstruction provides the foundation to analysis in Chapters 5, 6 and 7 (The Deconstructive Phase). This is undertaken before Chapter 8 assesses and opens potentials for a different pluralist politics (The Reconstructive Phase).

Following situating the research within its theoretical structure, Chapter 4 addresses the methodology. The qualitative approach employed expands on the theoretical framework, where the emphasis on examining complexities within a ‘localised’ social space emerged. This comes directly from the methodological principles of Bourdieu, which are detailed at this point (Grenfell, 2008a; Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2007). I examine the complexities associated with the local case study region and then move to outline the interviewing approach, methods and analytical techniques used.

The three components of theorisation that stem from the three research questions, then inform the themes of empirical discussion and structure the analytical chapters. This process of theoretical and empirical analysis is undertaken synchronously. Data and theorisation are not separated, as theoretical tools used to analyse and support empirical
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Figure 1.2: Thesis structure and rationale
arguments around each research question. Constructionism and Bourdieusian theory deconstruct the logic of division between nature and society, production and protection in tenure review, before collaborative management theory is built on to offer potentials for developing a pluralist landscape politics.

Chapter 8 affirms the complex issues associated with the bounding of the high country landscape with tenure review and continues to show the abundance and complexity associated with valuations of social space. The chapter embraces epistemological pluralism, as an open political concept that allows us to engage with multiple and complex visions. This is rather than falling back on a production-protection policy dichotomy.

To conclude the thesis, Chapter 9 brings empirical and theoretical debates together to contribute to new understandings of context and issues surrounding high country land management and separation based conservation approaches like tenure review. Through critique and by adopting a range of tools, the thesis begins to establish a new political future that recognises plural claims to space.
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Chapter 2

Theoretical Parameters to a Critical Spatial Geography

2.0 Framing the theoretical approach

The current chapter works in conjunction with Chapter Three to establish the theoretical basis to the thesis. Important to negotiating this framework is recognising that the socially constructed world is identifiable as bounded and categorised spaces (Castree, Demeritt and Liverman, 2009). In the postmodern frame these spaces mean different things to various people and are constantly evolving with social processes; whether structural, associated with capitalistic logics like political power, laws and economistic influences; or micro-scale transformations, involving the agency and praxis of people and semiotic meaning production. The current study is therefore a partial interpretation of the constant evolution of high country space. This must be written into the theoretical and methodological approach to the research, connecting to the analytical contribution gained from the project, as a form of “situated knowledge” (Nightingale, 2003: 76), as well as the theoretical and methodological decisions made by me as the researcher. This is a practice of critical reflexivity, a concept engaged with more deeply in Chapter Four (Bourdieu, 2000; Gross, 2011; Daniels, 2011; Massey, 1999; England, 1994).

To begin the chapter in Section 2.1, the current project is situated within a postmodern ontology. I employ a post-structural framework and the tools of social constructionism as a reflexive approach to understanding the social practices that make rural high country space meaningful and how meanings and attitudes are changing. However, in Section 2.2, I suggest that embarking on a postmodern theoretical approach requires acknowledgement of the Marxist origins of the production of space and nature theses, and the interest Marxist scholars like Smith and Harvey have taken with nature’s externalisation from society. I make explicit how some of the political-economic critique, and namely that of Brower (2006; 2008a; 2008b; 2009), who emphasised inequities associated with tenure review, fits within this broader debate. I then move to the rationale of Doreen Massey in Section 2.3, who while a Marxist geographer, confronts criticism that historical materialism has remained too abstract, high level and economistic in focus, by negotiating a framework between macro and micro-scale analysis. In so doing, the materialist lenses of political economy and neoliberal critique are retained as an important aspect to the research approach. After all, tenure review as the intervention in focus,
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originates with the neoliberal overhaul of New Zealand’s agricultural economy. However, the philosophical and methodological rationale of Massey and other locality-focused geographers, emphasises empirical analysis attentive to actor agency and the intersubjectivities of people involved within local spaces, in order to interpret broader changes and structures. Consequently, this chapter negotiates a theoretical approach that balances between macro-level abstraction and micro-level convolutions.\footnote{Similarly, this is a philosophical logic that infuses with the thinking of French sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu examined and Chapter 3, and also frames the methodological approach to the present study, developed in Chapter 4.}

In Sections 2.4 and 2.5 that follow, I examine the different elements of theory regarding the multiplicity of landscape and nature, which contribute to the intervention made by the current study. However, each element of theory is articulated in a way that further informs and expands on issues with the dualism between protection and production values and objectives within tenure review. In the late 1980s, early attention to the dualistic externalisation of nature from society was primarily the focus of Marxist scepticism towards forms of Westernised, bourgeois environmentalisms (Smith, 1984; Gregory, 2006). However, in Section 2.5, I explain how social construction and conservation geographies have continued to critique duality constructs between nature and society in cognitive frames and within eco-politics advocating nature’s separation from culture. Constructionism highlights an agent focused empirical approach to understand the importance of semiotic meanings and how social values influence contextualised eco-politics. In the final section of the chapter I highlight how the objectives to the research inspire a value theoretical approach (Braun, 2006a), to inform duality constructs embedded within macro-level institutional structures and social thought around New Zealand’s conservation orthodoxy. For this reason, the research examines social values and how new meanings and definitions of high country space are being constructed and negotiated with the intervention of tenure review; erecting new and firming pre-existing boundaries across space. Critiquing boundaries between nature and society links to the application of Bourdieu in Chapter 3, as a framework that enables further critical examination of social-spatial transformation associated with the erection of boundaries and the power relations operating between contesting social orders.
2.1 Adopting a postmodern analytical frame

Modernism and postmodernism are used frequently to characterise dominant social formations. Murdoch and Pratt (1993: 414) address that modernity and postmodernity can be classified simultaneously as “a cultural movement, an expression of economic structuring and as a perception of the world that is entrenched in the discursive spheres”. The terms modernism and postmodernism therefore depict different ideological frameworks, or bodies of ideas that reflect beliefs and interests of groups in society and underlie political action, contested social attitudes and praxis (Philo, 1993). The distinction between postmodernism and post-structuralism articulated at this juncture, relates to what Murdoch and Pratt (1993: 412) consider to be the post-structural “focus on the strands of the postmodern debate that highlight questions of knowledge”. Such an acknowledgement emerges from philosophical questions that surround the hegemonic position of particular knowledge systems in environmental debates and practice (Pedynowsky, 2003; Whatmore, 2009; Goodman, Boykoff and Evered, 2008). Critique has continued to surround the knowledge hegemony tied intricately to the legitimacy accorded to quantitative science and positivistic knowledge systems, as opposed to traditionally derived and local knowledge (Turnbull, 1997; Nightingale, 2003; Thoms, 2008).

One distinction between the ideological frameworks of modernism and postmodernism is the engagement of critical reflexivity, which reveals the scrutiny post-structuralist thinking has placed on the partiality of all knowledge systems (Massey, 1999; Katz, 2001; Chambers, 2009; Nightingale, 2003; Turnbull, 1997; Braun, 2004). A second distinction is the postmodern researcher’s theoretical and empirical commitment to challenging resilient ontological dualisms in social thought and praxis; such as between objective/subjective structures, local/non-local, urban/rural, and important for the current study, nature and society (Wacquant and Bourdieu, 2007). Interrogation of such dualistic constructs has remained a concentration of scholars from various disciplinary vantage points. Mentioned previously, the current project borrows from several different paradigms of thought, including materialism, constructionism and Bourdieusian theory, which apply to interrogating boundaries erected between production and protection (or nature and society) within tenure review.

16 Through exploring critical work in rural geography (see: Murdoch and Pratt, 1993; Cloke, 1989; 1995), it is suggested by Bond (2008) that within studies of rurality, post modernism consists of two primary aspects: 1) postmodern society is comprised of amorphous, heterogenous arrangements of places, territories and connective networks; 2) postmodernism, as a theoretical lens, is a current version of recognising that the world and our knowledge of it is under a constant state of flux, as a dimension of postmodern thought more closely aligned with post-structuralism.
Parallel thinking on space and dualism in postmodernism and materialism

Key thinkers such as Lefebvre, Bourdieu and later Baudrillard, among others from the French school, are attributed with the postmodern shift for re-injecting spatial thinking into French social theory. Lefebvre and Bourdieu each provided different readings of the impact of capitalism on the production of space and society. Whereas, Baudrillard emerged as part of a cohort of French thinkers known as the post-structuralist school, including Deleuze, Lyotard, Foucault, Derrida and Lacan (Morin, 2010; Soja, 1989; 1980). Each shared interest in semiotics and social power.\(^\text{17}\) Previously, under the modernist paradigm, time was prioritised as vital and transformative of social processes, whereas space was viewed as the static backdrop on which social processes unfurled (Massey, 2005; Soja, 1989). For this reason, under modernist quantitative traditions time and temporal change was measured and mapped positivistically (Massey, 2005; 1999; 1993). Space however, remained under theorised, assumed static and unproblematic.\(^\text{18}\)

Parallel work in the Anglo-American scholarship of the late 1980s saw several important theoretical works that examined what spatial theory could look like from a Marxist materialist perspective. Smith’s (1984), *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital and the Production of Space*, Harvey’s (1989), *The Condition of Postmodernity*, Cooke’s (1989), *Back to the Future*, and Soja’s (1989) *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*, were prominent contributions. Each of these materialist contributions connected local transformations, predominantly in urban contexts, with macro level trends of capitalist development. Smith’s (1984) work remained resolutely grounded in a historical materialist framework, where he considered that capitalistic processes were the most significant influence on the social production of space. Smith (1984: 49) emphasises that as “capital stalks the earth in search of material resources; nature becomes a universal means of production in the sense that it not only provides the subjects, objects and instruments of

---

\(^\text{17}\) Semiotics emphasises understanding signs, symbols, representations and signification within social and political practice. Broadly, semiotics is the study of meaning making and subjective knowledge often tied with the discursive realm and complex social epistemology. It is a lineage of thinking that post structuralism reinvigorated. Following the positivist trends of the modernist period and quantitative revolution, research in the realm of interpersonal subjectivities and the power associated with representation and meaning making and knowledge challenged the previous demand for positivistic quantitative understandings of the world, which had become the western benchmark of rational, objective and ‘tested’ knowledge (Turnbull, 1997; Pedynowski, 2003). Post-structural semiotics was less interested in the ontology and structure of things, but the qualitative ways that things are known, valued, represented and understood, providing an alternative understanding to structuralist accounts like Marxist political-economy and quantitative, Western-centric traditions within social science.

\(^\text{18}\) Following the French school of post-structuralism, this lineage of social spatial analytic is engaged with later in the chapter. A culturalist values and pluralist frame focused on semiotics holds that space, nature and landscape ‘produced’, meaningful and complex.
production, but is also in its totality an appendage to, the production process”. Therefore, spatial transformation is intricately and complexly tied with capital, where nature is assumed into processes of capitalism and consequently, spaces and landscapes are produced, destroyed and remade under the dictate of economic production and accumulation.

Similarly, Harvey (1989) also maintained that materialist approaches to understanding the structures and logic of capitalism is of fundamental importance to challenging the inequities of global capitalism and understanding the spatial, economic and political transformations manifested locally in complex ways. For this reason, Harvey in the *Condition of Postmodernity* (1989) was at the time, explicitly arguing against new postmodern and post-structural inspired thinking, which was fast becoming assumed as the new benchmark of geographical knowledge; emphasising different, qualitative ways of analysing cultural pluralism and accepting relativity and relational understandings of social praxis, space and nature. In this way, Harvey suggests that at most postmodernism could be understood with reference to a Frederic Jameson type of Marxist analysis (Harvey 1989; 1984). Jameson (1984) as a Marxist scholar, described postmodernism as the rapid changes to the spatialisation of culture under the pressures of capitalism and accumulation logic, to some extent integrating between macro and micro scales of analytic. There is a distinct emphasis on the complexity of agent interactions and responses within Jameson’s work, however, as a Marxist he extrapolates back to broader capitalist structures.

Furthermore, there is certainly a case to be made that with *Postmodern Geographies* (1989) and subsequent works like ‘Thirdspace’ (1996), Soja was moving from a predominantly Marxist to a postmodernist way of analysing issues. However, in 1989, *Postmodern Geographies* remained macro-level and relatively economistic in terms of spatial analysis. Due to the emphasis on higher-level economic structures and capitalist logic, ruminations within other areas of geography questioned whether macro-level, political-economic and quantitative analysis was all postmodern geography could amount to. For example Relph (1993; 1997), a culturalist geographer, claimed that an over reliance on structural and political-economic methodology reduced Marxist contributions to dense and overly theoretical conclusions. Materialist theory was argued by Relph (1993: 98) to have become “an abstract argument in words”, detached from empirical complexities, and therefore, limited in addressing profligate environmental and social challenges. It was argued that such issues were increasingly global, but intensely local and that local spatial
dynamics could not be understood by totalising and generalised statements on which Marxist structuralism relied.

Such discussion illustrates tensions that have been prominent in geography, between (macro) structural and (micro) agency focused research, the latter being closely aligned with post-structural accounts. Previously, political-economy and macro-level approaches were venerated as an objective way of understanding issues associated with the social production of space under capitalism (Massey, 1999). However, questioning of the materialist paradigm reinforced movement towards postmodern approaches emphasising locality and subjective experience. For example, post-structural and feminist critique, as well as work in rural geography led to a revalorising of ‘everyday’ experiences and locality as the focus of empirical inquiry (see: William, Liebert and Larkin, 2004; Katz, 2001; Friedman, 1989). Consequently, the macro-level framework of materialism became ‘situated’ (Nightingale, 2003; Kruks, 2014; Harraway, 1991). Political economy and structural critique has increasingly become recognised as a useful, but partial reading of the social (material and semiotic) production of space.

I reengage with criticisms that have fronted materialist thinking about space and nature in the subsequent section. However, there are significant strengths drawn from the work of Marxist geographers like Smith, Harvey and Massey that contribute to a strong theoretical framework for the present study. However, I argue that structuralist critique in the current study will be enhanced by applying other bodies of postmodern and constructionist thinking. After all, in the high country, reforming the leasehold tenure framework as the basis to capitalistic order with tenure review, likely dramatically impacts on values for space, contingent social attitudes and inter-subjectivities of agents. This acknowledgement suggests the need to understand macro-level dimensions of tenure review, but also the micro-level manifestations of the process in localised spaces, through the agency of people. Furthermore, some conventional critique of tenure review has focused on agrarian, class based capture of economic benefits from neoliberal, economic restructuring. In particular, the work of Brower (2008a; 2008b; 2006, 2009), which is discussed as a subsection to the following discussion, exemplifies a series of concerns related to broad-level critique of tenure review.

---

19 Such a critical view is often associated with Marxist materialist critique, which comes from a socialist grounding, critical of the power that landed classes have in agrarian societies like New Zealand.
2.2 The materialist stance: Nature and society as distinct realms.

Smith (1984) within *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital and the Production of Space*, engaged deeply with the dialectal co-production of ‘nature’ under capitalism. The international political climate of the 1970s and 1980s, when the materialist dialectics of Marxist scholars like Smith and Harvey emerged, was a period characterised by the proliferation of what Smith (1984) referred to as bourgeois environmentalism. The increasingly urbanised global community was fast becoming aware of resource scarcity. A sense of looming ecological crisis intensified social focus on environmental issues.

However, a prominent contribution from the Marxist production of nature thesis, was to show that Western preservation and environmental ideology often assume flawed understandings of nature as a realm external from society. Nature is categorised and fetishised and assumes a primordial, self-evident condition of ‘being natural’ (Smith 1996). On these grounds normative Western understandings of nature have established in environmentalisms that advocate the separation of ‘static nature’ from the destructive encroachment of society; a position that has been examined by materialist and constructionist geographers scholars alike (including, Harvey, 1996; Castree, 2004; Barnes, 2006; Braun, 2006a; 2006b; 2008; Katz, 2006).

Subsequently, Smith (2008) extended his 1984 and 1996 works, expanding on the understanding that there exist various contradictory definitions of nature at work simultaneously under neoliberal capitalism. Within Smith’s corpus of work, there exists the concept of *external nature*, or First Nature, a form of nature that exists separate to the realm of humans. First nature is distinct by the extent to which it is not social, a pre-human and frequently fetishised nature, which also provides the resource base to capitalist accumulation. Simultaneously, there is also the concept of *universal nature*, or Second Nature, where nature is defined as every material thing, including humans and their work within the biophysical world. The third form of nature described by Smith is *human nature*, which he assumes, within a Marxist episteme, to be governed primarily by the logic of capital and the characteristics of human behaviour and interaction under capitalism. Smith describes this logic of behaviour as a fourth form of *internal nature*, which captures personal...

---

20 In 1992, the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro, referred to as ‘Earth Summit’, and the associated Agenda 21 corresponded with the fear of biodiversity crisis. This became encapsulated in New Zealand’s environmental lobby, which at the time was becoming increasingly powerful in New Zealand’s political scene. The salience of this connection between international and national conservation contexts will become increasingly clear throughout the thesis. Examples, of this growing national concern are indicated with the establishment of the Values Party, which brought questions of social welfare, environmental quality and justice to the forefront of national politics (Rainbow, 1993).
feelings and attitudes often manifest at a local scale, such as a yearning or fear for nature. What Smith emphasised was the dialectic between the four forms of nature, as mutually constituted.

What Marxist dialectics invigorated was an understanding that nature and landscapes are historical products, but also dynamic entities (Harvey, 1993). This initial accounting for social-spatial co-constitution and flux has been extended to consider nature and society as not separate or opposed ontological realms, but are part of a broader global totality of transformative nature-society interactions (White, 2004), and interest in the various ways that nature and society are hybrid in both form and function.\(^{21}\)

In the following quotation, however, Smith highlights how the idea of nature’s dialectical production borders on absurd, because of the normalised way that nature is assumed separate from society within Western/new world concepts. Contrary to the assumed common sense externalisation, however, Smith’s principal contribution amounted from his assertion of the ‘fusing’ together of nature and society, where he states:

> The idea of the production of nature is indeed paradoxical, to the point of sounding absurd, if judged by the superficial appearance of nature in capitalist society. Nature is generally seen as precisely that which cannot be produced; it is the antithesis of human productive activity. In its most immediate appearance, the natural landscape presents itself to us as the material substratum of daily life, the realm of use-values rather than exchange values. As such it is highly differentiated along any number of axes. But with the progress of capital accumulation and the expansion of economic development, this material substratum is more and more the product of social production, and the dominant axes of differentiation are increasingly societal in origin. In short, when this immediate appearance of nature is placed in historical context, the development of the material landscape presents itself as a process of the production of nature. The differentiated results of this production of nature are the material symptoms of uneven development. At the most abstract level, therefore, it is in the production of nature that use-value and exchange-value, and space and society, are fused together (Smith, 1984: 32).

From a Marxist materialist perspective, Smith (1996: 56) argued that under the dictate of capital accumulation, “the geological and biological substratum are not immune from transformation by capital”. Such criticism of the still emerging neoliberal orthodoxy stimulated a surge of Marxist scholarship. Smith revitalised interest in the concept of nature, which until the 1980s was under thought. However, as a result, Marxist thinking

\(^{21}\) This argument has expanded into varied lineages of thinking around the hybridity and the fusion between biophysical nature and capitalist society. It is a political recognition regularly asserted in the growing corpus of contemporary geographers (such as Braun (2006; 2008a), Whatmore (2006; 2002); Bingham and Hinchliffe (2008), Lorimer (2012; 2005), Harraway and Latour (2004), Harraway (1991a; 1991b; 1990)), who have expanded on and diverged from the dialectics of Smith and Harvey’s historical materialism.
argued that the core to eco-politics was a need to analyse capitalism, its ecological and geographical effects, which are invariably wrapped up with class contests (Harvey, 2007; 2005; Castree 2009; 2008a; 2008b; Castree and Head, 2007; Smith; 1984; 1996; 2008). This became a theoretical tension, variably agreed with and challenged across the discipline of emerging critical, post-modern geographies.

Recognising how embedded processes of neoliberal capitalism are within biophysical nature, materialism emphasised relations with production that are constantly under transformation from the impact of the capitalist system. Human agents are understood to operate within these broader structuring’s of logic. Whereas, constructionist theorists like Braun (2006a; 2006b; 2008) and Harraway (1991a; 1991b; 1997), acknowledge interaction between agents. Therefore, space and physical nature are understood as co-produced and filled with social politics and the localised agency of people, which determine contingent experiences and values, mediating how people interact with each other, with space and with ‘nature’. These social complexities cannot be understood by a reductionist approach that breaks down sociality to the logic and structure of capitalism alone, suggest authors like Kruks (2014), Harraway and Latour, (2014); Latour (2014; 2004b), Katz (2006); Bingham and Hinchliffe (2008) Whatmore (2002). However, there are strengths in applying the materialism of Harvey to the current study, especially where he argues for the application of alternative lenses and paradoxical knowledge’s to the critique of neoliberal transformation.

---

**Harvey’s materialism**

David Harvey, like his student Smith, is ubiquitous with the reinvigoration of spatial analysis and materialist geographies of nature. To Harvey, questions of nature are always questions associated with capitalism, as a generative process through which the dialectical production of nature and spatial transformation occurs (Braun, 2006b). He asserts in *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*, that “the prevailing practices [of capital accumulation] dictate a profit-driven transformation of environmental conditions and an approach to nature which treats it as a passive set of assets to be scientifically assessed and valued in commercial (money) terms (Harvey, 1996: 131).”

---

22 This is the vision that Robinson (2011) depicts as an instrumentalist or economy-centric valuation of nature, often perceived (in debates over nature) to clash with eco-centric visions. This import stems from a Marxist socialist interest that seeks to challenge problems of social inequity associated with neoliberal capitalism. It comes from a point of view that transformation of nature in the support capital accumulation further advances the economic hegemony of traditionally the landed, or agrarian elite.
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Gregory’s (2006: 25) interpretation, is that to Harvey most of all, “geography matters, concepts of space, place and landscape unsettle and dislocate mainstream social theory to such a degree that they open up altogether different perspectives on the world”. Braun is reflective on the object of Harvey’s studies being “Marx not Marxism” (2006a: 7). Importantly, the position sheds light on Harvey’s contemporary project to invest in the emancipatory potentials of different perspectives within human geography. Harvey argued against an over focus on post-modern geographies and the tendency to focus on social and agentic complexities at the expense of addressing broader capitalist structures and functions of social-economic marginalisation. However, Harvey (2004) acknowledged the strength of alternative and paradoxical knowledge frameworks, where for example, he concedes the value of Harraway’s (1991; 1997) contribution, where she has remained a persistent critic of materialism and capitalistic critique abstracted from social context. Harvey stressed how alternative lenses enhance materialism as a platform for critiquing neoliberal hegemony, rather than detract from it. Alternative, epistemological frameworks allow for analysis from many different angles. Furthermore, Harvey’s emphasis on alternative knowledge’s is important for the theoretical justification of integrating together multiple frameworks as a theoretical bricolage within the current study.

Confronting weaknesses of materialism

Criticalisms of historical materialism, and the work of Harvey particularly, highlight three dimensions: 1) social values are rarely addressed within a political-economic framework, except for in generalised terms of categorisation, which may perpetuate generalisations and stasis attributed to space; 2) specifics and dynamics between individuals and social groups are frequently overlooked; 3) social and cultural understandings of space are often only weakly referred to. Therefore, basing analysis on broad-level political economic trends was criticised as too crude as a tool for understanding the complex and heterogeneous socio-cultural processes, network connections and the circulation of things, beings and capitals that constitute space and nature (Whatmore, 2002; Harraway, 1997; Harraway and Latour, 2004a; 2004b). Political-economic and structuralist frameworks are understood to not account for the importance of ongoing cultural production; namely the inter-subjective and representational complexities that relate to the co-production of meaningful spaces and therefore influence the relationships between human agents, space and nature.

Although Harvey’s theoretical and empirical focus on spatial and temporal (geographical) transformation under capitalism is frequently macro-level in focus, Harvey
does speak to micro-level changes. In recent examples of his work, such as *The New Imperialism* (2003), Harvey seeks to uncover deeper transformations occurring underneath the turbulence and volatility of neoliberal processes. He suggests that often the volatility of neoliberalism distracts from more perverse spatial-social transformations, which go unnoticed but support capture and accumulation by elites. However, a limitation of Harvey’s macro-level critique and emphasis on the adverse impacts of neoliberalism is that such a broad level analytic may also overlook inter-subjective resistance to orderings and logics of neoliberal orthodoxy, and conventional critique of it. Similarly, in *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (2005), Harvey pays close attention to the variations of neoliberal processes beyond the United States and Britain. However, his analysis remains at an aggregate, macro-level. He acknowledges the violence of neoliberalism within everyday life, but gives few examples of it. In so doing, Harvey insists that it is possible to derive the laws and processes of various regimes of capital accumulation, comparable to others based on structure and logic.

Such criticisms exemplify issues that scholars, including Harraway (1997, 1991a), Harraway and Latour (2004), Whatmore (2002) and Braun (1998), take with the materialist approach, argued to not give voice to local contingency within the relational co-production of social-natures. In so doing, such scholars tend to justify the localisation of empirical research in the spaces (community and home spaces) in which macro level pressures are negotiated. However, Harvey (1989) is critical of postmodernism being adopted as an epistemological benchmark. He also remained wary of geography’s contemporary emphasis on local contingencies, and he maintains an avid need to challenge broader capitalist structures that lead to dominance and marginality within local spaces (Harvey, 2003; 2005; Richter, 2011).

However, Harvey (1996) agrees that while seeking to provide critique of the capitalist system that underpins environmental degradation and social inequities, within forms of uncritical eco-Marxism vestiges of modernist, deterministic and positivist notions of external nature recur. Dualism is retained and what Braun (2006b) describes as a politically stifling ‘discourse of limits’ in the excerpt below, potentially feeds fear for nature

---

23 Post-modernism has been embraced by critical geographers (including Braun, Harraway, Whatmore) who emphasise the value of a relational ontology for transforming relations that rely on duality constructs between that which is determined to be nature and the cognitive other that is society. With the relational understanding, the notion of nature as static and existing external to society is challenged. Space and nature are under processes of constant material and social production.
and an oppositional politics between those who protect or ‘save’ nature and others who are assumed opposed to nature’s protection. As Braun (2006b: 199) argues,

…with the world so divided it comes as little surprise that a discourse of ‘limits’ and thus the ghost of Malthus – slips back into their [eco-Marxists] analytical frame, for all that remains to do is conceive both sides of the dualism – society and nature – as governed by laws: in the case of society, the ‘iron laws’ of capitalist accumulation and in the case of nature, the laws of classical physics.

Therefore, in the desire to transcend dualism, eco-Marxists often rely on the externalisation of nature as a distinct ontological realm. Consequently, to some extent Harvey supports the argument of Braun (2006b: 199) that “dialectics offers to crude a method to overcome dualism, retaining the terms of the binary, even as it seeks to replace them in relations”. However for this reason, Harvey sought to distance himself from contemporary eco-Marxism and emphasises alternative lenses of critique.

Harvey’s geography is definitely not static, an acknowledgement that geographers like Massey (2006; 2005; 1999), Braun (1998; 2006a; 2006b; 2008), Hinchliffe et al., (2005), Lane (2001) and Lynn (2000) have taken up voraciously. Concepts of space as a ‘container’ or an absolute, static and bounded entity are transformed in Harvey’s materialism, replaced by concepts of fluidity and the transient and contingent dialectic between society and space. Although focused on capitalist inequities and revealing as a macro–level materialism, Harvey’s geography goes beyond the limitations of materialism through emphasising spatial and temporal dynamics. Materialist dialectics, from Harvey and Smith, emphasises the constructed and contingent assemblage of society, nature and moving understandings of space. For example this is expressed by acknowledging the relative malleability or rigidity of class visions in rural or urban contexts in Smith’s concepts of gentrification (Smith, 2002; 1996); and where creative destruction marks the rupture between fixity and flux within the unsettled landscapes of neoliberalism, which disrupts stabilities that inhere within the subtleties, meanings and practices attached to local spaces and places (Massey, 2005; 1999).

Materialist dialectics rejects that there is some universal spatial language separate from social practice, because each is intertwined. The concepts of dialectics and co-production are aspects of shared ideology between Marxist materialisms and cultural and semiotic constructionist paradigms (see: Demeritt, 2001; Braun, 2006a 2006b; 2008; Braun and Whatmore, 2010; Braun and Wainwright, 2001). However, it is also the theoretical
juncture at which materialist and constructionist literatures diverge. In light of this divergence between materialist and constructionist geography, however, Gregory (2002) emphasises the potency of David Harvey’s scholarship for integrating multiple frameworks of analysis.

In terms of the current debate, materialist critique takes analysis to a particular place. However, having read much of Harvey’s scholarship, and engaging his support of alternative lenses, I suggest that argumentation retained at an abstracted level with political economy and legalistic framings may perpetuate issues of inequity. I consider this to be a flaw manifest within the polarising critique of tenure review offered by Brower (2006a; 2006b; 2008). Brower’s work became a force of conflict in high country landscape politics in 2006 through to 2010, and by applying alternative approaches a broader set of problematic issues emerge within Brower’s critique, which retained overly legalistic and economic framings. Harvey (2005) along with Blomley (2010; 2011) suggests that legalistic critique may perpetuate a status quo. Defensiveness of land and legal rights entitle particular concepts of ownership, which provide a support system for neoliberal structures. Potentially propagating the “turbulent landscapes of modern capitalism” as Gregory (2006: 202) argues. Landscapes characterised by fast paced social and spatial transformation and intensifying accumulation by elites under the orthodoxy of neoliberal hegemony. However, retaining legalistic and high level critique often preserves a priori assumptions regarding the dualism between first (external) and second (social) nature un-problematically (Smith, 2008).

**Brower’s critical stance on tenure review**

Through a macro-level framing and socialist perspective, Brower (2008a; 2008b; 2006) argued perceived inequities from tenure review outcomes as anti-democratic and representative of a non-transparent process that eroded public rights in the high country. Brower (2008a; 2008b, 2006) highlighted that issues of inequity are often entrenched by the operation of the State and a bureaucracy sensitive to traditional landed hegemony. As a scholar in law and economics, outcomes from tenure review illustrated capture of the process with the appropriation of Crown compensation and land as the resource base to capital accumulation. However, talking with a key informant whom I first met at the annual Federated Farmers conference in 2010 prior to the project’s commencement, Brower was understood to have constructed outcomes from tenure review in a way that “named and shamed leaseholders and dragged family names through the mud” (Key Informant 6).
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Several issues within Brower's coverage raised the hackles of the farming community, inflamed political rhetoric and also relations within tenure review. First, Brower (2008a) approached outcomes of tenure review in a way that extrapolated outcomes from especially high amenity regions of the high country, including the Queenstown and Wanaka region to a generalised appraisal of tenure review. The case study examples used by Brower (2008a) were all prominent properties in several high amenity regions. Each clearly represented inequity in terms of nature conservation and public access gains, relative to the Crown expense to reacquire pastoral lease land for conservation. Brower (2006) focused on the large crown remunerations, real estate development and land diversification in ‘premium’ regions.

Second, an important issue that provoked leaseholders and Federated Farmers lobbying, was that Brower misconstrued Crown pastoral leases as ‘public’ or Crown land (see: Brower, 2008a; 2008b; Quigley, 2008). Consequently, the right of exclusive occupation by lessees was brought under question leading to vocal contest from the farming lobby and intense conflict seen in the media and institutional coverage (Vallance, 2011; Upton, 2009; Bray, 2002; Walking Access NZ, 2009; Timaru Herald, 2010). This unrest led to what has been dubbed the ‘Fish and Game Case’ in 2009.25 In the High Court, the New Zealand Fish and Game Council challenged the rights of lessees to exclude the public from pastoral leases, on the basis that lessees hold perpetual, exclusive occupation rights. Resulting from this ruling, it is now understood that pastoral leaseholders hold exclusive occupation of leases, and therefore, hold rights to decline public access at their discretion – affirming the boundary between ‘private’ leasehold and public estate.

Third, by focusing on economic benefits for farmers from some tenure reviews, the situation became tied with deeper social and historical stigmas associated with farming classes and tensions between urban and rural communities. Mentioned in the hunting blog postings in Chapter 1, such representations are rooted in national representations of the southern landed gentry.

In ‘A Southern Gentry’, Eldred-Grigg (1981) examined the establishment of the productivist order across the high country and the social structures colonial pastoralism imposed. Eldred-Grigg documents how it was the younger sons of the British gentry’ class that settled the large pastoral estates, and later, as the lowlands were fully allocated for ‘agricultural improvement’, the high country leases (see Appendix 2a). Then, it was

25 The New Zealand Fish and Game Council vs Her Majesty’s Attorney General in Respect of the Commissioner of Crown Lands (First Defendant) and Christopher Dean Mouat, Donald Andrew Aubrey, Andrew William Simpson and Jonathan Arthur Wallis as Trustees of the High Country Accord Trust (Second Defendant).
predominantly Celtic working class immigrants who settled in New Zealand in the hope of more social opportunity and equity than in British homelands. They took up work on the large pastoral runs, and early in settlement a pseudo-British social system was enmeshed within high country society (Eldred-Grigg, 1981). In high country spaces, communities of workers and landholders came to co-exist in isolated places from which a sense of mutual reliance emerges in some of the literature (Dominy, 2003; 2001; 1995; Morris, 2009; Pawson and Brooking, 2002; McAloon, 2013). Properties relied on local communities for labour and vice versa, the communities relied on properties for employment – especially during times of depression in the 1880s and 1890s, the 1920s and 1930s and also during the First and Second World Wars (Te Ara, 2014; Holland, 2013; Holland, 2000). There existed delineation between leaseholders and workers, but each shared goals of surviving economically in a harsh place and under unforgiving environmental conditions. Such analysis reflected within Appendix 2a, which illustrates discursive change associated with the transition of social and economic context in the high country.

Resulting from this assessment of Brower’s work, I suggest that there exists complex backstories underlying her examination of tenure review as a ‘captured’, farmer-dominated process. For example, there is a convoluted political context that surrounds the interplay between the State, the public, conservation lobby and lessees in the high country. This aligns with the emergence of productivism and conservation awareness and fluid representations of the place of farming within the region, engaged with more deeply in Chapter 3. There also exist locally contingent subjectivities that are deeply entwined within the management of the high country and the shared mode of pastoral management encompassed by the pastoral lease (Dominy, 1995; Morris, 2009). As was examined by Morris (2009), such subjectivities and practices are clearly under transformation with the changing political economy and tenure system.

Furthermore, I suggest that Brower (2008a; 2008b; 2006), due to relying on evidence of economic inequities and what she deductively reasoned as legally unjustified outcomes from tenure review, did not begin her critique at the appropriate juncture. This manifested as a perceived attack of landholders, but tenure review operated as a practice of dividing space between production and protection values. As a State administered policy it has set in motion a process of social-spatial and economic transformation. Therefore, I suggest that issues lie with the ideology of division core to tenure review, which rests on the perpetuation of dichotomy constructs between nature and society at the heart of
modernist conservation orthodoxy. This issue I come to examine deeply in subsequent sections and chapters of analysis.

Authors including Brower (2008b) and her interchange with Quigley (2008), as well as Round (2009) and Mcfarlane (2011) all examine the issues and contest that surround tenure review. However, nobody challenges sufficiently the dualism erected between protection (nature) and production (society) interests. Brower’s critique provides a clear example of the argument Harvey (2005; 1996; 1993) makes, regarding how political economic and legal critique, from a socialist stance, can work in reverse of socialist aspirations, by reinforcing dualistic conflicts and affirming rights that perpetuate neoliberal hegemony.

Therefore, an alternative analytical approach is required. I apply a set of geographical lenses to a debate that has tended to be framed legalistically and as a clash between land rights and economic equities (Federated Farmers, 2009; Round, 2009; Quigley, 2008). Focusing on the troublesome duality erected between nature and society in conservation logic, I emphasise a culturalist approach rooted in the inter-subjective understandings and values of local people negotiating complex discourses. I come to the justifications for this approach in the following sections. However, one component to the rationale is that materialist/political-economic critique, though deconstructing issues of capitalist transformation, takes the discussion over tenure review to a place that remains antagonised. The political-economic and legalistic approach of Brower (2008a; 2008b; 2006) is useful for understanding issues associated with tenure review from a specific perspective, but possibly due to her origins as an economist, she identified no other theoretical options. However, it is hoped that empirical grounding in local context and deconstruction with alternative theoretical lenses, will inform the political-economic and legal setting in which policy decision-making is couched.

2.3 Negotiating between the macro and micro scales of analysis

Harvey’s thinking, along with much other materialist critique has continued to take explicit issue with what Braun (2006b: 191) in response to Latour (1993: 78), terms the “modern constitution”; the assumption that the world is divided into distinct categories or ontological entities, on which the socially resilient dualism between nature and society rests in modernist conservation ideology (Braun, 2008; Cronon, 1995; Harvey, 1996; 1993).

26 For example, Harvey (1982) argued that separation between nature and society is an historical effect of capitalist labour process. Humans oppose themselves to non-human nature, because this justifies nature’s
Mentioned above, relational co-production and dialectical interaction between society and nature are concepts fronted with relative agreement between materialist and constructionist scholars. However, this is where the paradigms begin to diverge with differing emphasis on macro structural and micro agency focus.

Braun’s argument signifies how materialism and political economy has come under criticism from culturalist geographers (including, Harraway and Latour (2004), Harraway (1997; 1991; 1989), Whatmore (2002; 2005)). While emphasising Harvey’s brilliance as a thinker on space and the importance materialist critique holds within human geography, Braun (2006b: 215), argues:

Harvey’s approach is that the production of nature is guided by something prior or beneath the level of practice, as if there were two realities – one reality consisting of the everyday practices and physical forces that constitute socio-ecological conditions, and a second reality that consists of the [structural/macro-level/capitalist] logics that determine them.

To posit capitalism like this Braun finds problematic. For he argues, it is to suggest a double ontology, “on the one hand, a world of practices and things, and on the other hand, a separate world of logics and [capitalist] spirit” (ibid.) This articulates a binary, whereby the risk is that capitalist logic is abstracted – rather than grounded in place in the operation of local contingencies, praxis and inter-subjective experience.27

Braun (2006b) applies the critical stance towards the nature society binary by reflecting on the context of international biodiversity conservation associated with the Rio de Janeiro ‘Earth Summit’ in 1992. Agenda 21 informed a technocratic response to global biodiversity crisis. However, for ‘deep greens’, the eco-centric response was that the core influence on biodiversity decline was human influence in nature. As Braun (2006b: 194) suggests, the solution from this eco-centric/preservationist stance was not a matter of “more reason, science and technology but less humanity in nature”. This signified the perpetuation of a modernist logic to environmentalism, with an entrenchment of ideology seeking the extraction of humans from nature. Whereas, the parallel discourse of ‘sustainable development’ emphasised humans existing sensitively in nature, but was

---

27 A term like capitalism, or capitalist logic is too generalist – it covers many spaces, logics, reactions, interactions – each are contingencies that are locally situated and complex, that should be unpacked and examined (Mitchell, 2002: 51). Situated events, specific places, particular knowledge’s get assumed into a broader, generalist framework of historical-materialist critique – which warps, essentialises and abstracts away from local sensitivities. The local is understood as contingent at the expense of compromising local inequities, politics and power relations.
encased within neoliberal logic and the balancing between neoliberal and deep green eco-centric ideologies (Wilhusen, 2010), a discussion reengaged with in Chapter 3.

To Braun (2006b), neither the technocratic or eco-centric response is satisfactory. The technocratic solution erases social and political-economic causes to environmental decline, which supports top-down and alienating environmentalisms based on the primacy of technical knowledge, economistic solutions and centralised administration. The eco-centric response however, is politically stifling for it sets up a false politics where only ‘perfect natures’ are justified protection, fortified into parks and reserves, locked away from social use. A sensitive approach to analysing multiple, complex forcings and feedbacks of environmental change is overlooked, because the root cause of environmental issues is assumed capitalist exploitation and human use. As a result, in order to protect nature, it is justified that humans be extracted, implanting an idealistic stance that is politically difficult and often socially objectionable (Brechin et al., 2002; Adams, 2004; Forsyth, 2008).

This argument is drawn out more fully in subsequent sections, applying literature from conservation geography; which often highlight issues with erecting boundaries between nature and economic production within preservation ideology (Adams, 2004; Bryan, 2012; Brechin et al., 2002; Zimmerer, 2010; 2006; 2000; Foster, 2010; McDermott, 2009; Walker, et al., 2002; West and Brockington, 2006; Olwig, 2006; 2010). Boundaries are a physical and cognitive construct that potentially lead to conservation and green ideology being peripheral to mainstream social practices and production, perceived as ‘extremist’ and impractical. Adams (2004) highlights this issue in the Australian context, and some media coverage suggest similar issues associated with tenure review, which in some examples expressed the debate over tenure review in terms of conflicting factions (including, Finnie, 2010; Littlewood, 2010a, 2010b; Ansley, 2005; Sage, 1995a).

Localising analysis
As Latour and Harraway (2004) advocate, social complexity often contradicts generality. Localities resist abstraction, because the complexities and idiosyncrasies of local space are interesting, empowering and complex in their exercise of agency. I perceive that within

---

28 This is the focus of political ecologists like Zimmerer (2010; 2000) and Blaikie (1997; 1985), Forsyth (2008) looking at the root causes of environmental issues and interventional solutions to environmental issues in a context or plural claims and multiple influences to decline. Issues surrounding the priority given to science and technical solutions in environmental issues and managing the ‘environmental commons’ is given considerable thought by Turnbull (1997), Agrawal et al., (2013), Dietz, Ostrom and Stern (2003), Brockington and Ingoe (2006).
Chapter Two: Theoretical Parameters to a Critical Spatial Geography

this contingency of local space (and sensitivities to the other) there exists the potential for a grounded local politics and action towards conservation outcomes. This may subvert national level politics, which as illustrated in Chapter 1 and with the coverage of Brower (2009; 2008a; 2008b; 2006) have become increasingly polarised. I suggest that conflict within the macro-level media and political sphere may act to decentre responsibility for issues, away from the State as the instrumental administrator behind tenure review. Consequently, contest between powerful groups supports / perpetuates the structures that lead to antagonistic factions locally, highlighting the various scales of tenure review’s influence.

The work of Doreen Massey, as a Marxist geographer is useful in terms of negotiating a framework between the macro level abstraction and the analysis of the inter-subjectivities of individuals negotiating localities. 29 This is also a theoretical and methodological ‘balancing’ that aligns with the thought and metaphors of Bourdieu, whose theory guides the normative framework to this study in Chapter 3 and the methodology in Chapter 4. 30 Massey’s scholarship advocates that political economy and structural critique provides an analytical way to expose the central processes of capitalist production (refer to Massey, 2005; 1993; 1992; 1984). However, the inclusion of a focus on locality allows the examination of specific non-economic, but inherently political and power-laden social processes. Massey emphasises the “unequivocally positive” (Massey, 1984: 300) nature of emphasis on locality and the unification between macro and micro focused analytic. She acknowledges however that,

...the challenge is to hold the two sides together ... understanding the general underlying causes while at the same time appreciating the importance of the specific and unique [situated in localities] (ibid.).

Massey has operated at the forefront of researching locality, whereby it is a ‘construct’ that within the postmodern paradigm is increasingly contested and acknowledged as fluid and multiple. As a broad overview of conclusions drawn from Massey’s scholarship, in For Space, Massey (2005:7) highlights how:

29 Massey’s contribution to critical and materialist geographies has been the reinvigorated interest in localities through a deep exploration of the contradictions and social richness embedded within local places. Massey is highly critical of inert definitions, and the ideological boundaries and power differentials that defend bounded and static meanings of space and place. In ‘For Space’ (2005), Massey asserts an explicit call for understandings of place that challenge aspatial readings of globalisation. She posits the need to move away from examining the political and economic frameworks of global commodity chains, towards, place-based studies of globalisation as experienced in localities (rural, urban, developing and first world).

30 Massey’s epistemological stance of balancing between micro level empirical analysis and structural critique aligns with Bourdieu’s theoretical approach explained in Chapter 3, and his methodological principles, which are explained in Chapter 4, Section 4.2. Bourdieu similarly highlights understanding local habitus and mundane forms of daily praxis to inform broader social, political and economic structuration of the ‘field’.
Space and place are products of interrelations. They do not have singular identities.

Places are not frozen in time, they are processes that encapsulate coexisting trajectories and value systems.

Space and place are always under construction; contested and political.

Places are not ‘enclosed’ with a clear inside and outside. Boundaries and place identities are power laden and socially constructed.

Local place subsequently becomes an important lens of inquiry for the current study, but requires examination as a concept, for the task of defining the field for research in Chapter 4.

Locality and a sense of localness are increasingly defended within the constant flux of capital accumulation and processes of spatial homogenisation (Harvey, 2005). However, as Massey (2005; 1999; 1996; 1989) suggests, ‘locality’ is often assumed and categorised as unified. An overt focus on locality in sub-disciplines such as rural geography has not come without contest from the broader academy, whereby it remained important to still address the broader factors of political-economic change, as a rationale for Massey (1993). As Massey (2005) explains, there is potential for contest between competing visions for space and place between different social groups and at varied social scales. In an abstract but theoretically rich way, Massey examines the interplay between neoliberalised capitalist development and the significance of local place in ‘For Space’ (2005):

In the context of a world that is, indeed, increasingly interconnected the notion of place (usually evoked as local place) has come to have totemic resonance. Its symbolic value is endlessly mobilised in political argument. For some it is the sphere of the everyday, of real and valued practices, the geographical source of meaning, vital to hold onto as ‘the global’ spins its ever more powerful and alienating webs. For others a ‘retreat to place’ represents a pulling-up of drawbridges and a building of walls against the new invasion. Place on this reading is the locus of denial, of attempted withdrawal ... a politically conservative haven (and in the end an unviable) basis for a response; one that fails to address the real forces at work. (Massey, 2005: 6-7).

First, through exposing how the meanings of place are defended in response to perceived threat, Massey suggests that this defence of place is often grounded on differing understandings and valuations for local place. To some, place is the focus of life and work, a mixture of the significant and day-to-day, mundane experiences of context. To others, place is a politically ‘neutral’ haven that struggles to address larger issues in a neo-liberalised

---

31 Massey (2005; 1996; 1993; 1992) challenges the binary between ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ of place, by addressing how space and boundaries are contested processes. In a constructionist framework, asserting that nature and understandings of space and landscape are fluid and contingent on social practices, means then that so are boundaries that enclose and the identities that categorise spaces (Mitchell, 1996; Gieryn, 2000; 2002).
rural context. Importantly, this insight raises the idea of competing conceptualisations of place.

Second, the recognition of dualism suggests the possibility of theorising the oppositional politics I have illustrated to exist between high country conservation and production interests. Massey suggests the potential exists for contesting, partial understandings of place articulated at different levels of New Zealand’s society by competing social groups. Despite rhetoric that neoliberal globalisation is purportedly producing a flat and borderless world of flows and flux (Friedman, 2005), place and the specificities of spaces become the locus of resistance and where politics are mobilised.

People may adhere to particular understandings and qualities of place and defend them as essential, valued qualities from partial perspectives, as is expressed with the examination of landscape below. However, Massey depicts the potential for different or contradictory understandings of the components and identity of a ‘defended place’. Different meanings of landscape, place and nature potentially underpin a system of contestation and fragmented values claims between social groups. This in turn perpetuates a division in ideas offered for the strategic management of places, landscapes and ‘the environment’. Understanding of polarity and defended political corners arise, which fails to account for the multiplicity of values that comprise places (Olwig, 2005). Social contest may also obscure the more furtive advancement of neoliberal privatisation, a dimension of locality that is highlighted by Harvey (1989; 2003; 2005), but continued by Massey (1993; 1999).

**Questioning locality**

There has been an on-going discussion within geography about the definition of locality. Previously, Thrift and Williams (1987: 17) defined locality as being a place “where there is a distinctive institutional mix giving rise to an identifiable economy and culture”. Then later in the 1980s Marxist geographers, including Soja (1989), Harvey (1989) and Cooke (1989) attempted to uncloud the meaning of locality. For example, Soja (1989: 639), in a highfalutin way defined “localities as being particular types of enduring locale, stabilised socially and spatially through the clustered settlement of primary activity sites and the establishment of a propinquitous territorial community”. Both Harvey and Cooke agreed

---

32 Biophysical aspects, species and systems that comprise ‘nature’ matter to social values for nature; however, the ways ‘nature’ is conceptualised matters in terms of the politics that surround environmental protection.

33 I began to examine this aspect of the relationship set up in New Zealand’s national discourse between high country production and protection interests in Chapter 1.
that locality was a concentrated milieu of thought and social action. However this was the extent to which Harvey and Cooke agreed with each other.

Cooke (1989) refined and expanded this sentiment, arguing that in locality there exists a context for social movement, innovation, resistance and adaptation. Cooke addressed that social empowerment in local context offered a primary challenge to the modernist structures of centralisation (both economic and governance), and at the time of publishing in 1989, fast neoliberalising global capitalism. Through strategies of decentralisation to ‘the local’, Cooke envisaged locality through a lens that transferred power to communities. To Cooke, locality appeared worth defending in terms of social equity. Relph (1991: 100) reiterates the sentiment of Cooke, asserting that within “an increasingly post-modern world of networks strategic alliances, mass produced variety and pluralistic culture, localism can become a key agent in overcoming residual modernity”.

Contrary to Cooke’s argument however, Harvey (1989) envisaged in locality the potential for mobilised power to perpetuate social hegemony. The assertion of locality represents the solidification of hegemonic spatial definitions in a bid to maintain political and social control. Harvey (1989: 303) claims that:

… any place bound identity has to rest at some point on the motivational power of tradition. It is difficult, however, to maintain any sense of historical continuity in the face of all the flux and ephemerality of flexible accumulation ... The search for roots ends up at worst being produced and marketed as an image.

Put simply, Harvey suggests that to maintain or stabilise a traditional social order and definition/identity of local place, especially under the homogenising influence of capitalism requires the articulation of power hegemony (social, political, economic). In defining what is local and non-local, it is seen that some claims are empowered and dominate in the formation of a mobile, socially cogent ‘local identity’. However, linking to the application of Bourdieu’s thinking in Chapter 3, in the process of empowering one identity, others are marginalised. Therefore, Cooke, Harvey and Massey show that the complexity of focusing on locality is two-fold. Locality is simultaneously a place of social resistance, opposition and adaptation to higher-level structures, but is also the context of hegemonic power relations.

Postmodern emphasis on locality

Issues and criticisms associated with macro-level approaches led to a sea change in geography as the new paradigm sought to embrace a new sociology of “systemic difference and cultural plurality” (Bauman, 1992: 35). This came with a post-structural recognition of
plural actors being constitutive of the social space, and a plurality of diverse, meaning
generating agencies located in local places and “all subject to their own respective logics
and armed with their own facilities [and discourses] of truth generation [and justification]”
(ibid.).

Questioning structural critique and generalised, macro level approaches has thus
underpinned emphasis on locality studies in rural and also feminist research. Locality
became a primary focus in rural geography, providing a window through which to examine
the specific impacts and dynamics of economic restructuring and social change in rural
regions as a result of neoliberal policies (Roche, 2005; Mackay, Perkins and Espiner, 2009;
Cloke, 1989; Le Heron and Cloke, 1992). Emphasis of ‘glocalisation’ methodologies for
the assessment of marginalisation and power constructs also became prominent across
feminist and political economic geographies (Katz, 1998 1995; Harvey, 1996;
Swyngedouw, 1997). In feminist and constructionist research, however, to investigate such
situated dynamics, ethnographic methods are embraced to examine the politics and power
constructs that result in social marginalisation and the meaningful creation of ‘local spaces’.

More recently, localised analysis has been further validated with regards to
discussions of productivist ideas of agriculture. I examine the productivist / post-
productivist / multifunctionalist rural transition more explicitly in Chapter 3. However,
Wilson (2001) identifies dimensions of productivism that when reversed characterise post-
productivism, including ideology, actors, food regime and emphasis upon economic
dimensions of postproduction have continued to be defined by exogenous/structural
forces of agricultural change, thereby, generating an over emphasis on political-economic,
legalistic and structural critique (analogous with my critique of Brower’s (2008a; 2008b;
would continue to be benefited by actor-oriented approaches and locally grounded
research. Furthermore, Ward et al., (2008) considers that studies on agricultural reform
since the 1980s have been overly structural. The authors sought to highlight the positives
of grounding research on rural change at the scale of communities, household, individual
farms and even individual actors. Similarly, Milbourne (2007) sheds light on the empirical
strength of focusing on the specifics and complexity of singular and multiple case studies
or rural contexts.

In all, the thinking of such scholars and reflecting on Massey (2005; 1999)
highlights that rigid definitions of localities do not fit easily within a postmodern position
that emphasises plural, heterogeneous spaces and concepts of landscape; as well as the inherent fluidity and interconnectedness between spaces, localities, actors and actants (Massey, 2005; Latour, 2004a; Law, 1995). Massey’s (2005) thinking, along with, White (2004), Tsouvalis (2000) and Whatmore’s (2002) theorising of ‘hybrid’ places, landscapes, knowledge and complex interactions between nature and society, blurs distinct, socially imposed boundaries between local and non-local, inside and outside place, the rural and urban. These debates emerge more fully when applied to understanding concepts of landscape and nature in the high country context.

2.4 Conflict over ‘landscapes’, duality framings and hybrid nature

McClean (2007) acknowledges that the whole of New Zealand is a cultural landscape, meaningful in complex ways to various social groups, but the high country is an iconic cultural landscape. As an iconic place, the contemporary high country landscape has been fashioned from a natural landscape by a dominant cultural group of pastoralists. As Akagawa and Sirisak (2007: 179) explain, referring to Sauer (1963: 343),34 “[c]ulture is the agent, the natural area is the medium, [and] the cultural landscape is the result. Under the influence of a given culture, itself changing through time, the landscape undergoes development, passing through phases and probably reaching ultimately the end of its cycle of development”. Poignant for the current study, Sauer (1963) identified that a common practice associated with Westernised landscape protection is to clearly separate the cultural landscape and natural landscape, which in turn is transformative of nature-society relations.

Many authors have highlighted how the intermediate zones between ‘natures’ legislated for protection, bounded and enclosed in national parks, and intensively modified ‘humanised natures’, have become intensely contested terrains (Zimmerer, 2010; 2000; McCarthy, 2014; Bryan, 2012; Castree and Head, 2009; Adams 2004a; 2004b; Adams et al., 2003; Brockington and Ingoe, 2006; Ingold, 2003; 2009; Lurie and Hibbard, 2008). Bids to control, preserve and restore still extant remnants of ‘native’ ecology in regions like the high country sets in motion social struggle over competing visions for the trajectory of such ‘natures’ (Robinson, 2011; Braun, 2006a; 2007; 2005; Redford and Sanderson, 2000).

A host of contemporary conservation strategies, like tenure review, have been geared towards boundary making motivated by an impulse to ‘restore’ nature, resurrecting it from the tarnish of human modification; designating and firming up the boundaries

\[34\] Sauer’s (1963) book *The Morphology of Landscape*, has been highly influential with regard to postmodern thought into the complexity of landscapes as not just biophysical spaces and aesthetic scenes, but cultural and inherently political, relationally produced constructs.
between that which is ‘externalised nature’ and the juxtaposed other of ‘society’ (Braun, 2008; 2007; Zimmerer, 2006, 2000; Cronon, 2006, 2002, 1996; Smith, 1984). ‘Social spaces’ like the high country are frequently objectified and venerated for indigenous, ‘natural’ and pre-human qualities, even following a history of cultural influence (Cronon, 1992; 2002; White, 1995). In the context of wilderness conservation, Cronon (1996) reminds us of how historical processes and associations of humans with nature are denied to legitimate ideas of pristine nature. However, this practice of erasure and denial is contradictory when “… everything we know about environmental history suggests that people have been manipulating the natural world on various scales for as long as we have a record of their passing” (Cronon, 1996: 19). Then Cronon (2003) highlights how Native Americans cultivated many plants and they cleared some forests for agriculture. Consequently, ‘the landscape’ becomes a nexus of social struggle between those who seek to protect, and those who seek to produce from ‘nature’, as a complex terrain holding multifarious cultural definitions and values (Meinig, 1979).

Tenure review, motivated by an impetus to restore parts of the high country to the level of reformed grassland’s national park (Mark et al., 2009), set in motion a unique set of spatial practices, namely bounding and territorialisation (Zimmerer, 2000). The associated cognitive practices, on which such division rested, relied on a particularly resilient imaginary for a need to divide between ‘protected nature’ and ‘productive nature’. This certainly highlights the oppositional way that the debate is frequently framed within the national discourse (see Chapter 1). However, concepts of boundaries between nature and society are strong themes in international literature, associated with the geographies of conservation in Western nations (Bryan, 2012; Cronon, 2002; 1995; 1992; 1990; Stewart, Lieber and Larkin, 2004; Proctor, 1995; Zimmerer, 2006; McCarthy, 2014; 2006; 2005); and also, Western institutions importing division ideologies in developing nation conservation (Agrawal et al., 2013; Robertson, 2012; Brockington and Ingoe, 2006; West, Ingoe and Brockington, 2006; Brockington, 2004).

What I seek to demonstrate is the postmodern notion that there is no singular or essentially known ‘landscape’. The constructionist position, emphasising a relational

---

35 The understanding that landscapes are always defined and understood in diverse ways was conceived by the geographer Donald W. Meinig (1979) in his seminal paper, in which he examined the same landscape/scene from ten different social perspectives, ranging from understanding landscape as the basis of accumulation and wealth production to ecological systems and aesthetic scenes (nature) and utopian visions (ideology). Meinig (1979: 33) considered how landscapes are not only physical, but metaphysical and semiotic as well, because “any landscape is composed not only of what lies before our eyes but what lies within our heads.”
ontology introduces the contestation and instability associated with concepts of ‘nature’ and ‘landscape’; acknowledging such constructs are plural and under a constant process of becoming and meaningful assembly (Braun, 2008, 2005; Tsouvalis, 2000). It provides a creative and vitalist vocabulary of emergence and fluidity with spatial becoming and the co-production of hybrid social-space (Tsouvalis, 2000; Lorimer, 2012). Positions advocating preservation of ‘real nature’ and ‘natural landscapes’ are therefore brought under intense questioning.

In particular, the metaphor of nature-society ‘hybridity’ (Braun, 2005; 2006a; White, 2004; Whatmore, 2005; 2002; Curtis, 2004; 1998; 1994; Pedynowski, 2003; 2000; Zimmerer, 2010; Tsouvalis, 2000) provides analytical strength, and also a linking theme through the thesis. Hybridity elaborates on the affective, composite relations between physical/material landscape and human actors, often conceived of as ‘non-human nature’ to highlight the creative, inventive co-production of plural natures (Lorimer, 2012; Robertson, 2012; Braun, 2005). As a concept, hybridity provides a lexicon that lends itself to a now unquestioned position in postmodern geography, emphasising the fluidity of relations with nature. In constructionism, the notion of fluidity and co-production influence thought and pluralised understandings and values for biophysical nature (Braun, 2006a; 2006b); where ‘nature’ is often essentialised and used interchangeably with ‘the landscape’ in representations of the high country (see for example, Sage, 1995b; High Country Accord, n.d.-b; n.d.-d; O’Connor, 1998).

Braun (2006a; 2008) asserts that the vocabulary of hybridity, however, needs be applied to local situations. Undertaking empirical analysis in local spaces enables moving beyond the abstraction of theorisation in order to thresh out the different fabrications of hybrid social nature, and to understand the promiscuous entanglements between social life, space and ecology (Whatmore, 2002; Lorimer, 2012). Reflecting on the work of Lorimer (2005; 2012), ‘a space’, often understood as singular, static and bordered (such as the high country in national level representations), is in fact comprised of multiple-natural trajectories, which are socially emergent and contested.

In theory, the validity of understanding landscapes such as the high country as a socio-natural hybrid for the fact that they are anthropogenic and utilised, is accepted in constructionist geography and fields such as non-equilibrium ecology with focus on novel ecosystems (Zimmerer, 2000; 2006; Hobbs, Higgs and Harris, 2009; Seastedt et al., 2008). The notion of the ‘hybrid countryside’, the ‘global countryside’ and ‘multi-functionality’ in rural studies has grown in use (Murdoch, 2003; Woods, 2006; 2007; 2009; Mackay, Perkins
and Espiner, 2009; McCarthy, 2008). However, in conservation policy and practice within New Zealand, boundary making and therefore, territorialisation, between ‘protection’ and ‘production’ remain persistent (Norton and Miller, 2000; Wallace, 2014); and this may perpetuate productivist logics associated with non-conservation land (Campbell et al., 2009; Roche, 2005; Jay, 2004; Le Heron and Roche, 1999; Cloke and Perkins, 2002; Conradson and Pawson, 2009).

Externalising ‘nature’, erasing culture and seeking to separate natural values from social and economic values, is a source of tension surrounding tenure review. In particular, analysis begins with what Braun (2006a) terms a values theoretical analysis - a useful tool for seeking to understand inter-subjective positions and the complex, social semiotic ‘co-production’ of space. First however, I explain the parameters of landscape thinking from a constructionist frame. This leads to briefly engaging with how ‘landscape’ is conceptualised within the Resource Management Act 1991 as the foremost legislative tool in New Zealand’s environmental management framework.

**Decoding ‘landscape’ and ‘nature’ with social constructionism**

Social constructionism embodies corporealisation of produced nature and space, as both material and semiotic thing and phenomenon, where, as Braun (2006b) proclaims, social dimensions of praxis are not reducible to trends of capitalism and economic logic alone. Social constructs relate to the inter-subjectivities of human choices, agency and relations, rather than laws related to human judgement and capitalist logics. Although the precise origin of social constructionism is debatable, the renaissance in such culturalist and agent focused approaches to social theory emerged during the late 1980s and developed in the 1990s. Early thinkers on the social construction of nature from the social-semiotic perspective included the notable contributions from feminist geographers, Fitzsimons (1989) and Harraway (1990; 1991a; 1997), who each questioned assumptions regarding conventional forms of nature. With the rise of machines and hybrid forms of social-nature Harraway’s (1990; 1991a; 1991b) metaphor of ‘cyborg nature’ was especially fruitful. Constructionism also embraces the recognition of pluralism, with the potential for multiple, value based and semiotic ‘natures’ or landscapes to exist within the same physical spaces. The discussion between Harraway and Harvey (1995) and other contributions like Harraway and Latour (2004a; 2004b), Robinson (2011) and Nightingale (2003) highlight the potential for multiple epistemological positions for understanding nature, space and landscape as meaningful constructs.
The core strength of the constructionist thesis is recognising that meaningful spaces and landscapes are the contingent outcomes of convergence between biophysical nature and human relations. Nature and landscape are co-produced both in interaction with capitalistic transformations, law and tenure arrangements, which have been the focus of materialists like Smith and Harvey and political ecologists like Castree (2008a; 2008b; 2001), Blaikie (1999), Blaikie and Brookfield (1987) and Forsyth (2007). However, cultural and semiotic practices are also significant influences in the co-production of landscape and nature, where meaning making practices, power relations and social complexities have continued to be the focus of constructionist and feminist scholars like Harraway (1991a; 1991b; 1997), Demeritt (2002; 2001), Braun and Wainwright (2001); Katz (2001; 1998), Nightingale (2003) Hartsock, (2006), Gregory (2001). Emphasising epistemological pluralism, such scholarship suggests how ‘landscapes’ and social-natures are social products that evolve with a complex and uniquely situated history that requires critical thought.

‘Landscapes’ do not present uniform meanings to everybody whom encounters them (Olwig, 2007; Thompson, 2011; Stephenson and Gorrie, 2011; Stephenson, Abbot and Ruru, 2011). Explained by Olwig (2007; 2006), landscapes consist an amalgamated reflection of the plural relationships people have with land and the environment. Therefore, concepts of a singular and static landscape, such as generalised representations of ‘high country’ or back country, are contrary to the postmodern position, where emphasis is placed on how landscapes are multiple and internally diverse. This is exemplified in Applications Box 2, where ideas of stasis are fixed to the high country, expressed in two representations of the high country landscape by prominent New Zealand landscape painters Grahame Sydney and Michael Hight. Briefly deconstructing two images, the first called Rangitata Valley by Hight, and the second called Up on the Downs by Sydney, provides insight into the politics of representation.

In particular, Sydney has been vocal with encouraging politics around retaining the high country’s grasslands for their “natural magic” (Sydney, 2010: n.p) as an advocate for the preservation-focused lobby group Forest and Bird. For example, emotive politics challenge how the Mackenzie Basin landscapes in places are being “changed dramatically from natural shades of tawny Brown to bright green” (Forest and Bird, 2013: n.p.) by a productive “onslaught” (ibid.). Sydney fronts the organisation’s website, as a public face campaigning for ‘saving the Mackenzie Basin’. The catchword of ‘save’ depicts the emotiveness of the anti-intensification lobbying Forest and Bird has engaged. He also
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depicts his personal value for the austere naturalness of high country landscapes in several items of grey literature, and his paintings (see: Blundell, 2015; Macfie, 2010). For example, Sydney states:

I believe that landscapes have a power and a meaning far beyond any temporary economics. Landscapes, the natural theatres of our personal experiences and dramas, perform a symbolic and emotional function miles beyond their economic or geographical rationale. (Sydney, 2010: n.p.)

Economic rationale is understood temporary, whereas there is a juxtaposed understanding of the landscape as a natural theatre. Sydney’s representations are highly political, but also selective of what images of space and nature are displayed (Lough, 2005). The sense of isolation is echoed in many of Sydney’s landscape paintings. They are empty of people, although evidence of human presence is often there: railway lines, fences, ramshackle buildings, abandoned vehicles or a cluster of rural mail boxes. These elements attach to tropes of meaning and the representations deployed in Sydney’s paintings and landscape advocacy are highly subjective, and ‘naturalness’ is examined below as a concept requiring analysis within the current study.

On the grounds that ‘the landscape’ can never be singular, it is always on the move, emergent, or ‘under construction’ (Olwig, 2007; Wilhusen, 2010; Foster, 2010; Cronon, 2002), impressions of stasis are understood as snapshots in the emergence in time-space, as artefacts contingent on the relations of assemblage and ‘becoming’ at a particular historical juncture (Braun, 2005; Olwig, 2006). Landscapes exist as complex overlays (Ingold, 2009; 2005), or “meaningful composite formations” (Tsouvalis, 2000: 6), co-constructed in the fluid relations between society and biophysical nature. This is a relational dialectic that creates resilient social meanings and aspirations, moralities, resource dependencies in networks of interaction with non-human others. Some landscapes as ‘hybrid composites’ are more resilient than others in time-space, but all are in a constant state of flux.

---

36 Marxist thinkers on space, like Harvey (2005, 1996), Massey (2005, 1999), constructionist geographers such as White (2004) and Braun (2006; 2008a; 2008b) and environmental historians like Cronon (2002; 1995) acknowledge ‘emergence’ and ‘social-material becoming.

37 As an example of this, the pastoral lease regulated a period of time, where a productivist landscape maintained a relative stasis across high country space.
In her research Tsouvalis (2000: 1) argues how old wood forest has established in the British cultural psyche as a “social-ecological utopia”. This follows centuries of forest landscapes existing as untamed spaces, harbouring societies’ undesirables, vagrants, demons and beasts, and the wish to transform such wild spaces into productive spaces. Old wood forests were constructed as the opposite to civilisation and socially tamed farmland and cities. Subsequently, these historical meanings have morphed. Old wood forests have established a pre-human utopia status. They are of high ecological value and are represented as holding sacred value. Whereas, introduced pine forests have become
valuable as symbols of British economic development and resilience, highlighting how humans overlay meanings across indigenous, human-created or invariably ‘hybrid’ natures.

Similar concepts surround the high country landscape. Transforming indigenous New Zealand landscapes and taming them as agricultural spaces, motivated early productivist transformation, seeking to make non-human nature conform to human agency (Brooking and Pawson, 2010; Brooking, 1996; Holland, O’Connor and Wearing, 2002; Dominy, 1995; 2003; McAloon, 2013, Guthrie-Smith, 1999[1926]). Such dimensions of transformation are outlined in Appendix 2a, which provides a summary of five broad phases of social-environmental and landscape change in the high country. Scarce value was placed on indigenous ecology (except in some cases sedges were understood drought tolerant in historical high country habitus), and following clearance development was focused on transforming untamed nature into a new, pseudo-British pastoral landscape (McAloon, 2013).

In contemporary representations, indigenous species are accorded high social value. For example, the Canterbury Conservation Management Strategy (1991), the General Policy for National Parks (DOC.govt, 2014), the New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy (2000), the Reserves Act (1977) and Conservation Act (1987) are all illustrative examples of the emphasis protecting indigenous biodiversity is accorded in the New Zealand conservation framework. All advocate the preservation of nature in parks and reserves, isolated from social and productive influence. In tenure review, the high country is advanced as both a space of high biodiversity values, recreational access values, production values, iwi and exotic fish and game values. The intervention has begun to transform the traditionally productivist landscape that has formed part of the backdrop to New Zealand’s nationalist imaginary as an agricultural nation. However, even landscapes that have retained a set of social values for a considerable length of time, like the pastoral landscape quality of the high country, are open to reformulation. The workings of the human mind means that social perceptions of a landscape can adapt to this dynamism (Harré and Gillett, 1994), questioning debates over aesthetic landscape values. The appreciation of landscape and the meanings we ascribe to ‘it’, often as a singular entity, are constantly under challenge.

Landscapes, therefore, are not just a ‘physical tract of land’, a singular aesthetic or meaningful ‘view or scene’, a tabular rasa or empty space over which particular social-cultural representations seek to affirm stasis (Massey, 2005; Wallace, 2014; Stephenson, 2005). Inherently, landscapes are subjected to change from various natural or human-
induced and political processes, at a range of scales, from incremental to sudden, and can undergo extensive and rapid transformation. As the landscape theorist Kenneth Olwig (2002) claims, societies transform their landscapes. In contemporary times, a dynamic of disparate stakeholders are involved in the deconstruction and reconstruction of landscapes, the way a space is imagined and how it is utilised ‘acceptably’ (Olwig, 2002). Landscapes are not static. However, the high country is a space often defended as stable in representations at a macro-level. Some depictions I suggest obscure the landscape’s dynamic social production (Massey, 2005).

How the public and environmental managers conceive of nature and landscapes as ‘static’ and pre-human, relates directly to environmental practices and eco-politics. Concepts of ‘stasis’ are often applied to nature, for example, with the perceived potential to restore nature to a pre-human indigenous state in conservation ecology (a focus of critique within novel ecosystems literature and non-equilibrium ecology, see: Hobbs et al., 2006; Seastedt, Hobbs and Suding, 2008; Hobbs, Higgs and Harris, 2009; Manning et al., 2009; Zimmerer, 2000; 2006). But understanding nature, space and landscape as static is political and riddled with power relations (Redford and Sanderson, 2000). This point links directly into the examination of duality constructs between nature and society from a constructionist lens within the present study. However, first I briefly examine how the constructionist emphasis on emergence and epistemic pluralism (Robinson, 2011; Braun, 2006a; 2006b), fits with how the concept of landscape is understood within the Resource Management Act 1991 (hereafter, the RMA 1991). Pastoral lease tenure review was supposed to operate with the principles of sustainable management mandated by the RMA. However, at this early juncture in the study, separating ecological protection values from production and cultural use values with tenure review, appears to conflict with recent considerations of ‘landscape’ within the RMA case law pertaining to the high country.

---

38 Olwig’s (2002) arguments connect back to the dialectics of Smith (1984; 200) and historical materialism of Harvey (1989; 1996) where capitalist modes are understood to construct and deconstruct landscapes. In terms of an initial application of the notion of ‘pluralism’ to high country landscape, the current research is situated as a snapshot in the constantly transforming social-cultural and political-economic context reshaping the high country landscape into contemporary forms.

39 Therefore, although the high country ‘landscape’ is often attached to cultural representations and significances that perceive it as singular, this stasis actively contested by multiple interests. An example of this is the tensions between whether high country space is defined as a productive or a protected space, depicted in Chapter One.
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Landscape and the Resource Management Act 1991

Linking the notion of landscape pluralism to New Zealand’s resource management framework, the term ‘landscape’ is not defined in the RMA 1991. However, various descriptions have developed within evolving case law and management practice. The New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects (NZILA), for instance, describes landscape as reflecting “the cumulative effects of natural and cultural processes” (Quality Planning, 2013: n.p.). However, in response to the emerging complexity of the concept, provisions in RMA policies and plans have tended to rely on classifying ‘significant’ landscapes, which are understood to require special protection due to holding elevated values under the RMA 1991.

The critical understanding taken from emphasis within the RMA 1991 for this study is the appreciation of cultural landscapes in Section 6(f)) and the definition of historical heritage in section two of the Act. Also amenity landscapes are accounted in Section 7, defined as landscapes that offer visual amenity at a district or regional level, or are outstanding but insufficiently natural. However, the Act remains steadfast in emphasising the protection of ‘naturalness’. Under subsection b of Section 6, the RMA 1991 provides special attention to: outstanding natural features and landscapes. However, the legislated emphasis on social / cultural and amenity values sometimes competes with priority given to ‘indigenous ecological values’ in the Reserves Act (1977), Conservation Act (1987) that guided tenure review at its outset in 1989. The above recognition aligns with Norton and Miller’s (2000) acknowledgement that core legislation in New Zealand’s ‘conservation’ framework legislate a modernist division between nature and society, advocating nature’s separation into parks and reserves. Ideology encased within the earlier legislation advances preservation logic, rather than conservation logic, denoting sustainable management and use. The concept of sustainable management was integrated with the 1991 institution of the RMA, but is surrounded by significant questioning due to the concept’s origin within the tenets of neoliberalism (Memon and Wilson, 2007; Memon and Kirk, 2012; Memon, 1993; Bührs and Bartlett, 1993). Such separatist, preservation logic conflicts with more integrated approaches to managing social natures, with humans-in-ecosystems approaches to the management of novel ecosystems (Hobbs et al., 2006; Seastedt, Hobbs and Suding, 2008; Hobbs, Higgs and Harris, 2009; Manning et al., 2009; Marris, 2009; Walker, et al., 2002); and also, emphasis on ecologically sustainable management in the Crown Pastoral Lease Act 1998, at the heart of tenure review. Of

40 An argument developed more deeply in Chapter 3.
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note, such thinking links to the divisive ideological frame within modernist conservation orthodoxy, which has motivated a lineage of constructionist scholars interrogating duality constructs erected between nature and society.

2.5 Unpacking the nature society dualism through a constructionist lens

Explaining the research objectives in Chapter One, I questioned the process of boundary construction between production, protection and access interests with tenure review. Underlying this questioning is an understanding that as a result of erecting a boundary, some claims, knowledge and visions for nature and landscape are included and others are marginalised resulting from the re-categorisation of land. From reviewing media coverage and grey literature, it was clear that tenure review relied on selective representations of nature and landscape and as a result obtaining outcomes for some stakeholders, like Fish and Game, became challenging in the narrow parameters of negotiation and focus on protecting indigenous values.

Furthermore, there had been an enduring history of Māori social, cultural and spiritual connections to high country space, prior to the social-cultural significances that surround high country pastoralism. For example, some tenure reviews have actively recognised the claims of iwi. Pastoral lease properties like the Elfin Bay, Greenstone and Routeburn Station’s at the head of Lake Wakatipu were high priorities in the Ngāi Tahu settlement with the Crown prior to tenure review (Ngaitahu.iwi.nz, 2014). High on Ngāi Tahu’s agenda was the continued availability of public and iwi access, with tenure review offering the capacity for lessees to privatised land and develop intensive production practices. Protecting conservation values, but also spiritual and cultural connections to various regions was similarly important. Notably high country properties are often the gateways to areas of cultural importance for tangata whenua (people of the land). Also, within the mandate of Ngāi Tahu, there is emphasis on the productive potential from high country land, where tenure review offered in some cases the opportunity to further secure the future prosperity of descendants from the southern tribes.

As a person from Pakeha decent, I am not situated in a position that can talk to issues of Māori claims and values with required sensitivity. This is why in the remainder of the thesis I do not focus in depth on Māori claims within tenure review. I am however familiar with different concepts of land ‘ownership’ between Māori and Europeans and the difficulties this has caused many Māori since European colonisation (Pawson and Brooking, 2013; Tipa and Nelson, 2008). Importantly, Māori have not traditionally had a
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culture of individual ownership (King, 1997). Māori land was held communally, as a system of tenure referred to as papatupu, where land was allocated by chiefs on the basis of the needs of whanau (family) and hapū (tribal groups) (Winmill and Morton 1993, 28). Māori land ideology is situated in a deep epistemological and ontological conception of the place of people in cosmology and understandings of the biophysical world. Māori worldview conceptualises people in a holistic way based on associations between tangata whenua and the land. Landscape is therefore a matter of ancestral connections whereby Māori conceptualise their existence within the realms of the spiritual world placed between Ranganui (the sky father) and the nourishment provided by Papatuanuku (the earth mother). In this way the concept of Kaitiakitanga (guardianship), as a keystone concept within the Māori land care ethos, invokes care for ancestral connections and protecting the mauri (life essence) of the natural and metaphysical world.

As Gandhi and Freestone (2008: 1) conclude, colonial occupation of New Zealand was justified by colonial ideology of cultural and racial superiority and the Lockean legal idea that “those who did not cultivate the land had no rights to it”. Individual, freehold absolute land title are concepts that colonial land law held dear. As Winmill and Morton (1993: 36) examine referring to the prominent Māori Land Court judge, Justice Durrie, “the European land tenure system, in its present form, is a veritable engine of destruction of Māori land holdings" and therefore communal connections to whenua (land). It may be considered that neither Māori nor European concepts of land ownership are appropriate for the future but rather some hybrid concept. However, there are various weaknesses to the current approach to landownership resting on the division of land between individual titles and this will be challenged further within our increasingly crowded, demanding and resource constrained island nation. Even now, the existing concept of freehold is questioned by the wider community’s power to ask for accountability to be taken for land-use impacts on private holdings and for landholders to conform to consenting and permits under the RMA 1991. This is a debate from which emerges questions of collective versus private benefit, which has been debated as far back as Aristotle.

It is clear that this is a topic for a different thesis to untangle in depth. However, I do consider that Māori concepts, such as the ideas of guardianship within the concept of Kaitiakitanga, which corresponds with humans being an intricate part of land and ecosystems, not external to them, is likely fruitful when applied to the high country context. It offers insight in looking towards more convivial relations between nature and society, which is examined more fully in Chapter 3 (Hinchliffe and Whatmore, 2006; Whatmore,
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2009). Of particular relevance, tenure review relies on narrow categories of landscape, seeking to construct parks and reserves with public access, at the same time as separating economic values and retaining the economic viability of productive units on fee-simple absolute freehold. This philosophy of dividing between nature and society has a deep social and political history to which I now turn. In this study I go into detail regarding the duality constructs intrinsic to the ideology of tenure review, which has clear application for extension in future research applying a lens of Māori land care ethic.

Society’s externalisation from nature

Mentioned previously, separation informs some modernist Western environmental protection logics. As McClean (2007: 8) asserts, in New Zealand “the prosperity of the late 19th century provided space for a growing scenery preservation movement based on the English Romantic movement”. In 1903 the Scenery Preservation Act was enacted, which illustrated a history of tensions between rural and urban visions for protecting ‘nature’ places. However, New Zealand’s preservation logic also has vestiges back to the North American wilderness ethic emphasising National Park establishment, from which issues emerge. For this reason, the current study is couched within a broader international conservation literature, critical of the inequities associated with divisive approaches to protecting biodiversity, questions of boundaries and issues with power and knowledge (see: Fraser, 2009; Merchant, 2004; Cronon, 2002; 1995; 1992; White, 1995; Bryan, 2012; Adams, 2004; Zimmerer, 2010; 2000).

The fundamental aspirations to westernised, new world concepts of nature’s spatial and epistemological separation from society (Cronon, 1995; Snyder, 1990; Nash, 2001; White, 1995; 1990; Soper, 1995; Merchant, 2004; 1995; 1980; Wainwright and Robertson, 2003), extends historically to the wilderness thinking of Henry David Thoreau, and later by preservationist Aldo Leopold. 42 However, various authors in contemporary

41 Thoreau (1817-1862) advocated for outdoor recreation and environmentalism. However, he was not preservation focused like Leopold. Thoreau appealed to a moralistic philosophy, which negotiated between wilderness and humanity, which in his generation was spreading fourth throughout North America. Thoreau envisaged a middle-ground between wilderness and urban degradation to exist with pastoralism. This is interesting because eco-centrism often rejects the use and productivist ‘taming’ of wildlands.

42 A Sand County Almanac (1949), Leopold’s most influential book was a potent stimulus to modernist environmental ethics with the emphasis on wilderness preservation. Leopold’s ethos was founded on a deeply held concern and respect for the natural world. Unlike preservationists like Ralph Waldo Emerson and Henry David Thoreau, who promoted nature’s beauty and emphasised nature as a necessary counterweight to society (instrumental in the founding of the American Wilderness Society), Leopold signified the integrated links between the two spheres. Leopold advocated that the core goal of conservation was to ensure that the health of natural systems was maintained (Primark, 2006), however, he emphasised that humans should not be understood as external to but part of the ecological communities and should be
conservation geography interrogate the history of wilderness conservation, which manifests itself as a process of land accumulation and territorialisation in developed (see for example: Bryan, 2012; Blomley, 2008; Corson and McDonald, 2012; McCarthy, 2014; 2006; Robertson, 2012), and developing nations (Brockington, 2004, Adams et al., 2003; Brockington and Ingoe, 2006; Fairhead, Leach and Scoones, 2012, Vandergeest and Peluso, 2001). In particular, the social construction of nature as requiring purification to be ‘legitimate’ and of human-free form (Wallace, 2014), and subsequent processes of separating nature from society is shadowed by a history of ethical dilemmas (Cronon, 2002; 1995).

Numerous authors (including, Zimmerer, 2010; West, Ingoe and Brockington, 2006: Adams, 2004; Bryan, 2012; Setten and Brown, 2009; Proctor 1995) highlight how constructing wilderness and the use of enforced boundaries to protect nature in fortressed parks has led to injustices being inflicted on populations. For example, the desire to protect ‘wilderness’ free from human civilisation, except those fortunate enough to afford access to it, influenced the National Park movement in the United States. A prominent example of injustice associated with the bounding of nature was with the establishment of Yellowstone National Park, the world’s first National Park, gazetted on March 1 1872 (Merril, 2003)(see Appendix 2b for details of the ethical issues with constructing Yellowstone, which holds a similar history to many other North American wilderness areas). This historical example of externalising nature from modernist productive practices, set away and respected as touchstones of ‘original forms of nature’ brings to light issues of Bourgeois, urban-centric environmentalisms, that Smith (1984), Harvey (1996; 1989), White (1995; 2004) and Braun (2006b; 2007; 2008) are deeply critical of.

Historical and contemporary examples of negative social impacts associated with boundaries for nature conservation are global in scope. For example, Brockington (2004) examined the injustices associated with coercive conservation and evictions from natures for which people had established livelihood dependence. Fortress conservation parks in several examples sought to restore nature back to a ‘legitimate’ state by enforcing boundaries and disallowing often-poor populations to use conservation land in Africa (Brockington and Ingoe, 2006) and the imposition of specialist / technical knowledge in South America (Escobar, 1998).
Questions arise regarding to whom social benefits from conservation come. This is in light of conservation historically being associated with the aspirations of the urban Bourgeois, who hold the economic ability to travel to and recreate in protected natures and wilderness in distant places (White, 1995; Cronon, 1996; 1995). Therefore, it has traditionally been the urban dominant demographic who have sought social exclusion from nature (Cronon, 1996; 2002), an issue I engage with further to introduce Chapter 3.

In contemporary literature, authors including Corson and Macdonald, (2012), Phalan et al. (2011), Ingoe (2006) and Robertson, (2012) highlight the social power associated with biodiversity conservation and egalitarian ideas of social equity in protecting the lifesaving capacity of nature. Such ideals fuel a continued effort to reserve nature and isolate species from human use. However, often this practice of bounding distracts from the ill effects and social consequences of conservation interventions, which become manifest as territorialisation and resource conflict through the bid to control land and ecological values (McCarthy, 2014; Bryan, 2012; Redford and Sanderson, 2000). Emphasising issues with nature’s separation, scholars (including, Borini-Feyerabend, Johnston and Pansky, (2006) Abrams, Borrini-Feyerabend and Gardener (2003), Borrini-Feyerabend (1996), Adams (2004), Brechin et al., (2002)), explain how conservation is often imposed by external, westernised agencies, in developing nations and centralised State agencies in developed nations. These organisations frequently advance divisive preservation ideology seeking to disallow social activities perceived to damage nature. Centralisation of control is recognised to alienate populations and lead to conflict, where at times claims for territory are understood locally as unjustified impositions and ‘green grabs’ as processes of conservation land accumulation (Fairhead, Leach and Scooners, 2012; Carson and MacDonald, 2012).

Of particular relevance to the current study, extraction and erasure of human histories is a focus of social struggle when many reputedly ‘natural’ ecologies hold extensive social histories. Cronon (2003) investigates the ‘Riddle of the Apostle Islands’ in Lake Michigan, where to legitimate the islands as a ‘natural wilderness’ the remnants of human habitation in this harsh environment were removed. However, this overlay of historical social use was valuable for the cultural context and heritage it provided. A history, as Ingold (2004; 1993) suggests, of people knowing ‘places’ through their feet and embodied experience, as a ‘socialised’ cultural ecology (Zimmerer, 2006; 2004). Unpeeling the layers of overgrown nature on the Apostle Islands, the remnants of social history remained intact, supporting the understanding of landscape as a constantly evolving overlay (Olwig, 2007;
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(2006; Ingold, 1993; Stephenson, Abbot and Ruru, 2006; Born, 2012). The full erasure is social history for the restoration of a perceived ‘pre-human’ ecology or state of nature is impossible. Furthermore, whether such an intervention of restoring purified nature is socially just or desirable is contested.

New Zealand’s conservation orthodoxy and the high country context

Many of the conservation geographers referred to in the previous section identified how in developing nations, the boundary between nature and society has historically, and in some contemporary examples, been forcefully regulated. In the New Zealand conservation context, however, it is a cognitive and politically enforced boundary between society and nature, which influences social attitudes towards preserved spaces like National Parks and inherently human and productive spaces (Highham, 1998).

Although a British colony, New Zealand quickly adopted the American-centric wilderness conservation methodology (Kliskey, 1994; Kliskey and Kearsley, 1993; Shultis, 1999). Expansive spaces were perceived people free, regardless of histories of pre-European settlement providing a latticework of trails and connections for gathering Kai (food) (Sullivan, 2009) and Taonga (treasures) like Pounamu (greenstone) from Fjordland (Brailsford, 1984; NZCA, 2005). The first National Park, Tongariro was gazetted in 1887, which has an interesting connection with Māori, explained below (Moon, 2013). As a result, national parks have remained at the core of New Zealand’s preservation psyche, venerated as the “ultimate examples of prehistoric New Zealand” (2precious2mine.org, 2012), becoming sacred spaces within New Zealand’s national identity.

The ideology of separation to create national parks as wilderness sites is an ideology from within a particular temporal construct. However, apart from Māori use values, human populations in most cases were less present in areas of New Zealand gazetted as National Parks (between 1887 and 2002, when Rakiura (Steward Island) National Park was granted

---

43 This trajectory of conservation development diverges markedly from European countries, where England, Sweden, Denmark and Norway have retained human centred and use based conservation logic. The ideology equates from an acknowledgement that predominantly all European natures have for long been humanised (Bryan, 2012). Protecting the heritage used landscapes and avoiding intensification of agricultural landscapes has led to wide spread subsidisation, for example in the United Kingdom (Bils and Gross, 2005; Whitfield, 2006; Hartridge and Pearce, 2001; Bowler and Ilbery, 1998), Austria (Schmitzberger et al, 2005) and Denmark (Madsen, 2003)

Also, a significant body of literature has established around the concept of the 'Right to Roam', examining historically less bounded and defended pastoral spaces in England and Scotland (Anderson, 2007; 2007a; 2006; Anonymous, 2015; Shoard, 1999), in Scandinavia (Hojrting, 2002; Williams, 2009).

44 Even though National Parks are administered centrally by the Department of conservation, noting etymological distinction between 'preservation' aspirations that underpin the organisations 'conservation' title, which implies use.
New Zealand’s most secure conservation title). Early on in colonial history, the imperialist logic that began to transpose across New Zealand’s landscapes meant that boundaries between nature and society were erected with relative ease. Māori use ideologies were easily dominated by newly imported colonial logics (Moon, 2013; Belich, 2001; King, 1997). This however is complex in the case of Tongariro National Park. The history of establishing Tongariro National Park is social and political, as well as undertaken to protect indigenous nature and significant landscapes. The volcanoes Tongariro, Ruapehu and Ngauruhoe are highly significant in Māori legend due to ancestral associations, but to prevent these significant mountains and thus iwi connections to passed ancestors being sold to European settlers for agricultural development, in 1886 local iwi Ngati Tuwharetoa sought to reserve the area now identified as Tongariro National Park. In September 1887, some of the tribal whakatapu was conceded to the Crown on the understanding it would become a protected area (Cowan, 1927; DOC, 2013). Importantly, Tongariro National Park in 1993 was also the first cultural landscape recognised as a UNESCO world heritage site for its indigenous cultural associations as well an ecological significance (Buggey, 1999), highlighting the inextricable social links to a special space of nature, landscape and cultural values.

The conservation lobby sought to create a series of Grasslands National Parks as the end outcome to tenure review and also vast contributions of land from Nature Heritage Fund purchases (Sage, Graeme and Maturin, 2005). The high country however, provided an entirely different canvas of tenure arrangement, economic and social-semiotic significances, compared to the early history of establishing national parks. Conservation accumulation was less straightforward. After all, the high country is a space, inhabited, worked and valued for nigh 160 years, by a powerful pastoral leasehold lobby, and over time the agricultural class established a relative stability across the high country as a productivist space and culture. It is apparent from discussion in Chapter 1 however, that the high country is both a place of agricultural production and conservation values, and the traditional power dominance held by agricultural definitions of the landscape is challenged by various other national interests and stakeholders. Broadly, understanding the high country as of agricultural and ecological values is the dualistic categorisation of space that tenure review advanced, implanting a divisive, split methodology (Wright, 2009) reliant on boundaries and static concepts of landscape and nature. Such dualistic constrains relate to the macro level debate, suggested in the media that tenure review manifests as a State mediated ‘green grab’ (see Appendix 1c), which falls back on a national conservation logic grounded on value for ‘use free nature’ and indigenous ecology as potentially
alienating philosophy (Norton and Miller, 2000; Wallace, 2014). At this point it is clear that how nature is framed as separate from culture originates from a very particular social-historical constitution that can have drastic political and social effects. In Chapter 3, this assertion is extended with a Bourdieusian framework, which highlights how separation between nature and society (protection and production interests) also comes with distinct spatial consequences.

Contrary to division however, restating the constructionist stance, various scholars (including, Robinson (2011), Gregory (2006), Ingold (2007) (Braun, 2006a, 2008) Greider and Garkovich (1994)) highlight that concepts of landscape and nature are plural, hybrid and transformative. For example, Braun (2006b: 218) acknowledges the fluidity of delineation between urban and rural nature, stating:

All nature is urban nature for the extent the systems of production, exchange and consumption have become global, ‘distant’ natures and everyday urban environments are woven into tight webs of socio-ecological and spatial relations.

Importantly, this is example of Braun’s relational ontology, which borrows from the notions of a “properly political ecology” (Brennan, 2006: 2) proposed by Latour (2004a). Expanded from ideas of rhizomes and the machinic ontology offered by Deleuze and Guattari (1988), Latour’s (2004a) ideas of a ‘proper ecology’ socialised and politicised ideas of nature, unsettle the dualism between nature and society “by showing how unsmooth the objects of study in biology [and] ecology are” (Brennan, 2006: 2). Like the materialism of Harvey and Smith, Braun’s ontology encompasses capitalist relations. However, emphasis is more explicit with regard to the relational coproduction of social-nature and the spatiality of these co-productions. With inference to the rest of Braun’s recent corpus (see: Braun, 2004; 2005; 2006a; 2006b; 2008), such relational co-production infers meaning making, social values that motivate social praxis and socio-spatial relations. It is clear in Braun’s understanding that nature is interwoven with society in various material-semiotic ways that the traditional delineation between distant national parks, rural natures and urban spaces is compressed into one social-natural or hybrid realm.45

Such a reformulated ontology of all nature as relationally connected, radically reconfigures the terrain of eco-polities and questions the justifications and divisive goals of New Zealand’s conservation orthodoxy, from which practices such as tenure review originate. Inherently, such recognition brings social conventions of valuing nature and

45 Inspiring thinking about relations of conviviality between humans and nature as a debate engaged with in Chapter 3.
wilderness, free from society, under question. For example, judgements like whether tawny brown is more ‘natural’, or lush green is ‘better’ or ‘worse’ in terms of aesthetic perspective, is a matter of situated adjudication. The notion of ‘defending naturalness’ evident in the political positions of Forest and Bird, DOC and preservation ideology, generally emphasises pro-public and ecological benefits of conservation. However, this is a political stance that may buttress opposition towards those producing from nature. Also, the defence of naturalness may be ideologically flawed when high country ecosystems are socially valued, but are vastly modified from pre-human conditions. For example, ‘grasslands’, which provide the “character of the high country” (Ralston, 2014a: 16), are a highly modified, cultural phenomenon – a hybrid of indigenous and exotic species. Photos taken in the field from a block left to success following tenure review illustrate the hybrid form of current grasslands are provided in Figure 2.1 a, b, c and d below, which ties to a debate revisited in Chapter 5. It is clear in each photo, which depict representative ecosystem types in the case study region, that where indigenous species are present that the hybrid mixture is interspersed with a relative dominance of exotic pastoral species. Each of these ecosystem types is highly modified by cultural intervention, even if in several examples, there is a significant presence of indigenous species.

Landscape transformation is an interesting aspect of analysis in itself, to the extent that scholars like Fitzharris, Brooking, Holland and Peden amongst others, have devoted academic careers to its exploration. The parameters of this study do not allow the breadth to fully address such a diverse literature and landscape history. In Appendix 2a however, a summary of five phases of landscape transformation has been compiled providing insight into the history of social-natural co-production. Provided is a chronological progression of important biophysical / environmental, political, social, economic / productive transformations that have occurred. With a varied range of supporting literature I examined representational transformation, in terms of how social representations have changed around use values of the high country. What is highlighted Appendix 2a is how the high country has remained constantly fluid, emerging as a productivist landscape in the late 1800s as a hegemony that has increasingly become challenged by multiple interests now involved with the co-production of high country space. The material sits within Appendix 2a to provide additional descriptive narrative on the issues examined within the thesis. The contextualisation provided is useful, but is unnecessary within the thesis text because this study takes a different theoretical and empirical approach, and diverges from previous descriptive assessments of rural change.
Figure 2.1 (A, B, C, D): Succession and competition on Rangitata Gorge properties;

Figure A: Competition between native Spaniard (*Aciphylla horrida*), snow tussock (belonging to the genus *Chionochloa*) and inter-matrix species including various exotic pastoral grass species.

Figure B: Steep hillsides in the Rangitata Gorge are often populated by prostrate coprosma interspersed with grazed exotic pasture species.

Figure C: Regenerating sedges/tussock on Mesopotamia Station.

Figure D: Matagouri (*Discaria toumatou*) grey scrub on Forest Hill Station with grazed understory populated by dryland exotic pastures species.
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Significantly, the constructionist stance emphasising pluralism aligns with the decisions of Justice Williams concluding the High Court ruling to classify the Mackenzie Basin an Outstanding Natural Landscape. The Court restated the principle of ‘naturalness’, or how this concept is used in the RMA 1991, as a cultural construct. Therefore, understandings are not an absolute and conflicts cannot be arbitrated with reference to a pre-human natural benchmark. Justice Williams ruled that perceptions of naturalness, associated with the Mackenzie Basin (and therefore, high country space more generally) vary for different people due to diverse relationships with place, which corresponds with Section 91 of the Mackenzie Basin Outstanding Natural Landscape ruling.46

This theoretical area of social production is potentially fruitful for reassessing tenure review. It motivates a critical spatial geography that unpacks how dualisms between nature and society are constructed and contested and unmasks the assumed stable realities of nature that guide people’s values, attitudes and therefore, eco-politics. I suggest that political progress may rest in a paradoxical frame to conventional critique of tenure review, to shed light on new conceptualisations of contestation between social groups depicted in Chapter 1.

I do not want to reduce the complexity of socio-nature to what Braun (2006: 213), describes as the "movement internal to the temporal rhythms and spatial orderings of capitalism". Similarly, in the work of Massey (2005, 1999) there is emphasis placed on the need to localise capitalist critique, understanding its effects as manifested in intensely local, situated practices and micro-politics. For this reason, I assert that we need to understand the specific spatial and temporal character of nature’s production. That is, before conceptualising issues with the conventions of tenure review, which perpetuate the dichotomy between nature (protection) and society (production) as a macro-level, neoliberal policy. I suggest this begins with understanding valuations of high country space

46 Section 91: Perceptions of the “naturalness” of the basin vary with the beholder.

“That naturalness is not an absolute that can be measured by reference to a pre-human benchmark is an important legislative precedent for landscape management in New Zealand. Perceiving the landscape as multifaceted”, Justice Williams also ruled that ecological science is relevant to landscape debates but should not take priority over other knowledge systems and valuations (such as perceptual, associative and cultural factors). It was considered that the Mackenzie Basin, as a pre-settler state (early Polynesian and European) was predominantly forested and the short tussock that provide landscape character are likely a result of anthropocentric burning and pastoralism. But, that many people consider the Mackenzie Basin a relatively natural landscape was deemed important, and therefore, there existed sufficient evidence of naturalness to be classified an Outstanding Natural Landscape. The Court commented that the seven point scale that Dr Steven proposed, ranging from ‘very high’ to ‘very low’ naturalness would likely be useful scale, but the scale would require indicators. The Court stated that ‘moderate-high’ category (5 of 7) might be sufficiently natural for Outstanding Natural Landscape categorisation (Quality Planning, 2013). This classification is the same as the scale recommended in the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects Best Practice Note for landscape matters (NZILA, 2010: n.p.).
locally, as the primary focus of Research Objective One. In the sense that the resolution of the research seeks to explain the outcomes of tenure review as a macro-transformation, I pursue an understanding of how broader trends influence attitudes and society-nature relations at a more specific spatial scale. Such insight inspires the 'value-theoretical analysis' applied within the thesis, which is examined as the final section to this chapter.

2.6 Approaching pluralism with emphasis on local values

Linking to the methodological approach that I explain in Chapter 4, a value theoretical analysis is applied within the current study for it supports moving away from macro-level economic and legalistic critique such as Brower (2008a; 2008b; 2006) Quigley (2008) and Round (2009). As a distinct linkage to Bourdieu’s thinking in the following chapter, values influence individual attitudes and collective positionings, social practice and relationships between actors. Therefore values for place and for nature held within the high country need further inquiry.

The significance of a value theoretical approach is that focusing on local complexities will allow a deep understanding of how tenure transformation is impacting: 1) the values and social attitudes of local people and hence, on local social-spatial geographies; and 2) on the development trajectory of a cultural landscape that has established deeply within New Zealand's national heritage (Law, 1997; Stephenson and Gorrie, 2011; Dominy, 2003; McClean, 2007; Moon, 2013). In looking towards alternative conceptualisations of high country space, local values provide a lens into three important aspects:

- Whose ideology and values are included and whose are excluded within concepts of landscape and nature, and with the categories imposed by tenure review.

- Assumptions embedded in both agricultural and conservation claims to the high country as static and divided for protection and production are problematised.

- ‘Protection’ is a subjective concept and there exist varied understandings of the role of farmers in protecting the high country landscape. Custodianship is socially and politically loaded – and therefore is a point of contestation.

---

47 Such a theoretical and methodological position motivates negotiating a line between macro and micro level analytic, where Deleuze and Guattari (1988: 235) assert that “every politics is simultaneously a macropolitics and a micropolitics” (emphasis original).

48 Engagement with local values and worldviews, Largue offers the opportunity to understand how particular positions are mobilised strategically within ‘the field’ (Bourdieu, 1984), and on what socio-cultural claims environmental values are contingent.
Within the pluralism and layers of value imbued upon spaces, nature and landscapes, exists the potential to examine where values are shared between actors and where conflict arises. Applying the social constructionist framework to this study is therefore focused on untangling the ways in which individuals and groups participate in the construction of space and mobilise ideology and values for nature and place politically. This suggests the need to explore the ways in which particular social meanings are produced and defended, by individuals and between particular social groups operating in the high country.

By engaging with values I hope to enable the promotion of dialogue in order to root conservation interest in the knowledge structures of complex local farming communities. The intent of undertaking such an intensive study is to highlight direction setting for landscape strategy and potential for local buy in and support for ecological protection. It is hoped that such an approach will assist a more agonistic platform to be forged between local conservation and production “knowledge cultures” (Tsouvalis, Seymour and Watkins, 2000: 910). This becomes the attention of Chapter 3, as a normative framework proposing a pluralist politics to progress debate beyond antagonistic positions.

2.7 **Summary of chapter and theoretical position**

In the preceding chapter I examined the theoretical parameters to a critical geography examining transformation to the high country landscape that has occurred since 1991 with tenure review. The complexity involved with managing this evolving space was highlighted. In particular, I followed the temporal development to the social production of nature thesis in geography, initially as a Marxist lens of inquiry, and then as a lineage of constructionist thought. These tools have explicit application to critique tenure review and deconstruct the binary logic the policy advances, separating production values from ecological preservation and access values under the centralised control of DOC.

Neoliberal transformation leads to changes in space and to nature, destabilising existing social-ecological assemblages and undermining long term cultural landscapes (Olwig, 2007; White, 2004; Greider and Garkovich, 1994). However, locally there is a deep context of social complexity and subjective response and resistance to the transformational capacity of capitalist logics (Massey, 1984; 1994; 1995). Thus, I seek to explore how actors recognise their position in a ‘globally open’ high country context. This suggests a need to engage with the ways individuals’ value space and understand the pressures facing the high country. Within lived place, individuals who are often rigidly fixed in popular discourse to the identity of ‘conservationist’ or ‘farmer’ are reflexive to contextual changes, and
relationships with ‘other’ actors. I seek to identify connections and contradictions in narratives and the way that individuals mobilise ideas of personal values and place identity. The strength of a localised lens of social construction is that understanding social complexity offers important political and strategic inroads for landscape management.
Chapter 3

Visions of the ‘Ideal’: Negotiating a Way Forward

3.0 Contributing to the political stance of the thesis

Extending the theoretical arguments developed in Chapter 2, political ecologist Richard White (1995) looked deeply at dispute that surrounded North American Brown Owl conservation and forestry. Evocatively titled “Are you an environmentalist or do you work for a living?” derived from a bumper sticker, White’s (1995) essay illustrated how the issue pitted local development and livelihoods against the socially potent green aspirations for re-naturalising old wood forest, by preventing social use.

Importantly, White suggests the multiple scales to the current research problem. His provocative essay brought under question both the contradictions embedded in Western conservation ideology, and also, the power of environmental politics backed by discourses of ‘saving nature’ and biodiversity. Controversially, White (1995) argued that ‘nature’ is often advocated for by urbanites at a distance, by those for whom resources come from shops and supermarkets. Their ‘work’ is undertaken in office blocks, by computer, biro and paper, and therefore, they rarely face the environmental impacts that come from their work in capitalist jobs. Disconnected from nature, the conservation park represents a moralised terrain attached to the altruistic feel good factor of protecting nature. The additional benefits of recreation and social enrichment they travel away from ‘used’ contexts of capitalism to experience, means that often urban environmentalists impose particular expectations on how nature should be in other, non-urban spaces.

As a Marxist, in-line with Smith (1984; 2008), White (1995) asserted that ‘nature’ becomes a fetishised environmental commodity external from society and productive spaces. Such an ideology, resting on the separation of nature and society, is conceived to be politically moribund. It results in a contradictory politics, which distracts attention away from social-natures and environmental problems closer to urban environments (such as air, water and resource use), as well as better and worse relations with modified environments and natures (see: Adams, 2004). As Braun (2006b: 195) asserts, this cognitive framing of separation “enables one to advocate for the preservation of nature in one place”, on a moralistic and inflexible vision of ‘pure’ and externalised nature; while, it extends a set of social and economic factions “that relentlessly objectify and exploit the earth elsewhere” (ibid.). For this reason, distanced constructions of nature may seek to
displace the histories of humans within what may be understood hybrid or ‘quasi-natures’;\textsuperscript{49} natures that are not entirely natural, but not modified to the extent that allows spaces to become more explicitly ‘human’ and modified. Natures within a cityscape in this cognitive frame may be left to the devices of humanity. The occupants of which need not comprehend the influence of their own practices, resource demands, social expectations and political positions on the constitution of immediate urban natures. Whereas, people in non-urban spaces have to conform to the imposition of expectations, due to living in ‘more natural’ or biodiversity valuable spaces.

Braun (2006a; 2006b; 2008) asserts that an alternative politics of nature need be adopted, whereby he suggests engagement with plural epistemology and social values. In Chapter Two I began to embark on this reformed politics by explaining the potential for a localised, value theoretical approach to empirical investigation. In the current chapter, first, in Section 3.1 I signify the diverging trajectories of protectionism and productivism in high country space. I then examine ideas of balance that pervaded rhetoric and institutional discourse surrounding tenure review. This corresponds with what Memon (1993) suggests to be a marriage of convenience between neoliberal and deep green environmental logics. Such an entanglement also appeared in the discourse surrounding the enactment of the Resource Management Act in 1991, couched within the contested concept of sustainable management. The second dimension to the chapter relates to research objectives two and three. Beginning in Section 3.2, I borrow from Bourdieu’s theory and from those who have applied his metaphors of social praxis. In the current thesis, Bourdieu’s thinking is applied as a framework for interrogating the erection of boundaries between protection and production. How boundaries are influencing the productive habitus of landholders and changing attitudes towards relative others located and working within high country spaces is examined. The final segment of discussion in Section 3.3, reengages with concepts of hybridity and pluralism in order to outline the parameters for establishing a more agonistic form of governance and eco-politics.

3.1 The emergence of productivist and protectionist trajectories

The productivist order

The emergence of agriculture, or what for the purpose of this study, is defined as a ‘productivist’ order, characterises a deeply ingrained social and political aspiration in New

\textsuperscript{49} Referring to Latour’s (1993) notion of the ‘quasi-object’, expressing the hybrid formation between human and non-human and the constant process of co-production between nature and society.
Zealand’s society. Productivism is defined as a function of ideology connected to capitalistic logics that emphasise the production of agro-foods in what may be considered a conventional modernist, or Fordist industrial model (Wilson, 2007; Walford, 2003; Rosin, 2012). The emphasis within this model is on increasing measurable economic productivity, and that a high growth rate is commensurate with more production and socio-economic betterment in broader society (Wilson, 2007). The term is now often used pejoratively in rural scholarship, where the paradigm of focus in rural studies moved to post-productivism and multifunctionality, as ways of reading rural space and diversification away from traditional grass based, agrarian models (Burton and Wilson, 2006, Walford, 2003).

In terms of this study, the ‘high country’ has been understood as a pastoral landscape since colonisation by immigrants who farmed the inland expanse - initially as ranging stockmen (Chapman, 1996), who envisaged the transformation of land into a productive utopia, building the resilience of the new colony and supporting the British Empire (McAloon, 2013; 2002; Moon, 2013; Pawson and Brooking, 2006; Brooking, 1996; Holland, O’Connor and Wearing, 2002). Eventually, a succession of leasehold tenure began to solidify agricultural claims to the previous wastelands, until the Land Act in 1948 provided exclusive occupation rights with the Crown Perpetual Pastoral Lease (hereafter Pastoral Lease) (see Appendix 2a). Understanding this contextual significance provides important an understanding of the social fabric of high country pastoralism and background to the pastoral lease, as a historical claim that was neglected in the work of Brower (2008a; 2008b) (see: Quigley, 2008; Round, 2009).

Elements of social tension were explored in the work of Eldred-Grigg (1981), which I developed in some detail in Chapter 2, regarding the early social order, abundant wealth and political connections of the southern landed gentry. Such understandings have permeated how the high country landholders have traditionally been represented in wider New Zealand. However, at a broad level, tensions between high country farming classes and ‘others’, particularly lowland farmers and urban folk, intensified during the 1950s ‘wool boom’. This period of time represented a marked increase of high country wealth as landholders capitalised on wool yields from large flock sizes (McAloon, 2002; Pawson and Brooking, 2002; Haggerty, Campbell and Morris, 2009).50 The power of the agricultural

---

50 The wool boom coincided with demand for wool as the United States was stockpiling wool in case the Korean War escalated. Social representation surrounded the influx of money for high country farming, where in other parts of New Zealand’s society, returning from the economic decline following World War Two had been difficult. At this time agriculture became further entrenched in New Zealand’s social psyche as an economic backstop.
lobby and productivism, as an economic backstop, remained dominant in the national discourse and psyche. This dynamic is depicted in the cartoon below in Figure 3.1, which illustrates New Zealand’s social success riding on wool prices.51

Figure 3.1: On the back of the Wool Boom. Published in the New Zealand Herald in November 1950, the cartoon by Gordon Minihinnick, denotes to the wool boom that was leading to prosperity for New Zealand farmers. The growth in demand for wool fibre corresponded with the Korean War. In 1950, New Zealand was the world's third-largest wool producer and as a result of demand, the domestic and rural economy boomed. Cartoon courtesy of New Zealand Herald. (McGibbon, 1992: 135).

There is a historically connected and resilient social frame of understanding farmers as ascendant and politically supported elites (Eldred-Grigg, 1981; Pawson and Brooking, 2002; Brower, 2009).52 However, underpinning this there has long been a dynamic of ‘boom and bust’ within the high country farming economy; associated especially with the exposure to economic flux and the jeopardies of pastoralism in the high country

51 Discourse surrounding economic reliance on agriculture has also surrounded the more recent dairy industry and land intensification boom (Fed. Farmers, 2009: n.d.)

52 Farmers are often understood as socially and politically powerful in New Zealand’s society associated with the economic dominance they have held (Hendy and Callaghan 2013; Round, 2009; Pawson and Brooking, 2002; Brooking, 1996; Brower, 2008; 2006). Traditionally farming classes have assumed a place in the cultural psyche of the nation, as the ‘backbone’ and ‘lifeblood’ to the national economy, in historical and contemporary representations (Pawson and Brooking, 2002). This mobilises a particular social representation that is challenged by deep greens. The reliance the New Zealand economic model places on agriculture insinuates environmental decline (Walker et al., 2006; Swaffield and Brower, 2006), as it is evocatively described as “ecological destruction” in an article by Forest and Bird (Maturin, 2009a: n.p.).
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Arguably, the economic wealth and social status of the ‘southern landed gentry’ has fluctuated, but on a pastoral basis, has generally decreased as processes of rural peripheralisation has meant that the distribution of wealth in New Zealand is increasingly urbanised and captured in a smaller subsection of society (Round, 2009; Federated Farmers, 2005; Pawson and Brooking, 2002; Fairweather, 1992; 1987). However, Brower (2008a) would disagree, where tenure review highlighted capital falling into the hands of politically connected leasehold families; initially as the result of crown negotiations and remuneration from review and subsequently the benefit from development, where potentials were freed up by receiving fee simple title of previously leasehold land. However, as mentioned in Chapter 2, Section 2.2, Brower’s coverage was criticised by the farming lobby for being generalised from a sample of extreme examples of intensive productive development, real estate and tourism venture capitalism.

An idea of resource privatisation and business diversification from State orchestrated tenure review under neoliberal impetus, however, fits with current scholarship in rural geography. Couched within the examination that neoliberal rural space as increasingly diversified and less agricultural, the term multi-functionality is suggested to signify the latest paradigm for understanding rural change. However, authors including, Walford (2003) and Rosin (2012) acknowledge that rural spaces and even single properties often comprise a mixture of traditional productivist, post-productivist and multifunctional strategies. With tenure review, high country space has become increasingly complex, where under the pastoral lease land use was regulated to a homogenous, predominantly non-intensified (except closely adjacent to homestead curtilage areas) grassland pastoral system. Fee simple freehold is allowing a diverse range of business strategies to be followed on land that is now privatised. This means that the future trajectory of high country development is open and complex. Such inquiry into the productivist / post-productivist / multifunctionality transition fits with the Bourdieusian dimension to this study. The first aspect of research objective two, inspires an examination of how tenure review is impacting on land use decision-making. In particular, issues associated with the changing scale of

---

53 This follows a general tends of agricultural development in New Zealand, which is characterised historically by dramatic flux between periods of economic success and a blighted history of economic depression (Peden, 2011). Following economic boom in the 50s, 60s and 70s, and increased agricultural subsidisation under the Muldoon era of government, the dynamic decline was intensified in the agricultural sector in 1980s with neoliberal restructuring (Federated Farmers, 2005; Le Heron, 1989; Cloke, 1989; Cloke and Goodwin, 1992). In the high country, under the pastoral lease, farmers tended to withstand economic flux by gearing business strategies to avoid risk, which was intensified due to the regions climatic extremes and reliance on merino sheep meat and wool.
farm production as a result of tenure review leading to DOC assuming control over vast areas of previous lease hold land for protectionist purposes, requires examination.

**An evolving protectionist order**

This would appear to be an opportune time to define ‘protectionist’ for the purposes of the study, as the term will currently appear vague. It is a broad term, which includes preservation and conservation ideology. It is important here to make distinction between preservation logic, emphasising modernist separation rationale, reliant of nature’s externalisation from society like with wilderness thought (examined in Chapter 2); and conservation logic, as a term that signifies integration with use and neoliberal ideas encased with sustainability and ‘pragmatic’ utilitarian ideas of protection (Robinson, 2011; McCarthy, 2014). The etymological distinction between conservation and preservation is important at specific stages within the thesis, at which point I will make the rationale for differentiating clear. However, defining the ‘protectionist order’ as a broad interpretive tool fits with the way I apply Bourdieusian thought in subsequent sections, as a structural grouping that I use to set up the normative framework to this study. I then unpack and critique the structuring and the categories it implies within subsequent chapters using participant insight.

At a broad level, depicting processes of dual emergence, environmental protectionism within New Zealand gained political momentum within mainstream society in the 1960s and 1970s. Subsequently, environmentalism, or a protectionist order gained power, as a deeply rooted, but complex element of New Zealand’s contemporary social-political make up (Wallace, 2014; Salmon, 2013; Robbin and Griffiths, 2004; Rainbow, 1993). At this time, social consciousness was intensifying around issues of environmental exploitation, which increasingly fueled public backing of the green lobby and ecological preservation causes. The formation of the Values Party in 1972 (which subsequently became the New Zealand Green Party in 1990) is illustrative of changing social expectations associated with nature’s protection and the intrinsic linkage that environmentalism has traditionally held with confronting narrow economic structures and addressing social justice. Each of these agendas was an increasing focus of leftist politics in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s.

As a significant historical moment, the Values Party is considered the world’s first national level political party that held central aims of environmental protection and social justice, which went hand-in-hand with socialist objectives in this period of social, economic
and environmental uncertainly. Consequently, the New Zealand green movement is suggested by Rainbow (1993) to have held utopian, but also anarchist origins focused on challenging the status quo of political orthodoxy. However, recognising the Green Party’s historical affiliation with Labour in coalition government (Greens.org.nz, 2014: n.p; Rainbow, 1993), establishes the initial inclination towards contestation at a macro level of national politics between productivist and protectionist ideology.

The political power of the farming lobby has remained strong within the constitution of New Zealand’s politics. For example, an article for the Waikato Times on 11 June 2011 covered the backlash following then Labour leader Phil Goff’s description of Federated Farmers, New Zealand’s principal farming lobby organisation, as “the National Party in gumboots” (Waikato Times, 2011n.p). Goff’s quip riled farmers, and depicts the historical ties that agriculture has held at the upper echelon of political authority, when successive National governments’ have obtained power.54 As a result, the contemporary emergence of productivism and protectionism in the high country region conveys a complex politics. Productivist stability across the high country since European colonialism has increasingly come under challenge with the development of national green politics. ‘The landscape’ has been brought under negotiation by the plethora of actors now involved in the trajectory and emergence of high country space, coupled with a transformative political economy and changing conservation and land tenure policy space.

My focus within this research is on the contemporary genesis and transformation of spatial meanings associated with the values theoretical analysis engaged with in Chapter 2. However, my interest as I began to engage with above, goes beyond the genesis of plural meanings and values (explained in Chapter 2), and is fronted with further goals: 1) to examine spatial transformation related to changes to productive habitus caused by bounding of the landscape and the modified spatial scale of high country properties following tenure review; and 2) the transformation of relationships between farming and ‘protectionist’ interests operating within local high country space. At the macro level, such thinking links intricately with transformative power relations between protective and

54 This dimension of New Zealand’s political context is detailed by Rainbow (1993) in his discussion of the escalation of green politics with the instigation of the Values Party in 1972, which became the Green Party in 1990. The Values Party envisaged a ‘zero growth’ society; a green ideology, which rejected National Prime Minister, Robert Muldoon’s ‘Think Big’ strategy encouraging GDP growth and FDI with the development of oil, gas, coal, electricity resources and increasing emphasis on agricultural subsidisation.

The Values Party emerged partly from the ‘Save Manapouri Campaign’ between 1959 and 1972, with proposals to raise Lake Manapouri by 30 metres to provide energy to the Comalco aluminium smelter at Tiwai Point in Southland. This campaign was a significant issue in the 1972 general election and the elected Norman Kirk Labour government endorsed the Save Manapouri principles.
productive interests locally as a result of the neoliberal intervention of tenure review (as a macro-level, and centralised imposition, agreed to on a voluntary basis). At the micro-level, such spatial transformation ties to representational practices. For example how people understood/identified as ‘farmers’ or ‘conservationists’ understand themselves and whether this complicates generalised depictions. It also relates to the modification of relations between production and protection interests following tenure review where more distinct boundaries are affirmed between that which is public conservation estate and ‘other’ land, privatised as fee simple title held by previous pastoral lessees.

These are ambitious parameters for a single doctoral research project. However, the intent is to forge ahead with opening a debate around the boundary politics stimulated by tenure review. Research objective three seeks to assess how this analysis contributes to a different political future. I argue that each theoretical component, which aligns with different empirical applications in the thesis, contributes to a fuller picture of boundary transformations associated with the intervention of tenure review. Bourdieu’s thinking has particular relevance to the interrogation of such boundary politics, where I seek to understand how social orders associated with ideology and defended political positions (at a macro-level) are leading to contests over high country space locally. Tenure review became overly reductive and about separating economic production, ecological protection and public access objectives. For this reason, in the following section I argue that tenure review identifies a Faustian pact between neoliberals and deep green (preservation) environmentalism. This dynamic illustrates tensions with modernist ideas of nature protection and the requirement to externalise nature from society, as was examined in Chapter 2 and the introduction to the current chapter (see also: White, 1995).

A Faustian pact between neoliberal and deep green preservation

Tenure review was conceived of as policy in 1989 and instigated in 1991, initially under the Land Act 1948, and later advanced under the Crown Pastoral Lease Act 1998. It signified an end game to the thrust of neoliberal overhaul that confronted New Zealand’s agricultural-economy with ‘Rogernomics’. As a result of neoliberalisation a discourse of resilience attached to national economic dependence on agriculture is entrenched within

---

55 ‘Rogernomics’ was coined by journalists at the New Zealand Listener magazine, who used it to illustrate the neoliberalisation of New Zealand economy following the policies of Roger Douglas, who in 1984 became Minister of Finance for the Fourth Labour Government. Douglas’s policies emulated those of Thatcher in the United Kingdom and Reagan in the United States, characterised by market deregulation, tight control of inflation and a floating exchange rate. Interestingly, such a neoliberal marketisation is more strictly aligned with the political right, and the approach of the Labour government of this occasion faced criticism.
farming identities and in New Zealand’s cultural psyche (Dominy, 2003; 2001; 1995; Rosin, 2012; Brooking and Pawson, 2002; Cloke, 1997).  

In the 1980s and up to the late 1990s, pastoral agriculture was strained economically, and many high country communities remained in a state of decline (Armstrong et al., 2008). In some media and grey literature arguments, the pastoral lease is perceived as an out-dated mode of tenure, where leaseholder’s held pastoral rights over huge tracts of land with conservation potential (Forest and Bird, 2007; Sage and Maturin, 2007; Sage, Graeme, Maturin, 2005; Maturin, 2004; Sage, 2002; Sage, 1995b). Similarly, within farming advocacy, tenure review promoted the ability to ‘free up’ the economic resource from the regulative constraints of the pastoral lease (Kerr, 1991; Sage, 1995c). In other arguments, however, the pastoral lease is perceived as a tenure system that promoted custodianship through centralised regulation of a ‘low intensity’ agro-tenure system (Federated Farmers, n.d.; 2005; Maxwell, 2012).

Emphasis on separating values from pastoral production intensified in 1981 with the instigation of the on-going Protected Natural Areas Programme (PNAP) identifying Recommended Areas for Protection (RAPs). This process culminated in tenure review, which offered the ability to further protect RAPs. During discussions over its instigation, tenure review divided the cabinet, for a varied range of reasons (pers. comm., Political Informant 1, previous Speaker of The House). However, progressing with review was ultimately understood to offer benefits to both sides of the “social political divide” (ibid.) between nationalising values for ecological protection as well as public access and economic production. Ideas of balancing production and ecological protection objectives are covered extensively in the Hansard record of Parliamentary debates around the lead up to tenure review’s instigation (1989 – 1991) and debate on the Crown Pastoral Land Bill introduced in 1995 and enacted in 1998.  

There existed relative social and political agreement between lobbies, with the perceived need for tenure review to ‘balance’ conservation objectives while optimising high

---

56 The period of time directly following liberalisation in 1984 was catastrophic for some New Zealand farmers, due to prior reliance on state subsidies, a hangover from production emphasis under the Muldoon era of national politics (Le Heron and Roche, 1999; Fairweather, 1992; 1989; Cloke et al., 1990). A body of literature surrounds the neoliberalisation of New Zealand’s agricultural economy; which post 1984 transformed from one of the most protected internationally, to one of the most liberalised (Freedland, 2000). Agri-systems are now exposed to fast and sharp global market change and competition. Furthermore, following adversity culminating from restructuring, the ability for farmers to be self-sustaining, productively efficient and free from government subsidisation has become ingrained within the contemporary psyches of New Zealand farmers (Morris, 2009; Rosin, 2012).
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country production. Examining the positioning of various stakeholder groups within the debates on the Crown Pastoral Land Bill, between 1996 and its enactment as law in 1998, tenure review was understood to be a way of providing inroads for stakeholders to make claims. Iwi claims were given explicit priority as well as public access. However, how the process has unfolded in local high country regions has been highly complex and contested.

The outcomes, associated with division and the primacy given to production and DOC conservation values, have been a focus of significant controversy (Brower, 2006; 2008a; 2008b; Swaffield and Brower, 2006; Walker et al., 2006; Stephens, Walker and Price, 2008; Rutledge, Walker and Price, 2005; Walker and Lee, 2004). For example, the narrowness of assumed categories prioritised in tenure review were noted in comments in Parliament by Labour MP Damien O’Connor that, “there are basically three major interest groups: conservationists; recreationists; and those who have utilised the land in the past and those who see in the future new possibilities for utilising it, following the passage of this bill” (O’Connor, (28 May 1998) 568 NZPD 9369). O’Connor extends:

The objective of protecting the high country is truly admirable and, I think, the view of every New Zealander, whether a farmer, conservationist, or recreationist. We must protect the high country [recognised as being of high cultural, economic and ecological value]. But it is a question of maintaining a balance and protecting the rights of those people who live in those areas, who have lived on the land, and who I believe, probably have more knowledge about the management of that land than any academic. However, the views of the academics, the people who have studied the ecological values, the flora and fauna, are important. They have a large band of supporters. They view the protection of this land from an ecological perspective as absolutely paramount. Clause 20 is the key part of the Bill, and goes a long way to achieving the balance that was always an objective of the select committee. The land is able to be reviewed so that we can rejig the priorities, and can allow some of the land to go into private ownership and some of it to go back to the Department of Conservation.

We had to balance the views of the conservationists, who clearly saw that those inherent values were paramount, and the economic uses, which are significant, and, certainly, are the motivation for many of the existing lessees – the pastoral leaseholders – to undergo the tenure review process. They want to ensure that they get something out of that process. (ibid.)

There was an argued need to balance objectives of conservationists, lessees and recreationalist, but in actuality, was this balancing, which led to separation between values categories, destructive of net conservation benefit? Net conservation benefit is a term the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment recently referred to in her assessment of high country land use and the exchange of stewardship land (much of which was contributed from completed tenure reviews) for economic use (Wright, 2013). The term
implies conservation and sustainability outcomes across a landscape, recognising its integration and the weaknesses of patch dynamics ecology associated with modernist isolation and preservation strategies of ecological restoration. Overall, in this study, it is a term that scrutinises the impacts of the division between production and protection, modifying productive practices and the constitution of high country under the pastoral lease; a cultural landscape that tenure review was debatably seeking to protect, as a point made clear by Swaffield and Brower (2009).

Balance or destructive division?

Memon (1993) suggests the process of ‘balancing’ between protection and production interests that occurred with tenure review is symptomatic of the negotiated Faustian pact between the ‘deep green’ environmental ideologies of New Zealand’s preservation lobby and neoliberals. The reason why tenure review received relative support fitted with dual strands of social orthodoxy at the time of instigation. For example, DOC was founded in 1989 within this context of neoliberal change, as the centralised organisation charged with the responsibility of conservation and the management of National Parks. Issues with the etymological differences between preservation and conservation are foregrounded.

Furthermore, the Faustian pact between economic orthodoxy and ecological preservation manifests within other examples in New Zealand’s environmental management framework. For example, the ‘marriage of convenience’ between neoliberal and ecocentric objectives is an issue Memon (1993) comments on with the emergence of the RMA 1991.

He notes the dilemmas of the Act’s hybrid mix of laissez faire market-driven resource development, couched within an environmental effects based policy and planning framework. Importantly, such examination highlights the contest between

---

58 Division was legitimised on its ability to form a network of ecologically rich grassland and alpine parks and reserves, and the explicit allocation of public access easements. These goals provided the impetus from conservation groups to support tenure review. However, the process also met the historical demands for freeholding by leaseholders (the Todhunter letter, from 1941 in Chapter 1 and Appendix 1a signifies this historical claim). The relationship between these social interests were brought together and ‘mediated’ by tenure review. However, as a process formulated on separating values, it set interests in opposition by firming boundaries and “cutting up” the landscape (McFarlane, 2011: 1). This is an important intervention made in Chapter 6 and 7, in relation to research objective two.

59 The Resource Management Act (RMA) was passed in 1991 and promotes the sustainable management of natural and physical resources such as land, air and water on an effects basis. The RMA is New Zealand’s principal legislation for environmental management at national, regional and local levels. However, it has been variously criticised for being ineffective at managing adverse effects on the environment, especially at a cumulative and landscape wide scale because it relates to individual development proposals; and criticism has also focused on how time consuming and expensive RMA processes are, due to bureaucratic restrictions on legitimate economic activities (Pawson, 2010; MfE, 2010; Frieder, 1997; Fisher, 1991; Palmer, 1991).
modernist (divisive) and post-modernist (integrated) ideologies of environmental management, encompassed in New Zealand’s conservation framework.

In particular, Norton and Miller (2000) are critical of these tensions in New Zealand’s conservation politics. They suggest that erecting boundaries across productive landscapes without intact native ecosystems may act to undermine indigenous conservation outcomes and the potential for integrated connectivity within the patch dynamics of hybrid, agricultural ecosystems. This becomes a point of argument in the current thesis, where I question whether tenure review undermines the integration of the high country landscape, which was retained under the pastoral lease. As examples, the Reserves Act 1977, Conservation Act 1987 and Crown Pastoral lease Act 1998 are explicit in their emphasis on separation of nature and ecological protection from production. Whereas, the RMA 1991 was enacted with an all-encompassing purpose of sustainable management, which in Section 5 is described as:

… managing the use development and protection of natural and physical resources in a way and at a rate which enable people and communities to provide for their social-economic and cultural well-being and for health and safety, while

   (a) Sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and

   (b) Safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and

   (c) Avoiding, remedying or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.\(^{60}\)

The concept of sustainable management is contested however, where the RMA framework now operates in a neoliberalised political economy emphasising privatisation and individualised wealth maximisation. This is especially the case where in Part 2 of the RMA 1991, Sustainable Management is set out and applied under a hierarchy of ambiguous principles in Sections 6, 7 and 8.\(^{61}\) The Crown Pastoral Lease Act 1998, however, also emphasises the concept of sustainability. Applied within the mandate of tenure review, Clause 20 (a) (i) of the Crown Pastoral Lease Act 1998 states that tenure review should “Promote the management of reviewable land in a way that is ecologically sustainable”.\(^{62}\)


\(^{61}\) Section 6 is a list of matters of national importance that shall be ‘recognised and provided for’ in achieving the purpose of the RMA; Section 7 is a list of matters that all decisions ‘shall have particular regard to’ and Section 8 specifies that achieving the purpose of the RMA shall take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.

\(^{62}\) McFarlane (2011) gave deep insight into how contestation that surrounded tenure review undermined this critical objective of tenure review, for the ecologically sustainable management of Significant Inherent
Memon’s (1993) insight into the Faustian pact at the heart of New Zealand’s environmental management framework within the RMA 1991, suggests that tenure review may have provided an inroads for neoliberalism. The emphasis on sustainable management in the RMA is a New World attitude towards protecting nature, whereas advancing division is a modernist attitude based on duality framings between nature and society. Tensions within the current era of environmental management suggest the bolting together of these contradictory ideologies in the post 1984 politico-economic era. The crown pastoral lease resource was imagined as a productivist landscape, which therefore justified the separation of production values, privatised and ‘freed up’ from the constraints of the pastoral lease for ‘improved’ production. Concurrently, land perceived to hold Significant Inherent Values (SIVs) (where emphasis is placed on indigenous ecological values in the CPLA 1998) were accumulated into the conservation estate, perceived ‘locked up’ for protection. Once under full Crown control under DOC management, conservation estate is often represented as ‘nationalised’ and ‘safe’ from production impacts (Tanczos, 2007; Forest and Bird, 2009; Ell, 2002; 1994), setting up generalised contest between privatisation and nationalisation as explained by Quigley (2008) in response to Brower (2008b). Tenure review thus reflects the neoliberal scheme to privatise previously State held assets and land resources (Robbins, 2008; Bakker, 2010; Bakker and Bridge, 2006; 2008; Castree, 2008a; 2008b; Harvey, 2007; 2005). This ideology ties to broader tenets of neoliberalism, championing that privatised innovation leads to trickle down economic benefit; an argument Harvey (2007; 2005) would assert to be a major ideological faux pas in the advocacy of neoliberal models.

Research objectives two and three question the costs of the division created by tenure review. Drawing on the theoretical insights of Bourdieu, questions I consider include:

- By applying binary concepts of productive and protected land, does tenure review constrain more creative and sensitive usage of productive land, reducing the emergence of more ecologically sensitive uses?

Values. However, McFarlane’s (2011) analysis did not interrogate the issue with duality to a sufficient level, even though her study was situated in a constructionist framework, which holds deep commitment to critiquing duality constructs between nature and society.

63 ‘Freed up’ and ‘locked up’ are tropes used interchangeable in the media and the political lobbying of Federated farmers and conservation NGO’s like Forest and Bird. The trope of freed up illustrates both how tenure review moved production restrictions in agricultural lobbying. However, conservation land is also understood as freed up from the control of leaseholders for access and biodiversity conservation, when ‘nationalised’ within the conservation estate. ‘Locked up’ is used to depict land that was in pastoral lease prior to tenure review. However, it is also a trope found in the criticism of conservation land in the media and farming lobbying, where ring fenced conservation land is understood to be locked up and externalised from social use.
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- Has tenure review deepened tensions between stakeholders by erecting boundaries between preservation and productive uses?

- What role does the state play at a local level and level in the mediation of conservation and production interests?

- What insights into the soundness of the rationale underlying tenure review are provided by academic critiques of division between nature and society?

Inspired by the political stance to this thesis, these questions begin to frame the platform for empirical investigation and the critique of tenure review, which is hoped will identify potential leads for developing a more equitable high country landscape politics in the future.

3.2 Extending values analysis with Bourdieusian Theory

Mentioned previously, the critical value analysis introduced in Chapter 2 signifies moving away from structural, macro-political inquiry, to focus on the micro-politics of nature’s constitution in systems of locally negotiated values. Emphasis on individual agency asserts the fluidity of landscape and the epistemological pluralism associated with concepts of and values for nature. This could be extended theoretically and methodologically in ways that focus in more detail on agent subjectivities’. Such thinking connects back to the aforementioned geographical extensions of hybridity thinking and theoretical engagements with Actor-Network thinking, Assemblage Theory and also alternative frameworks like Social Network Analysis. Each framework positions the complexity of the micro-scale and individual agents at the centre of investigation.

For example, White (2004) following on from constructionist thinking in environmental politics in White (1995) has moved to emphasise hybridity thinking. There exist various contentious points of view about the legitimate place of humans, sitting outside of nature or as intrinsically part of ‘it’ (a point exemplified in the work of Robinson, 2011). Social nature, hybrid natures and landscapes (White, 2004), novel and non-equilibrium ecosystems (Cumming et al., 2009; Hobbs, Higgs, Harris, 2009; Hobbs et al., 2006; Zimmerer, 2007; Manning et al., 2009; Forsyth, 2008) all recognise a growing awareness of situating humanity within nature. Also, the more-than-human geographies of scholars like Bingham and Hinchliffe (2008), and the multi-natural assemblage thinking of Lorimer (2012; 2005), Braun (2006a; 2004), Castree (2008a) as well as Anderson and Mcfarlane (2011), signify recent extensions of Actor-Network Theory in geography.
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Emphasising the active agency of non-humans and humans in the constant constitution of space, society and nature, by embracing Actor Network Theory was a potentially productive line of inquiry. However the intent of this project is to untangle the duality between nature / protection and society / production, implanted by tenure review. At this point it is stressed that tenure review, as a policy intervention, was informed by a macro-level ideology of boundary logic within New Zealand’s conservation orthodoxy, which manifested in complex ways locally over the temporal duration of the tenure review process. In this way, the micro-level manifestations of the process reflect structural (political-economic and legislative) considerations as well as agent centred (social, cultural and semiotic) changes; and overall, tenure review may suggest further estrangement between powerful social ideologies in New Zealand’s social fabric. The explicit focus of the project is to interrogate spatial and productive change and tensions between human agents, in order to critique the assumptions on which tenure review relied and the separatist logic it projected on space. This precedes a focus on what Braun terms an ‘ethical pluralism’, returning to understand how accounting for diverse values claims, and rooted contingencies of local space may guide a more inclusive framework for high country landscape management; as the focus of research objective three.

Avoiding relativism: where stabilities disintegrate into pluralism

Critics of post-structural and constructionist scholarship, argue that such approaches may allow for degenerative relativism, whereby “anything can be made to look good or bad simply by being re-described” (Relph, 1991: 103). Critique in this frame suggests that relativism and idealism stems from opening up assumed stabilities of knowledge and the order of nature and space (as well as the research process and findings) to pluralised interpretation. Subsequently, critique of assumed stabilities, such as separation between nature and society at the core to restoration ecology, preservation and wilderness ethics (Ginn and Demeritt, 2008), might undermine the potential for a stable platform on which to advance environmental advocacy and policy direction for protecting ‘nature’.

The constructionist frame asserts that there is no singular or objective way of knowing space, ‘thing’ or phenomena (Braun, 2007). Therefore, a pluralist approach acknowledges that there are no universal grounds for action and ‘solutions’ are contingent outcomes. However, accepting pluralism does not mean embarking on directionless
relativism. Accounting for epistemological and values pluralism, if channelled effectively, potentially leads to an opening up of discussion and politics to alternative ideas, values and dynamic socio-cultural ideologies that need be adjudicated between, without privileging some and marginalising others and degenerating to overly simplistic categories. What the pluralist stance does is potentially open the politics over tenure review to alternative understandings, as an approach that relied on a narrow premise that prioritised balancing between production, protection and access values, as expressed in the Hansard records of Parliamentary debate.

Emerging from the pluralist stance is a postmodern political space that embraces difference and an open approach to understanding social phenomena. Such assumptions rely on the operation of a well-managed and open, agonistic politics, and through this, making genuine attempts to latch on to “intersubjective solidarity” (Relph, 1991: 104), without reference to absolute standards. This does not mean abandoning rational and scientific methods, which contribute a great deal to conservation understandings. However, a postmodern framework empowers that acceptance of ‘other’ or alternative claims within pluralised social understanding and values systems. As Rorty (1989: 73-74) outlines,

The ironic post-modernist has to accept, for instance, that the scientists believe in one version of reality and religious fundamentalists in another; in their own circles they are both right and there is no objective way of deciding what is closest to ‘reality’. Nobody knows best. It is precisely this that is meant by the philosophical declaration that there are no privileged positions.

Therefore, a distinct aspiration exists within pluralist political approaches to open up a discussion, untangling the various ways social phenomena and landscapes are understood and valued. However, critiquing the existing parameters of an issue like tenure review is the initial stage to this. The values focused approach allows engagement with local processes and attitudes for a nuanced reading of local space. However, Bourdieu’s scholarship and scholars who have applied his concepts, allow for deeper critique of duality constructs between nature and society, from this platform of local empirical investigation.

---

64 As a primary post-structuralist critique of the hegemony that scientific knowledge has maintained in the definition of and solutions offered to social and environmental challenges in developed and developing nation contexts (Agrawal, Chhatre and Hardin, 2008; Agrawal, 2009; Turnbull, 1997; Watson and Huntington, 2008, Pedykowski, 2003; Chambers, 2009). These solutions at times show no understanding of politics and social-cultural context and such issues and tenure complexities (Watson and Huntington, 2008; Agrawal et al., 2007).
3.3 Applying Bourdieu’s rationale and metaphors of social praxis

Bourdieu labelled his inquiry a theory of social practice (Bourdieu, 2000; 1998; 1996), and while his sociology was silent on addressing the issue of space (see: Ergler, 2012; Grenfell, 2008a), Bourdieu’s thinking is fruitful for looking at struggle over space at both micro and macro scales.

Bourdieu’s corpus developed at a distance from the historical materialism of Smith and Harvey, however, as a Marxist and structural sociologist there exist connections between. *The Weight of the World* (1993) is understood as Bourdieu’s most noteworthy critique of neoliberalism, the criticism of which consisted the preeminent motivation in Bourdieu’s latter scholarly contribution (Bourdieu, 1993; 1998; 2000; Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2007). As Schwartz (2003) explains, Bourdieu sought to confront neoliberalism, which was fast becoming the political norm with drastic impact on the capitalist landscape in France and globally.65

Considerable insight can be learned from Bourdieu’s theoretical and methodological rationale, which aligns with the approach of Doreen Massey in negotiating between the macro / structural and micro / agency levels of analytic. Structuralism, existential and phenomenological thinking each inspired Bourdieu’s sociology. He perceived that constructionism, with its focus on agents and semiotic phenomena does not address issues of scale, collective norms, social order and questions of power to a satisfactory extent (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2007). Therefore, Bourdieu asserts that there is structure to collective affiliation and action - shared visions, values and aspirations guide praxis through the concept of shared habitus, explained in the following section (Bourdieu, 2000; 1993; 1979; Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2007; Grenfell, 2008a). However, he emphasised strongly that such structuring is not functionalist (as economic and environmental determinisms would affirm). Bourdieu (2000), suggests that social practice, interactions and ideology are in constant flux and also vary spatially and temporally and therefore, cannot be abstracted to generalised, coherent trends and rules (such as capitalist orders that the materialism of Smith and Harvey have been critiqued for remaining focused on (Whatmore, 2002; Harraway and Latour, 2004)). This rationale influenced the series of

---

65 Such a dimension is similar to New Zealand where neoliberal logic has fast been assumed into the normal social structures of society, economic development and especially agricultural production (Perkins, 2006; Woods, 2009; Rosin, 2012; 2007). ‘Rogernomics’ is understood by Freedland (2000: n.p.) to have “out-Thatchered Thatcher and out-Reaganed Reagan”, reflective of the drastic impact the ‘New Zealand experiment’ had with privatisation of public assets and market deregulation imposed by the Fourth Labour Government (Cloke, 1989; 1997; Cloke and Goodwin, 1992).
conceptual metaphors Bourdieu’s developed to theorise social interaction and power relations within the field.

Habitus and the field

Bourdieu extended Weber’s concept of social order, into his theorisation of ‘the field’. The elements of the field as a concept are examined below in Concept Box 3.1, whereby each individual occupies a position within a multidimensional space. Broadly, however, from Marxism Bourdieu retained an understanding that broader forces (capitalistic / neoliberal) influence localised social relations dramatically. The concept of the field is a structuralist interpretation in the line of thinkers including Durkheim, Marcel Mauss and Levi-Strauss (Grenfell, 2008b; Schwartz, 2003; Brubaker, 1993). For this reason, Bourdieu emphasises the tendency for hegemonic capitalist and social structures to reproduce themselves, based on analysing symbolic structures and forms of classification (Shucksmith, 1993, 2002; Burton and Wilson, 2006; Lee et al., 2005; Rosin, 2012).

Capitalist transformation is achieved on the ground, the logic pervading throughout mundane, day-to-day activities. For this reason, Bourdieu sought to understand what leads to collective grouping of social agents within society. As a sociologist, his thinking fits with how the constructionist lens is applied to the current project, emphasising micro-level complexity and the inter-subjectivities of agents. The *habitus* is the collective unifier between people; which Bourdieu (2000: 139) defines as “bodily knowledge” and the “embodied dispositions of individual will, but also not on a whim of unthought action”, signifying both elements of structural and agentic influence on social positioning.66 The habitus and praxis of people is motivated by attitudes and values, which are inherently complex and changeable, linked in dialectic, not separate from the capitalist mode.

---

66 Bourdieu’s focus on body action and practical dispositions within the concept of habitus, expanded on phenomenology, following from Merleau-Ponty, Husserl and Heidegger. In line with this tradition of social theory, Bourdieu sought to transcend the assortment of oppositions, which continued to frame modernist social science; for example, between subjectivism and objectivism, ‘us’ and ‘other’, micro-politics and macro-politics, structure and agency, freedom and defence, natural and social (Schwartz, 2003). The theorisation of habitus and the various species of capital were focused on reconceiving these oppositions, which is a distinct linkage between Bourdieu’s thinking, post-modern and post structural approaches like constructivism. Both frameworks seek to be sensitive to located social complexities, which in the current study are interrogated in chapter 5 and then built on to reformulate a new spatial politics in Chapters 6, 7 and 8 of the current thesis.
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Examining the habitus is associated with understanding how social actors make changes, sometimes subtle, other times more explicit, in order to challenge or retain the normalcy of social practice. Bourdieu (2000, 1979) suggested micro-level processes, attitudes and practices – the habitus – to be a rich micro-level lens for speaking back to macro and meso-level processes, a rationale the current study borrows explicitly by engaging with his metaphors, and also methodological principles in Chapter 4. By emphasising the role of social agents and their embodiment, (symbolic, physical, tangible and psychological) in social structures, Bourdieu registers the exertion of power and conflict, which relies on the exercise of various forms of capital.

**Concept Box 3.1: The field and the habitus**

One’s position within the field is defined by factors such as social class, lifestyle, attitude and values. These operate as what Bourdieu defined to be the habitus, a set of social dispositions of thought and practice acquired through everyday activities and experiences (Brubaker, 1993). The habitus becomes a social structuring conditioned within the individuals affiliated to a particular field. Through the habitus, individuals develop what Bourdieu defines a “sense of the game” (Bourdieu, 1990: 110), which relates to the hegemonic habitus or doxa of a field and allows participants within a field: 1) an understanding of the order and social expectations associated with a field; 2) an understanding of power relations that characterise the field; 3) practical sense and a comprehension of classifications of the social world where individuals relate.

The sense of the game therefore, provides understanding of appropriate attitude and practices within a field. This allows an individual’s habitus to fit, giving them access to the field through behaviours that align with those of the hegemonic group. Over time, participants within a field engage in complex sets of normalised social and spatial relations. Through practice, certain dispositions of social action, attitude, valuation and interactions (praxis) with other social groups and biophysical space, are normalised and perpetuated – stabilised as the doxa (normalised habitus) over social space. The corollary of this ‘normalised ordering’ is that those who do not hold the particular habitus for affiliation with a hegemonic group are ‘othered’ as different and therefore, are potentially excluded from the field, and assume the status of subaltern.
Theory of capitals and social power

In Bourdieu’s theory, social dispositions that constitute the habitus of different groups hold varied ‘species of capital’. An individual or social group can articulate these forms of capital through social relations within the field (Bourdieu, 1983; 1998; 2000), in order to affirm doxa. The concept of doxa refers to the learned, deeply embodied and unconscious beliefs and values, which are taken for granted as the self-evident forms and structure that constitute the dominant habitus of a particular field, and subsequently guide the attitudes and practice of both dominant and dominated participants. Further details regarding doxa are provided in Concept Box 3.2 below, along with a definition of hegemony extrapolated from Bourdieu (2000).

Concept Box 3.2: Defining DOXA and HEGEMONY

A doxic situation may be characterised as one of harmony between the objective, external structures and the internal structures of a field’s habitus (Grenfell, 2008a). Theoretically, a doxic situation is normalised and stable, in that a particular order of space and associated habitus has sufficient symbolic capital to retain hegemony or power dominance over all other orders. However, underlying this are alternative voices and visions for social-spatial order that challenge (or potentially enhance) the stability of objective and subjective social-spatial structures – with stasis relying on the articulation of capital vis a vis power.

**Doxa** tends to favour the hegemonic social arrangement of the field – privileging the dominant logic, which is assumed self-evident. Therefore, hegemonic categories of spatial understanding and the perceptions, conduct and practice that constitute the ‘dominant’ habitus are congruous with what Bourdieu (1984; 1996; 2000) perceives the objective, normalised or ‘common sense’ organisation of the field. Therefore, social struggle in the view of Bourdieu, emerges when the doxa (common sense dispositions of thought and practices) associated with a field are destabilised. Therefore, participants within a field often work in ways to defend and reconstitute hegemonic structures.

**Hegemony** is established in so far as dominance of other orders is marginalised with the articulation of capitals, through the exercise of symbolic violence, defined as the self-interested capacity to ensure that the arbitrariness of the hegemonic social order is either ignored, or posited as natural, common sense and therefore, legitimised as the justified order of the field (Bourdieu, 2000).

Within the metaphor of capital, Bourdieu extended the concept of economic capital to encompass various power potentials operating within the field and between social agents and groups. ‘Capital’ under Bourdieu’s definition, includes economic, social, cultural and symbolic capital. Briefly, social capital refers to the power and resources that accrues to individuals, or to a social order, by virtue of connection to networks, contacts and backing by social agents (Bourdieu, 1991). Cultural capital refers to the knowledge and skills acquired by socialisation. Bourdieu (1996) argues that cultural capital operates as a weapon in strategies of distinction / differentiation. In his own empirical analysis, this
distinction is between social classes under capitalism where he states that “differences in cultural capital mark the difference between the classes” (Bourdieu, 1984: 69), in mundane practices of social stratification and preference, such as through choices in clothing and art.

Symbolic capital refers to the representation of other forms of capital symbolically and “is the form that the various species of capital assumed when they are perceived and recognised as legitimate” (Bourdieu, 1989: 17). This conceptualisation of symbolic capital is important to the current research focus. It suggests the symbolic power and therefore political significance of values articulated within representations and understandings of high country space; and therefore how boundaries likely modify cultural meanings and identities that imbue high country place. As Bourdieu (1996) explains, cultural and symbolic capital developed in opposition to economic capital to understand how non-economic entities, like representations and collective capacities harness alternative forms of power. He did this by exemplifying a conflict between the social fields of business and art – the former holds predominantly economic capital at its disposal, the latter exercises cultural and symbolic capital, harnessing different forms of power and cultural significance. Bourdieu suggests that the issue within the capitalist system (which is now intensified by processes of neoliberalism) is that the field of art is understood ‘airy-fairy’, subversive, ‘alternative’ or idealistic, dominated by the privileged position of economic capital and business. That is until a particular piece of art builds enough cultural capital to become economically valuable and brought into the realm of ‘normal business’ and common social valuation. Where, as Bourdieu (1996: 81) asserts, the “economic world is turned upside down”.

Social representations and politics that surround the imperative to conserve in the high country and covering tenure review are at times analogous to the Bourdieu’s examples of business and art. At a macro-level, in media representations, agri-production is often framed in opposition to conservation, which is constructed as an ‘economic expense’ - an ideological aspiration that has social merit but ‘economically unwise’ and ‘wasteful’ of productive land (examples include: Loe 2007; Timaru Herald, 2010a; 2010b). Conservation is relegated to the periphery and represented as being less in the national interests than economic production. This is suggestive of the contest and struggle between different orders of worth and worlds of justification in the French convention theory of Bolonski

---

67 This is of particular interest to neoliberal natures literatures. Conservation is brought within the realm of the market – where conservation for conservation, for the intrinsic value of ecology and environmental quality is questioned, unless it is of ‘economic value’ (Castree, 2008a; 2008b).
and Thevenot (2006), Boltanski and Chiapello (2005), who have expanded on the thinking of Bourdieu.

---

**Social struggle and the assertion of power**

Mentioned above, symbolic capital is understood as the combined sum of all capitals (Bourdieu, 2000), which corresponds to the relative power at the disposal of a social group to affirm the hegemony of an order across the field (which can broadly be interpreted as a form of social-space, in the current study). Symbolic capital is the concept of capital focused on in the remainder of the thesis. It applies to a broad conceptualisation of competition between production and protection interests, as the dominant social-spatial categories prioritised within the logic tenure review, as I expand on the normative framings to the study.

To retain doxa, or stable conditions across the field, the order of a group whose habitus has stabilised as hegemonic exerts power, in the various forms of capital at its disposal. This is where the concept of symbolic violence emerges, as the metaphor Bourdieu uses to articulate how hegemony is obtained or maintained within a field (Bourdieu, 2000), or across a social-space such as the high country. Social groups use relative capital to defend the stability of an order, or to challenge the orthodoxy of an existing social-spatial hegemony. Bourdieu argues that despite agent autonomy, social decision-making and stability is strongly tied to pre-existing hegemonic structures. The order of social space normally always conforms to that of the social group, whose habitus has achieved the most normalisation, to become assumed the commonsense doxa of the field. Subsequently, subordinated agents and groups, reinforcing hegemonic doxa, internalise the normalised logic or habitus of a field.

Traditionally, the doxa of high country social space has been productivist. Hence, such insight connects Bourdieu’s thinking to the contestation in focus within the current study. The dispositions (habitus) that one social order (for example, productivism) introduces to the field, and which are perceived as normal or orthodox, exposes others to a particular vision of the field. However, an intervention like tenure review challenges existing social and spatial stabilities. The field becomes more complex and therefore, contested as other groups bring definitions of space, place, nature and landscape under renegotiation.
3.4 Contest between social orders and frameworks of knowledge

Bourdieu’s philosophy highlights the potential for competing social orders. His work is dominated by an analysis of the mechanisms implicit in the maintenance and reproduction of social hierarchies and the status quo (Rosin, 2012; Burton and Wilson, 2006; Burton, Kuczera and Schwarz, 2008; Burton and Paragahawewa, 2011; Shucksmith, 1993). Applied to the current study, I suggest various capitals form power related to the distinction of difference between productivist and protectionist orders (and affiliated groups) operating within high country social space. This is in light of Bourdieu’s (2000) acknowledgement that capitals are tools shaped in the interests of dominating space, with the exercise of capitals (power) in order to affirm a hegemonic spatial order.

No social field or order however, is completely stable and can come under challenge. Therefore, an order is open to transformation with exposure to new ways of knowing and doing. This is an intricacy of Bourdieusian thinking that Morris (2009) has previously applied to understand changing productive habitus in New Zealand’s high country. While many other Bourdieusian rural scholars (including Rosin (2012; 2008), Walford, (2003), Burton and Wilson (2006), Burton (2004a)), generally argue that the habitus operates to perpetuate the historic productivist status quo, Morris considers that exposure to new ways of understanding and valuing space will influence the future habitus of high country landholders. However, such change relies on bringing under challenge a normalised social-spatial and economic hegemony. Questions surround the emergence of social space from tenure review and Bourdieu suggests this process is deeply imbricated with social power. Fundamentally this is where the work of geographers who have applied and extended Bourdieu’s sociology offer considerable value to the study. I borrow from these scholars throughout the thesis, to provide insight into the complex relationships between productivist and protectionist orders and ideology within high country space (as interests frequently depicted in opposition within conventional understandings of high country space, suggested when reviewing media coverage in Chapter 1).

The application of Bourdieu in the work of geographers

Bourdieu examines how collectives are united people around a structured, but reflexive set of ideology and practice based dispositions – the habitus. However, such dispositions can be united around divergent goals, values, ideological and knowledge systems (Rosin, 2012; Boltanski and Thevenot, 2006). This acknowledgement extends Massey’s (2005: 6) assertion in Chapter 2, that local place may have “totemic resonance” for competing
reasons. For example, defence from external threat and internal transformation, or as a
place of intimate knowledge, meanings and livelihoods. The social order of a field tends to
appeal to a commonly held ‘symbolic good’ (for example, this may be, at a general level,
economically based (agro-production), socially (cultural meanings) or environmentally
(ecologically) focused. Bourdieu (1984: 66) regards these as “attributes of excellence”
encompassed within the habitus of a particular order. In earlier sections of the current
chapter I described how conservation and productivism have emerged as power-laden and
socially backed ‘national ideologies’, imbuing social objectives and ideals upon high
country space, which have morphed in contemporary times but still encapsulate particular
knowledge frameworks.

Previously, I suggested that the high country was established as a space commonly
understood as agricultural and productive. Inherently, this is tied to the cultural capital the
farming class has obtained. Therefore, questions of social mobility and domination arise.
The application of Bourdieu’s concepts by scholars in geography (including, Burton and
Wilson, 2006; Stoll-Kleeman, 2001) emphasise the perpetuation of ‘normalised’ habitus.
In rural geography, this suggests the continuance of productivism. For example, Burton
and Wilson (2006), Burton, Kuczera and Schwarz (2008), Burton and Paragahawewa
(2011), Rosin (2012), Jay (2007) and Shucksmith (1993), perceive that the habitus and the
exercise of capitals as a power differential, tends to benefit the re-establishment or
perpetuation of a pre-existing agricultural hegemony; especially after rupture or a period
of conflict, such as with neoliberalism (or tenure reforms as in the current empirical
example). Morris (2009), in the New Zealand high country, however, argues the potential
for the habitus and attitudes to change positively towards more sensitive productive
practices, an argument reengaged within subsequent chapters.

Productivist and protectionist orders each engage with an internally complex set
of changing social-spatial relations, representational practices and images that connect to
different aspects of New Zealand’s social fabric. Such engagements link historical farming
and conservation attitudes and practices with contemporary manifestations; cultural
memories and imaginaries of landscape; social ideals and identities that operate within New
Zealand’s cultural psyche. The following Concept Boxes 3.3 and 3.4 examine elements of
protectionist and productivist orders, which lend to understanding broad level tensions. I
suggest that productivism and protectionism each have a particular schematic of worth,
which are influenced by values and accordingly influence habitus and particular social
praxis. What grounding analysis locally seeks to understand is how these schematics are
complicated and added too, in broader terms looking at how local habitus complicates broader duality constructs that inform tenure review. While inadvisable to generalise, there are some distinct social values, practices and habits associated with conservation and farming objectives. High country protectionist and productivist orders have evolved out of social, cultural and political context in varied ways, and in the contemporary make up of New Zealand society hold considerable social backing (Salmon, 2013; Rainbow, 1993).

Concept Box 3.3 – elements of a ‘protectionist’ order

Some aspects of symbolic capital attributed to high country protectionism equate to ideas of:

- Protectionism as a set of social objectives (as a broad term covering preservation and conservation concepts), at a general level holds a particular schematic of worth prioritising ‘environmental’ values (Boltonski and Thevenot, 2006). In institutional discourse, intrinsic values, the protection of significant, rare and endemic species and significant landscape features are prominent.

- Holistic ethics and moral impetus for protecting and saving a fast degrading environment (Neumann, 1998; Castle, 1995).

- Wilderness and saving biodiversity is a form of symbolic power and expertise wielded by the conservation lobby. In New Zealand, conservation is predominantly an aspiration of the upper middle classes, and due to this social investment is an inherently political activity.

- Bourgeois environmentalism and urban backing, reiterating the influence of White’s (1995) sentiments at the introduction to the chapter.

- The significance that conservation and environmental protection discourses hold in New Zealand’s national psyche wield considerable social and symbolic capital. The ‘vote conservation’ dominance from urban centres, a value for iconic and special landscape and ecological values, is often grounded on an idea that production and protection are not complementary.

- Symbolic capital emerges around the passion that protecting an imagination of a natural. ‘100 percent pure New Zealand’, clearly evokes a sense of clean and green heritage, and pride in our international differentiation between us and other nations.

- The conservation heritage of UNESCO world heritage sites in New Zealand, are places protected for natural/ecological/landscape values, rather than socio-cultural values like in many other nations. The tourism significance of national parks and walking tracks, was outlined in chapter one, and provides a backdrop to the social, symbolic and economic significance of conservation.
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Competing habitus within a contested field

Operating in a Bourdieusian frame, authors including Burton et al., (2008), Burton (2004b), and Tsouvalis (2000) show how habitus influences ideologies and therefore that practices are implicated within the transformation of spaces. It is evident that the emergence of the high country as a cultural landscape may reflect competing ‘worths’ that are grounded upon differing habitus and complex visions for the order of high country space. For example, it is meaningful as a space of ‘nature’, the location of recreation and respite from urban lives, but also for local livelihood dependencies and utilitarian values (Robinson, 2011).

However, seeking to explore the transition from productivist to post-productivist ranges of behaviours and attitudes, Burton (2004a) addresses how there has been very little substantive work conducted on the culture of productivism and post-productivism from actor/agent perspectives. Analyses have focused at a broad level, which as Wilson (2001: 85) asserts, has “led to a heavy emphasis on the importance of State policies and a focus on macro-economic factors in actor decision making. Wilson (2001) makes clear that despite a decade of debate around the appropriateness of conceptualising change as part

---

**Concept Box 3.4 – elements of a ‘productivist’ order**

Some aspects of symbolic capital attributed to high country productivism equate to ideas of:

- Pioneering – the number eight wire mentality.
- The backbone of New Zealand’s economy, equated to social and economic resilience.
- Farming free from subsidies compared to other OECD countries.
- High country pastoral farming is encased in a cultural narrative that is deeply tied to the material landscape and homogenous grasslands of the high country, which equates to productivism’s historically grounded potency as a discourse, praxis/habitus and social-political affiliation.
- There remains social commitment to productivism in various levels of New Zealand society, in public understanding, as well as national, regional and micro-level politics.
- High country farming is economically significant and culturally valued as the traditional hegemony over high country space. Therefore, symbolic capital of production accrues from relative amounts of economic, social and cultural capital.
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of a ‘productivist-post-productivist-multifunctional’ transition pursued on a theoretical level, very little was known about farmers’ perspective towards such transition.

As a particular focus of the ‘value theoretical analysis’ (Braun, 2006a) that grounds the empirical basis to this study, I seek to examine how different ideologically grounded understandings of landscape and nature become valued and politically mobilised. At a local level, how are differences in cultural understandings of high country mobilised, justified and therefore negotiated? And how do such understandings and the subjective, partial visions of space reflect in on-going relationships between conservation and agricultural actors? Ideas of collective and competing “knowledge cultures” (Tsouvalis, 2000; Tsouvalis, Seymour and Watkins, 2000), fits with Turnbull’s (1997) examination of competing “knowledge spaces” and heterogeneous understandings of space offered by Danaher et al., (2000). It is clear that social practices and the habitus behind ‘common-sense’ ways of ‘knowing and doing’ are complex and struggled over. Exploring these Bourdieusian applications suggests how social power may be articulated within the current high country landscape debate – and intensified with tenure review bounding between production and protection.

Questioning whether the dispositions of individuals operating locally are exclusively ‘productivist’ or ‘protectionist’ becomes important, examining attitudes allows me to examine how macro level representations and the way tenure review operated (on the basis of narrow categories) are challenged and supported locally. Binary distinctions between production and protection are problematic because the social field represents the coming together of diverse people, social practices and interests (Bourdieu, 2000). A field is constantly shaped by the agency of individuals accumulated within it. The habitus is always a mix of multiple engagements in the social world, through the life span of individuals, and subsequently their exposure to ways of knowing and experiences. Hence, Tsouvalis (2000: 13) uses the concept of “meaningful composite formation” in order to explain complex, socially meaningful socio-natures, created and sustained through the construction of various networks and relations between humans and their environments. From these meaningful composite formations stem habits of mind and practice that

---

68 Each of these authors (Tsouvalis, 2000; Tsouvalis, Seymour and Watkins, 2000; Turnbull, 1997 and Danaher et al., 2000) operate within a post-structuralist framework and thus emphasise knowledge tensions, the situatedness of knowledge and the partial frameworks of exposure and understanding that knowledge is built within.

69 Through examining binaries such as concepts of dominated and dominant, orthodox and heterodox with localised empirical analysis, Bourdieu (2000; 1996) highlighted that internally the field is highly complex, but also the boundaries between binaries and how they are developed and defended.
determine attitudes toward the biophysical world. Tsouvalis (2000) implies that ‘competing natures’ are grounded upon various valuations in which hybrids of living and non-living beings are “socially defined [by humans] and conceptually and materially delineated” (p: 93). Only in this way do natures, landscapes and the identities of people, become meaningful – intertwined and recognisable through their comparison to other meaningful composites, values and habitus. This occurs through processes of constructing ‘the other’.

Meaningful composite formations are co-produced in interaction between human and non-human agents, and rely on the identity that social constructed classifications impose. Tsouvalis (2000: 173) argues that:

Making ‘things’ meaningful and the construction of reality, involves transformation and interaction in order to mould things into an order that is in-keeping with particular, and evolving visions of space and landscape.

Meanings are malleable, but also can be resilient structuring’s to praxis. Of particular relevance to the current study is how Tsouvalis (2000) illustrates social meanings to be directly related to classifications and boundaries, but also how some values and praxis transcend boundaries to establish as common ground narratives. To classify, means to group objects into classes according to certain principles. ‘Things’ are either classified according to a belief that they are similar or have the ‘same essence’ in common (Tsouvalis, 2000), or, they are classified according to difference, in terms of othering. For example, there is clear classificatory distinction often made between protection and production ideologies in media discourse and in the logic of tenure review, separating between Significant Inherent Values and production potential.

Classification systems and categories are the central stakes of social struggles, because of the power of categories to change the vision of the world and forms of behaviour (Bourdieu, 2000; Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2007). As Tsouvalis (2000: 107) argues, “definitions and categories construct and delineate realities discursively and create particular, structured pictures of the world”. For example, classifications are contests, so therefore, whether an individual is identified a ‘conservationist’ or a ‘farmer’, structure thought and guide perceptions, meanings and values systems associated with habits and practices (Bourdieu, 1991; Burton et al, 2012; Burton et al, 2008).

In this way, I suggest that socially constructed divisions may become embodied and maintained as ‘reality’ within the cognition of conservation and production actors. Articulated in the ideology and within practices as taken-for-granted or ‘normalised’ ways of doing and knowing with specific spaces and boundaries (Gieryn, 2000; Tsouvalis, 2000;
With time, division into bounded land use categories may become a practiced reality, estranging land classes and the social groups with whom land is associated (Blomley, 2010; Bryan, 2012). Therefore, what is the result for managing the high country as an integrated social space where tenure review is acting as a tool of separating values, allocating and distinguishing between public conservation and private freehold land?

3.5 Applications to the current study

Contrary to the postmodern position of space as emergent and complex, tenure review exercised a split methodology (PCE, 2009), which prioritised conservation, access and the freeholding of production values. As the focus to research objective two, I seek to understand how locally, this premise of division is complicated and rejected, as an inclination to which is evident in media coverage that explains how division was politically fraught (Sage and Maturin, 2007; Sage, 1995 a; Ell, 2002; 1994). Then with research objective three, I begin to highlight the potential for a transformed politics.

Dominant versus dominated

Reflecting back on the critique of Brower (2009; 2008a; 2008b; 2007; 2006) in the previous chapter, tenure review was understood as captured by a dominant landed hegemony. In the national discourse (public, media and academic) surrounding tenure review, protectionist imperatives are often represented as benevolent to bourgeois objectives of ‘saving’ natural heritage and ‘securing’ recreational access (see: Sage, Graeme and Maturin, 2005; Forest and Bird, n.d.; Edmonds, 1984; 1986; Ell, 2002; 2001). But also, protection is perceived dominated by the economic imperative to farm and the political clout of high country agriculture as a historically potent, collective cultural discourse and habitus.

In an orthodox Bourdieusian frame, it may be expected that one field is hegemonic, holding the doxa across the field. Therefore, one partial spatial definition / order resting on a particular knowledge system and set of dispositions would dominate all others. In a socialist view stemming from Marxism, this would be understood as the landed elite or the

---

70 Reading Harré and Gillett (1994), it is clear that those involved in the co-production of meaning assume ‘common sense’ understandings. These are rarely reflected on until challenged, for example, by a previously subjugated order. Such power struggles always represent that a “taken-for-granted view of the world and the forms of action and interactions associated with it are being challenged and problematised” (Tsouvalis, 2000: 107). Furthermore, once imbedded in institutional structures, ‘normalised’ understandings become difficult to challenge. They become embodied in the ways issues and ‘others’ are conceptualised as a self-reinforcing ideological reality. Assumptions become embedded in understandings and are used to reflect on the alleged attitude of other interests, however, locally, these are likely complex.
traditionally dominant agricultural class within rural space (Foster, 2010; Burton, 2004a; Blomley, 2008). However, is this an appropriate depiction advanced by Brower (2008a), or is it an oversimplification reliant on a dichotomy between dominant and dominated? The interplay between dominant and dominated orders is represented in Figure 3.1.

The domination of productivist interests over protectionist and public interests was a prominent and oppositional theme that emerged with a deep reading of Brower (2008a; 2008b; 2007, 2008; 2009). However, related to Bourdieu’s theory of capitals, and establishing a conceptual debate that is progressed throughout this thesis, I suggest that the conservation field and habitus within tenure review operates as a complex mix of Crown backed economic capital and forms of social and cultural capital. The amount of Crown funding that exchanged hands with tenure review has been an especially heated aspect of public and academic debate surrounding the work of Brower (2008a; 2008b) and Quigley (2008). It became a socially and politically impassioned issue largely due to the already economically dominant position some lessees have traditionally held associated with hegemony over high country space.

Reassessing this orthodoxy of setting interests apart is a central concern in the study. Therefore, in light of the divisive philosophy of tenure review, I propose a different reading to conventional understandings of the power relationship between conservation (often understood dominated) and economic production (as dominant). Contrary to the simplification displayed in Figure 3.2, what occurs to understanding the power dynamic, when the alleged ‘landed elite’ vocalise objections to tenure review and injustice at the hands of powerful bourgeois objectives of preserving (use free) nature? It is suggested that tenure review at least partly represents a bourgeois conservation aspiration that advances the ideology that ‘pure nature’ should be separated from society, which simultaneously satisfies neoliberal principles of land accumulation to aid privatised wealth maximisation.
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I question whether there exists a balanced contest between social orders that highlight the issues with a duality erected between production and protection categories. As a conceptual tool Figure 3.3 illustrates the way I have conceptualised the power balance between conservation and agricultural groupings as a straw-man depiction for reflecting on latter in the thesis. The figure provides an over-simplified depiction of the negotiation of knowledge, values and ideology occurring between conservation and production orders, at varied spatial scales from macro to micro level. At a theoretical level, while working towards a normative framework, it is useful to suggest that there is competition between the landscape definitions and orders ascribed by productive and conservation interests. However, what this research seeks to understand is how Figure 3.3, as an analytical tool, is complicated locally. Furthermore, what this study seeks to understand is the outcomes of ‘re-spatialisation’ with tenure review, and how this impacts on productive and conservation practice and the relations between stakeholders.  

Figure 3.2: Representation of imbalanced power constructs between conservation and agriculture, pervasive in current depiction in debates over high country land use change and management.

I suggest that erecting boundaries may

71 Differentiating between space and place is useful. Space at a higher level in public discourse is often defended on the grounds of its significant qualities as a ‘natural’ landscape and a ‘wilderness’. Place is simultaneously defended as a landscape that is a product of prolonged pastoral use and the location of farming heritage and social-cultural significance. Discursive and representational strategies emerge as
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overlook more sensitive relations with land (such as under the pastoral lease) and existing openness to conservation (use based) in the habitus of landholders. As a result, this may lead to the alienation of landholders from conservation objectives and incentivise privatised, rather than public interest, which the pastoral lease as a shared mode of tenure presumed.

Figure 3.3: Both ‘landscape layers’ have significant allocations of social, symbolic and cultural capital, articulated in networks ‘within and beyond’ high country space. As a simplified depiction, Figure 2.5 provides a representation of this dynamic.

3.6 A normative view

Grounding the rationale for research objective three, the remainder of the chapter explores visions of the ideal to suggest a normative basis to examine how competing and multiplicitous values may be accounted for. Through engaging with the values and the worldviews of individuals as the focus to research objective one, and then critiquing the dualistic parameters of tenure review (central to research objective 2), I seek to suggest potentials for an agonistic spatial politics, explained graphically in Figure 3.4.

important elements here, influencing how people perceived the identity of place and the significance of those existing within space. (i.e.: stigmas associated with the high country farmers as elites exposed in Chapter 1)
As depicted in Figure 3.4, I question how promoting dialogue between ‘local’ and ‘technical’ “knowledge spaces” (Turnbull, 1997: 556), and accounting for plural social values within the case study context, may allow for relationships to be built, in order to foster social learning and collaboration within local place (Robinson et al., 2012). However, this is not just social learning regarding conservation values, but social learning about all stakeholder claims. A coming together of multiple values and ideas of local space – which may be distracted away from, by over-focusing on the macro-level oppositions. However, such a politics relies on adopting a fluid and pluralist concept of space and landscape.

**Figure 3.4:** A schematic suggesting the dimensions of an open politics of dialogue between knowledge cultures for social learning and developing a shared landscape vision.
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**Accepting a fluid ontology**

Braun (2006b: 206) asserts that reconceptualising the ontology of space and nature as fluid and negotiated by multiple epistemologies posits that ethics and environmental politics must be understood in terms of “force and affect”. Such a transformed position emphasises potentials for becoming. Naturalisms and therefore eco-politics, based on ideals of static nature and space are challenged and understood politically stagnant in a world that is increasingly characterised by rapid change (Braun, 2008; Massey, 2005; Whatmore, 2002). The ‘outcome’ of social-spatial emergence is flexible, as partial realities of composite biophysical and social nature. As Hayden (1997: 191-192) asserts, “the earth is … the open-ended sum of a plurality of elements in constant interaction, rather than an absolute order of being”. Nature is conceived of in its vitality, its emergence and transformative capacities in relation to society, and importantly, how this transformation is political.

Failing to navigate the complex social, political, economic and semiotic forces that entangle within local places becomes the nexus of social struggle (Borini-Feyerabend, Johnston and Pansky, 2006; Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2002; Lynn, 2000). Additionally, what is done today determines the future condition of nature and social space. The production of space cannot simply be undone – or returned to a stasis, which erecting boundaries to separate nature into parks and the ideals of ecological restoration evoke (Braun, 2006a). Transformations are simultaneously constant but are also final. This opens the requisite to actively and reflexively negotiate a more sensitive place of humanity within social natures like the high country. The pluralist focus extends analytical concentration regarding how human nature and non-human nature is intrinsically linked in a co-productive dialectic, examined in Chapter 2. Mentioned previously, the concept of co-production has been expanded in the proliferating area of geography focused on ‘hybrid’ forms of social nature borrowing from Actor Network Theory.

The breadth of this study does not allow me to examine Actor Network Theory in depth. However, in the work of Whatmore (2002; 2006), Braun, (2006a; 2006b; 2008), Bingham and Hinchliffe, (2008), Bingham (2006) and Lorimer (2005; 2012), concepts of

---

72 Referring to the non-essentialist, relational ontology Deleuze and Guattari (1988).

73 Deleuze and Guattari (1988: 241-242) make explicit the complexity of what they express to be participation in the relational co-production social space and nature, as an ongoing process, stating:

> Natural participation of nuptials … [are] the true Nature spanning the kingdom of nature. These combinations are neither genetic nor structural; they are inter-kingdom … that is the only way nature operates – against itself … Becoming has neither beginning nor end, departure nor arrival, origin or destination.
social-nature hybridity have been extended to become a political discussion focused on how to go about rebuilding connections between nature and society. In this emerging paradigm of ‘more-than-human’ geographies, scholars like Braun (2005; 2006a) Lorimer (2012; 2005), Whatmore (2006) seek to forge a new politics that makes room for the non-human in social-spaces, rather than the allocation of land and bounding between categories of human and non-human nature. What is proposed by this scholarship is a radical ontology, which is guided towards an ethos of ‘conviviality’ towards the non-human other (Hinchliffe et al., 2005; Hinchliffe and Whatmore, 2006; Whatmore, 2009; Bryan, 2012; Lorimer, 2012). I suggest that this metaphor of conviviality towards the non-human has distinct strength in advancing a pluralist politics within the high country context. It provides for a lens of ‘custodial’ or ‘convivial’ ethics to analyse the subjectivities of landholders and conservationists. Braun (2006b) argues that nature needs to be understood as a unity that includes human labour. Thereby placing humanity in nature in this way challenges the resilient duality between the social and natural realms, where within Braun’s epistemology, humanity is placed as one of nature’s constituent parts, rather than dominant over other beings.

‘Conviviality’ towards nature, across all land uses

Biodiversity, water, air and landforms do not conform to socially constructed boundaries, unless modified to conform. Aligned with this insight authors including Zimmerer (2000), Norton and Millar (2000), Adams (2004), Molloy (1971; 1989), argue that optimal sustainability and biodiversity conservation gains are offered by encouraging better practices across all land use categories, on rural land, in urban spaces and where productive pressures and human populations are centred. This stance corresponds with the acknowledgement that although there has been a dramatic increase in conservation parks internationally over the last 50 years, this has failed to reduce net biodiversity losses and has not improved sustainability outcomes on private land (Brockington, 2010; Lorimer, 2012; West, Ingoe and Brockington 2006; Zimmerer, 2010; 2007; 2000; Adams, 2004). For example, as Norton and Millar, (2000: 26) assert, “while much of the focus of nature

74 For this reason, in Chapter 6, I examine the custodial ethos argued for by pastoralists. Frequently in media articles and grey literature, the pastoral lease is advocated to represent a low intensity, regulated form of tenure and as a result lessees are constructed as custodians or stewards. For example, in one media example by Bennett (2003) high country landholders were suggested to hold positions similar to Tangata Whenua, as kaitiaki or guardians, due to the length of connection with high country properties and the personal ethos many lessees held to care for the land. Similar sentiments were evident within the Hansard debates surrounding the movement of the Crown Pastoral Lease Bill through parliament and its enactment as law in 1998.
conservation in New Zealand and elsewhere is on formally protected natural areas (e.g. national parks and reserves), some of the biggest problems and challenges for nature conservation lie in those areas most intensively used by humans”. Consequently, reflecting on the stances of White (1995) and Cronon (1995; 2003; 2014) among others who query the erecting of boundaries between nature and society, focusing on parks and pure nature may negate responsibility for human impacted natures.

Statistically, division with tenure review has contributed approximately 125,000 hectares of land, predominantly above 1000 metres altitude into the conservation estate, which is administered by DOC. Approximately 183,000 hectares of land has been reclassified from leasehold to freehold, an allocation of land that is mostly below 1000 metres altitude. On face value, as a breakdown of hectares, this appears a relatively balanced split. However, authors like Walker et al., (2006), Rutledge, Walker and Price (2005), Walker et al., 2009 and Swaffield and Brower (2009) have revealed destructive outcomes of tenure review, which relate boundary changes to an altered spatial scale.

Swaffield and Brower (2009) refer to 27 per cent of indigenous vegetation on newly freehold land having been cleared. A further 20 per cent of new freehold had been sold, in some cases to foreign investors with considerable capital, or real estate developers, as an express concern of Brower’s (2008a) critique of tenure review. In terms of land clearance and the erosion of biodiversity values, I question whether this was not a predictable outcome when landholders expect similar productive returns from less land area following tenure review, in a political economy emphasising agri-development? The once large, pastoral lease properties, 303 in total with a mean size of nearly 6000 hectares are now divided into a total number of 865 parcels with a mean size of 334 hectares, a vast scale of transformation.

The purported conservation benefit from tenure review is the establishment of nine high country parks. However, as most conservation land reserved from tenure review is mainly above 1000m, it therefore contains land and values least at risk, already well represented in the conservation estate and often more difficult to access (Walker et al., 2007; Weeks, 2007, Walker et al., 2003). A modelling study by Landcare Research in 2007 presents a worst case scenario, that if all leases complete tenure review, according to previous trends of land use change, 65 per cent of extant native basin and valley floor habitats would be lost to development (Walker et al., 2007). These dry-land valley floor habitats are at greatest risk of biodiversity loss (Weeks, 2007). They face on-going pressure from current intensification trends. They also contain habitats, ecologies and species
adapted to the harsh conditions of the high county environment. However, they are fragile ecologies reputed as being under represented in the conservation estate, compared to higher altitude tussock lands (Walker, Price and Stephens, 2008; Maturin, 2009; Forest and Bird, n.d.; Sage, 2005b).

There exists contradictions within the work of Walker et al., (2009), Swaffield and Brower (2009; 2007) and Stephens, Walker and Price (2008) when focusing on constructionist scholarship and thinking about habitus change associated with boundary separation between nature and society. The ‘restoration’ of ecosystems remains an ultimate goal of ecological protection – rather than the adoption of novel ecosystem approaches advocated by Norton and Miller (2000) and Hobbs et al., (2008) and Hobbs et al., (2006). However, I suggest that the dilemma of imbalanced representation relates to how the premise of division between protection and production operated, as a process of separating and ‘othering’ land categories, alienating conservation use from productive use (an issue foregrounded in the Australia pastoral contest by Adams (2004) in the Australian context).

The work of Susan Walker and her colleagues at Landcare Research as well as Swaffield and Brower (2009) does however signify a paradigm shift in the conservation community around tenure review. Questions regarding what is occurring on ‘othered’, non-conservation land, subsequent to tenure review has become of concern. However, some issues, especially with intensification and scale change were noted in media coverage from within the farming and conservation lobbies early in the 1990s (Ansley, 1995).

The political stance that this project engages, highlights how separation between nature and society if rife with political and philosophical lacunae that fail to acknowledge the dialectical co-production of nature and society, especially, when society is situated as intrinsic part of an encompassing ‘global ecology’ (Braun, 2006a). This extends on Latour’s (2004a; 2014) recognition that a ‘proper ecology’ would reject the conventional notion of biophysical nature and ecology as separate from humans and society and instead adopt an understanding of multiple, hybrid compositions. This is an insight that has become increasingly recognised in the ecological sciences. Movements towards recognising non-equilibrium and novel ecosystems and the emphasis on humans-in-ecosystems approaches to conservation, push the boundaries’ of conservation ecology, traditionally framed as a ‘nature based’, positivistic and objective science (Walker and Hurley, 2004; Walker, 2005;}

75 In particular, conservation interests and the public have begun to draw attention to issues with intensification and land use changes have become prominent in some regions (Stephens, Walker and Price, 2008; Walker, Price and Stephens, 2008; Walker et al., 2006; Walker, Price and Rutledge, 2005). However, this was a foreseeable outcome of division, highlighted in Hansard debates at the time of tenure review instigation and surrounding the enactment of the CPLA 1998.
Chapter Three: Visions of the ‘Ideal’: Negotiating a Way Forward

Bateman et al., 2013). The defence of static nature and ‘lock up’ conservation ideologies are perceived not as an adaptive strategy for improving conservation performance by authors like Adams (2004), Norton and Miller (2000) and Brechin et al., (2002). But instead is a defeatist response, a ‘raising up of drawbridges in the face of capitalist threat and change’, as Massey (2005) so aptly explained in the previous chapter.

3.7 A transformed politics of nature conservation

Emphasising pluralism and fluidity highlights a change of approach, questioning whether well-supported and politically backed goals of naturalism are achieved as socially justified and feasible outcomes locally. It does this by highlighting that division for protecting static visions of nature, is politically and socially divisive, setting interests in opposition (Bryan, 2012; Adams, 2004; Cronon, 1995; Ginn and Demeritt, 2008). This does not mean that environmentalisms are unfounded, where impacts of water quality and species decline are significant on the global agenda and also major issues in the high country resulting from land intensification. However, the discussion becomes a matter of questioning political tact and approach, rather than social and political factions and conflict over the ‘ethical’ and ‘material’ grounding to environmentalisms (Brechin et al., 2002; Forsyth, 2008; Zimmerer, 2010; 2007; Bakker and Bridge, 2006; Daniels and Walker, 2001).

Such a stance represents a political future that Braun (2006b: 206) surmises as being, “open rather than closed, and this brings us face to face not with the essence of things, but with the questions of power, ethics and politics”. He posits that “there is no room for nostalgia here” (ibid.), and instead protecting nature requires an invigorated politics focused on negotiating the trajectories of development of social space and society-nature assemblage. Evidently it is a politics that recognises the social and political influences of environmental change and taking responsibility for the future natures that human changes effect, both in rural, urban and wilderness spaces (Braun, 2006b; 2008; Lorimer, 2012; Bingham and Hinchliffe, 2008; Hinchliffe and Whatmore, 2006). A pluralist ontology therefore, encompasses nature and humanity holistically, in order to foster responsibility for all nature. Nature is brought within the realm of social politics and as Guattari (2000: 66) suggests, we “must adapt our environmental ethics to the terrifying and fascinating situation” that is posed by challenging the preconceived ideology of nature’s externalisation from society.

Braun’s (2006b) critical recognition, is that ultimately, what the reassessment of space as fluid suggests is a reassessment of how first, we understand nature, and second,
how we intervene in present socio-ecological conditions. I see, stemming from the position of Braun (2006a; 2006b; 2008), that there exists two distinct calls to this end: 1) adopting an understanding of nature and space as plural/hybrid incites social and political investment in alternative forms of politics, where there is no recognised ‘objective’ way forward; and 2) the place of boundaries between nature and society, and the exercise of power that bounding involves, is brought under deep scrutiny.\textsuperscript{76}

1) An alternative view for environmental governance

Environmental governance can be understood as the dense interweaving’s of knowledge and power through which nature is physically, legally and economically defined, and control and regulation is achieved (Robbins, 2008; Vance-Borland and Holley, 2011; Whatmore, 2008; Desmond, 2004). While discussions of governance may acknowledge different valuations of nature (such as the basis for a conflict over resource use) most work on the governance of nature does not pursue the full implications of this perspective for understanding how governance – the social co-ordination of the inherently political nature of resources – is achieved (Robinson, 2011). Accordingly, the concept of environmental governance fails to adequately address underlying and contesting epistemologies of environmental knowledge, which this thesis seeks to illuminate in the process of interrogating issues with tenure review (Bakker and Bridge, 2008).

Processes of regulation are simultaneously material and discursive and extend to the enactment of institutional frameworks that embody the rules that define knowledge and legitimate authority (Bakker, 2004). It is however, not necessarily about the ‘weakness’ of the State’s involvement in environmental governance, subsequent to withdrawal with liberalisation. But, rather it is the transformed power geometries facilitated by this withdrawal and division between production and protection interests with tenure review, which I take interest in. Clash and struggle between social fields in New Zealand’s high country is occurring, where historically the pastoral lease meant that the State acted as a referee maintaining space as an agricultural stasis.\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{76} Further complexity to this changing social-spatial politics in the current research comes from the fast paced transformation imposed by a neoliberalised economy and the influence of tenure reform, as the empirical intervention to the study. However, it is important to not overemphasise such structural changes.

\textsuperscript{77} ‘Neoliberal natures’ literature highlights that environmental governance is often employed in a normative sense that naively celebrates the rise of non-state actors in civic and public environmentalism without questioning the reasons for and implications of this (Robbins, 2008; Castree, 2008a; 2008b). In actuality, the rise of environmental Non-Governmental Organisations, advocating a place for nature in society and capitalist economic structures is often coupled with the neoliberal trend of a ‘retreating State’. Such a retreat is shrouded in rhetoric of efficiencies and benefit, which often fails to disclose the complexity of politics occurring within interactions between the state and civil society, and between environmental protection and
Regulative or agency based governance

Conservation and biodiversity protection requires constraints to be imposed on resource users. Bakker and Bridge (2008), Wilson (2004) Meurk et al., (2002), Zimmerer (2007; 2006) suggest two methods of achieving governance of the commons, through regulative (structural) or behavioural (agency) based constraint. Regulative constraint relies on institutions, laws, and organisations,78 whereas behavioural constraint focuses on human agency, human institutions, and connecting into the cultural values, attitudes and practices that influence behaviour. This can be understood as the habitus that underpins attitudes and action (Bourdieu, 2001; 1998).

Brechin et al., (2002) assert that behavioural restraint can only occur voluntarily or be imposed by regulation and external pressures. However, centralised, or external conservation management is increasingly acknowledged as ineffective, especially when premised on division and locked away nature (Braun, 2004; Robinson, 2011). Mentioned above, such methods fall short in terms of conservation outcomes and sustainability gains, which remain peripheral to mainstream practices (Adams, 2004: Bryan, 2012). In social praxis, control and motivation towards particular objectives, like buying into conservation objectives, tends to occur through a combination of individual agency based control (values and attitudes) and externally imposed influences associated with the current political economy, social signals, the State and regulative institutions (Robbins, 2008; Brechin et al., 2002). This is a balance that the recent paradigm shift towards collaborative approaches to conservation management has sought to engage.

2) Community based and adaptive, contra boundaries.

To date, the results of community-based conservation covered in literature are mixed and the performance of many community-based initiatives has been well below expectation (see: Wood, 2008; McCarthy, 2006; Ojha, Cameron and Kumar, 2009; Memon and Wilson, 2007; Lurie and Hibbard, 2008; Selfa and Wada, 2008). This has led to debate in the literature over the merits of collaborative approaches (Agrawal and Gibson, 2001), and economic growth policies. Deeply held assumptions regarding conservation as an activity done as a centralised objective, under the control of state actors are brought under question.

78 This is a distinct issue associated with New Zealand’s conservation administration with the state centralised DOC. Therefore, to achieve longevity of conservation outcomes it is suggested that capacity is best grounded within the community, and increasingly this is recognised in changing paradigm towards community led and adaptive approaches to ecological management. But in the high country, what form community conservation will take under the current mode of transforming tenure arrangements and productive change is subject to contest.
evaluation from a number of different perspectives regarding the success of integrating local communities into conservation policy and practice (Brosius and Russel, 2003; Redford and Sanderson, 2000). In particular Redford and Sanderson (2000) argue that part of the dilemma rests upon the larger debate over preservation versus sustainable use, a problem that stems from the understanding that the protection of nature necessitates separation from culture in order to be ‘legitimately’ protected from humanity. Redford and Sanderson (2000) also address that the dilemma rests on a lack of participation and genuine dialogue between rural populations and environmental governance organisations in decisions that affect local livelihoods. The impact of this is deemed to be a weakening of relationships between the community and conservation organisations, and a lack of buy in and value for conservation initiatives. In several other studies, including Agrawal et al., (2013); Robinson et al., (2012), Vermeulen (2007) and Lockwood (1999), it was detailed how if local people understand environmental governance as imposed on them and not serving their interests in a tangible way, they feel that the conservation objectives do not involve them. Therefore, they do not benefit from observing rules or understanding what the motivations of conservation are, and therefore, conservation as an imposition is avoided and vocally rejected. For this reason, the collective action functions of environmental governance often fail.

The body of geographical and ecological literature surrounding collaborative approaches to conservation management is investigated and applied more fully in Chapter 8. In particular, I relate to how the current context of high country conservation has progressed in a different direction with emphasis on local partnership, while tenure review has continued as an on-going process of tenure reclassification. The Crown Objectives for the High Country for 2009 reflected the agenda of the current National government. The policy document rescinded the previous Labour government’s objectives, including the lakeside exclusion policy. It also announced what was described an “End Outcome” for strategic direction to high country land management, to ensure “Crown pastoral land is put to best use for New Zealand” (Littlewood, 2013: n.p). The National government abandoned the policy of creating a network of grassland parks, favouring privately controlled covenants (such as Queen Elizabeth II Trust covenants, where farmers retain control and ‘ownership’), in order to halt what National leaders and landholders argued to be a conservation ‘land grab’ indulged in by the previous Labour government.\textsuperscript{79} The three core

\textsuperscript{79} In the media a metanarrative combating conservation ‘lock-up’ was prominent. Accumulation from dual processes of tenure review and Nature Heritage Fund purchases, were represented to mean that DOC holds
objectives focused on encouraging: 1) effective stewardship; 2) ‘better’ economic use; and 3) improved relationships with pastoral lessees and communities. On face value, these objectives signify a positive step toward building partnership and local support, however, there are clear issues that emerge. In Chapter 8, I provide some appraisal to these recent objectives, which exemplify tensions in the current high country conservation orthodoxy.

3.8 Summary of theoretical approach

Chapter 2 and 3 work together, with each theoretical lens contributing to a different aspect of the argument advanced within the thesis. This theoretical grounding highlights potentials for a new, critical spatial politics that accounts for plural claims to high country space, destabilises dualism between (external) nature and (destructive) society, and informs New Zealand’s future environmentalisms on the basis of experience from tenure review. There is, I argue, a broader agreement and knitting together of the theoretical lineages, that all apply useful analytical approaches for progressing a reformed spatial politics. Each segment of theory contributes to a different aspect of the debate that frame the logic to the thesis analysis in chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8. As illustrated in Chapter 1, the analysis is divided into four chapters, in which the parallel theoretical threads engaged with in the preceding two chapters are brought together focused on grounding a pluralist approach to high country landscape management.

The call is made for the need to recognise space and ‘nature’ as multiple and emergent. Therefore, seeking to negotiate locally feasible, socially, economically and ecologically justified outcomes is imperative. In the following chapter I apply the theoretical framework examined in the preceding two chapters methodologically, as a qualitative framework to researching local values and attitudes towards tenure review and social, spatial and productive changes that have recently been occurring.

‘too much land’ as use-free conservation estate and farmers had previously undertaken a better job as stewards of the land, than an increasingly resource constrained DOC.
4.0 Introduction

The previous chapters established the theoretical framework to the study. The conceptual grounding borrows from threads of social construction theory and Bourdieu’s sociology to forge a coherent critical platform to the empirical research into tenure review. In the process of doing this, four research objectives were identified and positioned within the theoretical and ‘real world’ context from which they emerge. The chapter integrates the theoretical principles to the study laid out in Chapters 2 and 3 and the empirical research that follows, by providing a well-structured methodological approach. The study is deductive in the sense that the conceptual framework within Chapter 2 and 3 informs the way the research is undertaken and how data is collected, analysed and theorised. However, the study is also to some extent inductive in that, in particular, the normative framework, is informed iteratively by empirical findings to build new understandings of theory and context.

To begin, in Section 4.1 the principles of Bourdieu’s methodological approach are discussed, which emphasises that his triad of conceptual metaphors, field, habitus and capital, should be applied, extended and challenged in different empirical contexts (Wacquant and Bourdieu, 2007; Grenfell, 2008a; 2008b). The overarching emphasis of the chapter is thus a methodology that allows an exploration of the complexity and specificities that exist within the lived and worked ‘locality’ of New Zealand’s mid Canterbury high country. It is an integrated, post-structural approach that emphasises the contingency of discourses, knowledge and values (Braun, 2006a; 2006b). Post-structuralism, feminism and also Bourdieu unite around an emphasis on reflexivity, which identifies how power is articulated within social research and the creation of knowledge from it. In particular, reflexivity is a critical dimension to all contemporary social research, which declares the position of the researcher at the centre of the research field defined for the objectives of the study.

Consequently, the theoretical framework and methodology work together in a way which guides the remainder of the thesis as an interpretive bricolage, the focus of which is

---

80 For this reason Bourdieu’s thinking is not deterministic and static, as Calhoun et al., (1993) argued.
to analyse the empirical research findings and to progress the research towards reconstruction following critique. There are debates within geography about the role of research methods and the capacity to generate objective knowledge derived from empirical investigation. Ideas of positivism as the benchmark of rational and objective knowledge is an inheritance from the quantitative revolution and deterministic thinking in Western academic traditions. However, I disagree that we can have objective knowledge when the postmodern turn has opened social research to complex ethnographic positions and plural epistemologies. Therefore I agree with post-positivist approaches that think about knowledge as situated and contingent, and I use Bourdieu to highlight and think about such social complexity.

4.1 Bourdieu’s methodological principles

Bourdieu’s scholarship sought to address tensions between macro and micro level analysis that existed in social research. His approach to doing so is encapsulated within his “methodological principles” (Grenfell, 2008b: 219; Bourdieu, 2003; 1992; 1990c). Bourdieu holds to three research principles, which are necessarily connected, that should guide the application of his framework and concepts. He asserts:

First, one must analyse the position of the field *vis-a-vis* the field of power…

Second, one must map the objective structure of the relations between the positions occupied by agents of institutions … And, third, one must analyse the habitus of agents (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2007: 104).

The first research principle recognises the need to locate and analyse the field. I relate to the field, in terms of the present study, as a socially demarcated locality for researching, which I define in the following section. However, in establishing the conceptual framework in the previous chapter I have alluded to how the field is multi-dimensional and contested. Bourdieu’s first methodological principle links to the second, by acknowledging that power relations mould the structure of field, with differently positioned actors determining relations of power; a point that Bourdieu in the quote alluded to by associating ‘the field’ with the ‘field of power’.

Methodologically, I perceive that this acknowledgement applies both to understanding the power relations circulating the ‘real-world’ locality under investigation, and also applies to the power relations within the field when entered into as the ‘context.

---

81 For example, with potential for contest at and between lived and perceived space (Lefebvre, 1991). I posited this at the outset to the research, where I suggest localised, negotiated knowledge’s may differ from, challenge or support relations depicted in the media and other representations.
for research’. Bourdieu does this by acknowledging the need to map the positions occupied by agencies (or agents), which in Bourdieu’s thinking are inherently positions of power (including that between researcher and the researched) (Bourdieu, 2000). Power is manifested locally, but is also linked to broader structures of hegemonic power and relations of suppression through the habitus, which unites social groupings, but are simultaneously autonomous and agent based (Bourdieu, 2000). The third principle therefore, regarding the analysis of habitus, is the principle that justifies the localisation of empirical focus in a Bourdieusian framework; interested in the complexity of social values, ideology and its influence on the sociology of practice (Bourdieu, 2000).

Inherently, these principles show the negotiation of theory that integrated macro and micro analytic – focused on how objective structures (laws, political-economy, institutions) influences the subjective experience and practices of individuals, and in turn how these subjectivities influence structures. As Bourdieu (1990 a: 25) explains:

I could sum up in one phrase the gist of the analysis I am putting forth today: on the one hand, the objective structures that the sociologist constructs, in the objectivist moment by setting aside the subjective representations of the agents, form the basis for these representations and constitute the structural constraints that bear upon interactions; but on the other hand, these representations must also be taken into consideration particularly if one wants to account for daily struggles, individual and collective, which purport to transform or to preserve these structures.

Identified by Ergler (2012), the methodological strength of Bourdieu’s three dimensioned approach, is the ability to reveal a comprehensive, multi-layered understanding of social practice; including the localised habitus of agents, but also structures and power constructs that are actively built and broken in the evolving social context and, for my purposes, the constitution of high country space. This is not a “mixed method” approach explains Ergler (2012: 82), but it is understood that focusing on local experience and ideology aids an understanding of the interplay between contingent social experience and the structures that influence habitus and praxis as both agential (individual) and collective. This is suggestive of the interpretive bricolage approach adopted in the research. Bricolage is widely used by social researchers (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005; Crotty, 1998), as an approach and concept that depicts the integration between theory, methodology and analysis as an

---

82 Requiring reflexivity, the field or network of associations within the field is changed dramatically by the researcher’s entering into it (Leary et al., 2011; Chambers, 2009; Nightingale, 2003).
83 Described as a ‘methodological polytheism’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2007; Wacquant, 2008).
iterative process, which is both rigorous in connections, but also flexible in its composition and borrowings from primary and secondary sources of data and methods.

Applying this bricolage approach via Bourdieu’s three methodological principles to the object of research, namely the complex social construction of high country space and attitudes towards the production and conservation ‘other’ is done using the singular case study region in mid Canterbury. To do this I selected a qualitative, interview-based approach to investigate the complex and subjective experiences of participants within the localised ‘field’. Various techniques were applied within the interviews to understand the subjective attitudes of participants and how these attitudes related to (individual and collective) habitus and the endowment of symbolic capital, which is often used to advance or defend particular epistemological claims to high country social space. Furthermore, a range of secondary data sources was accumulated and analysed in depth (Section 4.6). This allowed inferences to be drawn between institutional structures and representational concepts associated with tenure review and the conservation of high country space, allowing insight as to where broader constructs and representations contradict or support local experiences and practices.

4.2 Approaching research from locality

Methodologically, post-structural geography and social constructionism align with Bourdieu’s theory of practice, which extended the ideas of constructionism in a way that examines structures of thought, social interaction and power.⁸⁴ In Chapter 2, I outlined how constructionism is critical of division between nature and society within conservation ideology, such as the divisive ideology employed in tenure review that occurred in New Zealand’s High Country. It was posited that as a structural intervention, tenure review manifests itself locally with the erection of boundaries between production and protection. Bourdieu’s methodological considerations are particularly useful for empirical research that seeks to understand how local spaces are impacted by this kind of divisive intervention. Focusing on locality in the current research is important for two-fold reasons. On one hand locality is a place of micro-level contextual experience, knowledge and ideology, located in an accessible space defined for the objectives to the research. On the other hand it is a space of entrenched historical and contemporary power relations, social

---

⁸⁴ As mentioned in Chapter 2, Bourdieu’s sociology research was fronted with the aspiration of challenging duality constructs embedded deeply within social science; such as those between subjectivism and objectivism, structure and agency (Grenfell, 2008b).
resistance, opposition and adaption to the impact of macro-level, structural processes, such as the intervention of tenure review.\textsuperscript{85}

Of course, while Bourdieu offers us a range of advantages, he is not the only scholar who has recognised how knowledge is situated and imbued with power relations. Feminist scholarship has for long examined the power dynamics that are articulated with the creation of partial, ‘situated knowledge’ from research (Katz, 1998; 1996; 1995; Nightingale, 2003 Rose, 1997; Pryke, Whatmore and Rose, 2003). Post-structural and feminist scholars also align with Bourdieu in highlighting the relational and constructed nature of ‘the field’, as a location delineated by the researcher as the focus of research, and inherently influenced by the researcher’s entrance and position within it. Reflexively, this identifies the need to attend to the way ‘the field’ is defined as the ‘locality’ of inquiry for the current study. This comes from recognition that demarcating a locality, a community, or a ‘physical space’, relies on the artificial erection of a boundary between and within spaces for a period of time.

In the following section, I begin to ‘define the field’ by introducing the case based approach. I then outline the various dimensions of the case study context in mid-Canterbury, selected as the ‘research field’. The remainder of the chapter then explains each element of the research approach, the methods employed and the analysis of data. Following Bourdieu, laying out the approach employed addresses how obtaining empirical material from interviews and secondary sources guided a reflexive and evolving methodology; an approach that was flexible to various contextual dimensions, leads and issues as they emerged through the investigation.

4.3 Situating the object of research, defining the ‘field’

Case based research

Case based research offers an approach that allows an in-depth investigation into the operation of epistemology, social values and practices, and the specificities of a particular locality or focus problem (Berg and Lune, 2004). This approach enables the conditions of a locality to be investigated in ‘real-life’, untangling the most important aspects or practical details of a subject or situation with complex social spaces, to offering deep, nuanced information (Yin, 2013).

Marcus (1995; 1998) posited that complex social phenomena cannot be studied in a single site and extrapolated out to infer on more general trends and structures. Marcus

\textsuperscript{85} See Chapter 2, Section 2.3 and the discussion of locality
(1998) continues a longstanding debate in sociology and other disciplines associated with multi-site and single-site ethnographic research, where he argues for multi-sited ethnography and comparative studies. In some cases multiple, or several case studies, have been used effectively in rural research, comparing similarities and differences to other spaces (see: Reed et al., 2009; Wood, 2008; Vermeulen and Sheil, 2007). However, where there is clear rationale, case study based research often seeks to learn from the specifics of a particular case, concentrating analysis, focusing on commonalities and complexities and drawing out inferences from a single locality. ‘Locality based’ research that has employed a case study based approach has tended to show that selecting a singular case study ensures that qualitative data gained from case study research is of high quality (Milbourne, 2007, Flybjerg, 2006; Ward et al., 2008; Wilson, 2001). Accordingly, it is argued that focusing on too many case studies, spreading analysis over too larger geographical area, or number of interest groups, often reduces the quality of data – a dilution effect noted by Lorimer (2005). Also, the ability for such complex data to be comprehended and packaged up is lost in the complexity of comparisons and contingency of diverse locations (Baxter and Jack, 2008).

Mentioned above, different researchers approach the selection of a case study in various ways. Stake (2000: 237) supports the singularised approach chosen, specifying two prominent case study principles often followed by researchers. The ‘intrinsic case study’ is used as a focused study approach, where a researcher wants to deeply examine the complexities of a particular context. The second example, the exemplary case study (ibid), is an approach that critiques a particular example of research, by examining the complexities of an alternative case. Both examples were salient in the rationale for selecting the case study for the current study. For example, seeking to understand alternative readings of Brower’s macro-level approach, which I highlighted in Chapter 2, enables us to question how her research methodology was implicated in the exclusion or simplification of several facets of the debate.

There existed a clear rationale for why I selected the case study region in mid-Canterbury for the current research. I sought to avoid the localities in the high country region, where landscape politics had become unworkably polarised. I avoided case study regions that had become contested in media and academic literature associated with tenure review. For example, steering clear of anomaly areas like the Southern Lakes region, where subdivision and foreign ownership have become polarising national issues associated with amenity demand (Brower, 2006; 2008a, 2008b; Quigley, 2008; McCarthy, 2008; Moss, 2008).
I perceived that focusing on that particular context might cloud objectivity from critiquing the intervention of tenure review, and the transformation of habitus and relations once tenure changed from leasehold to freehold.

Murdoch and Pratt (1993: 420) argue that one important aspect of locality grounded research is the ability to encompass “the specific development trajectories of [rural] localities”, with a high level of analytical accuracy. The authors’ argue that such contextual specificity could not be given full justification by a macro-level reading of “the logic of capital”, and that neither can such dynamics be understood as “simply unique and indeterminate” (ibid). The dynamics occurring within and between regions in the authors’ research spoke to the specifics of the way that rural localities were bound into uneven processes of economic and social restructuring following 1980s neoliberalism. At a broad scale there exists an enormous level of complexity operating within the high country region. There have been distinct and complex processes of transition occurring within the various geographical regions of the high country, from a region wide scale to that of single valleys and onto specific runs. This issue of complex development potentials is developed in Chapter 6. The ‘high country’ (and its inhabitants), which is often identified in simplistic categories, is therefore complex and ill-suited to sweeping generalisation.

The purpose and criteria for selecting the case based approach in this research was thus to focus on the complexity of local meanings and values and the ways which knowledge formations are being negotiated locally. It is hoped that undertaking this will inform higher-level discourses and conservation knowledge. Therefore, the research focus emphasised the need to delve into and untangle the complexity of social phenomena, concentrating on a singular region. I now turn in the following section to examine the mid-Canterbury high country, selected as the case study to the research.

The ‘field’ – case study selection and access.

Conducting a coherent piece of research relies on demarcating space into a bounded research field, defining social variability and the flux and mobile networks into a discrete construct. Bounding and categorising space is therefore, a social and political exercise, reliant on determining who and what comprises locality and community, and therefore, who and what is left out (Katz, 1995; England, 1994; Denzin and Lincoln, 2005).

The ‘field’ in the current study, however, is a previously demarcated space. The ‘high country’ – broken into ‘front’ and ‘back country’, ‘low country’, ‘basin and valley country’, ‘rough country’ and ‘sweet country’ as per some local definitions – is a space
often referred to as ‘different’ and ‘isolated’ in comparison to other spaces. It is predominantly “characterised by pastoralism” (Chapman, 1996: 3), but is also a space of “natural values” (Maturin, 2004: n.p.) and expansive landscapes. However, the ability for representations to concretise political meanings is a focus of critique within the current study. The intention of the case based approach locates analysis in a small segment of the broader region, to examine micro-level complexities and how discourses are mobilised and negotiated ‘in-situ’.

The mid-Canterbury high country provides the case study region for investigation, through which to speak to broader issues occurring with regard to tenure review. Referring to Figure 4.1 below, four distinct river valleys are encompassed within the ‘field’ boundary, including: the Rangitata Gorge; the Ashburton/Hakatere Basin that includes the wetland conservation area of National Importance, Ō Tū Wharekai; the southern and northern borders of the Rakaia River, including the south eastern edge of the Arthurs Pass to Castle Hill, adjacent to the Poulter and Waimakariri Rivers. Tenure reviews and Nature Heritage Purchases in these valleys have contributed predominantly to extending the Te Kahui Kaupeka Conservation reserve. Traditionally each basin has represented a different but intricately linked ‘locality’, separated by geographical boundaries such as the major Canterbury braided rivers (the Rangitata, Rakaia and the Waimakariri) and steep mountain ranges. For this reason, there are different climatic and altitudinal gradients for each of the valleys. The Hakatere Basin, for example is very arid, enclosed by mountains on each side. Whereas, the eastern foothills of the Rangitata and Rakaia Gorges are comparatively lush, but steepen and become arid further inland. Such an understanding of regions within a previously thought ‘unified region’ or locality supports the conclusions of Desmond (2004) and Massey (2005); acknowledging that demarcated spaces merge in and out of each other, making is difficult to identify where one space/locality finishes and the next begins.

---

86 Ō Tū Wharekai, or as it is known locally the Ashburton lakes, is one of the three wetland complexes that comprises the Arawai Kakariki wetland restoration programme. Arawai Kakariki is a national level initiative that acknowledges that the vast percentage of New Zealand’s pre-existing lowland wetland ecosystems since colonisation have been drained and developed, often for agricultural purposes. 

Ō Tū Wharekai encompasses a mosaic of diverse wetland habitats, including the braided upper Rangitata River and the 12 lakes that make up the Ashburton Lakes and is one of the best examples of an inter-montane wetland system remaining in New Zealand, containing a diverse range of endemic and significant native flora and fauna species.

It is a scenic context set with the back drop of the Southern Alps / Kā Tiritiri o te Moana The complex of wetlands is spread over a vast scale, nestled amongst high country tussock lands that have increasingly been transferred from pastoral leasehold to conservation land held within the Hakatere Conservation Park. The Arawai Kakariki programme is also acknowledged as while focused on three highly significant RAP’s (under represented wetlands), it emphasises building relationships with landholders and other stakeholders.
Chapter Four: Research Approach and Methods

Not only are there significant differences between different parts of the mid Canterbury High Country, but these spaces have changed over time. Indeed, the region provides an interesting focus to how landscape has transformed over time. Prior to European settlement, the region comprised layers of value to iwi, Ō tū Wharekai or ‘the home of kai (food)’, the name of the contemporary wetland protection initiative, is representative of the reliance early Māori had on the abundant food sources found in the inland regions of Canterbury. The location is also central to the pounamu (greenstone) trail, where east coast tribes travelled southwest through the Mountain Passes to reach the pounamu fields of Westland (Brailsford, 1984).

In terms of pastoral heritage, the furthest inland property in the Rangitata Gorge, has been entitled Mesopotamia Station since novelist Samuel Butler took up the leasehold
in 1860. As probably the most famous high country property, Mesopotamia has become entrenched in the cultural story and mystique of the colonial history of the high country. The property directly across the Rangitata River, opposite Mesopotamia, has retained the name ‘Erewhon’, which symbolises Butler’s association with the Rangitata Basin, where he penned his utopian novel of the same title. Butler meant the title to be read as "nowhere" backwards even though the letters "h" and "w" are transposed, which suggests the isolation of the Rangitata Basin. Stories such as this connect colonial history to contemporary meanings, on which aspects of New Zealand’s nationalism and identity have rested (Dominy, 2001; 1995; Peden, 2011; Moon, 2013; Law, 1997; Ginn, 2008). As we will see in Chapter 7, the use and meaning of Mesopotamia does not end in the colonial period, even if nationalism has demarcated it as such. Rather, tenure review, which was completed in 2009, means that the property’s importance to our understanding of the high country needs to be updated.

The limited population of the high country and proximity and commonality means that each basin is connected and networked. Being a community of originally only 303 leasehold families has meant that the high country community have traditionally been closely knitted (Dominy, 2001; 2003; 1995). This was a particular emphasis within the work of Dominy (2001), who emphasised the connections between the different basins of the Canterbury high country, where she resided for several years undertaking a longitudinal ethnography on several of the families. Inter-regional and generational connections through succession are a characteristic aspect to the high country. Within the Canterbury valleys there are six families who have connections to particular properties that span no less than three and up to five generations. Many had members involved in the formation of the Land Act 1948. In contemporary times family members are variously involved in local river and land-care groups (Rangitata and Whitcombe), high country committees; Fish and Game; the Walking Access Commission and Federated Farmers. Several have been critical members in the High Country Accord. Dominy (2001: 45) related to how high country farming families in New Zealand are interwoven into the fabric of the high country landscape and the heritage of properties, “to such an extent that the inscriptive

---

87 I will return to analyse these groups in due course as an illustration of community conservation and collaborative management in Chapter 9.

88 The High Country Accord established in 2002, affiliated to farming lobby group Federated Farmers, to advocate the lessees position within tenure review, which had become highly politicised with the Labour government of the time. The primary purpose of the Accord was “to ensure that tenure review met the objectives of the Crown Pastoral Lands Act of economic, environmental and social sustainability” (HCA, n.d.).
processes linking people to land and land to people seem ineluctable, unremarkable and
generic to them”. A core focus of the present study is to draw innate and complex
associations with space out to analyse and see how values, attitudes and relations contest
and provide a fuller picture of issues with tenure review.

The farming communities in the various valleys are often separated by distance,
but Dominy (2001) examined how collectively ‘people of the high country’ share a deep
affinity, being part of the same pastoral heritage and sharing in the history, social and
economic struggles and triumph. Perceptions of isolation are deceptive because the high
country community is tightknit and have not traditionally been isolated from one another,
spatially, culturally or on the basis of productive habitus, which has remained pastoral over
a long period of time. For example, Dominy (2001; 1995) acknowledged a collective
habitus of what it means to be a resilient ‘high country farmer’, and also collective practices
of pastoral farming and lifestyle. Increasingly however, high country landholders have
become isolated from the broader, predominantly urban New Zealand public. To some,
such as Brower (2006), tensions associated with tenure review and the social structures
that constituted the high country are interpreted to be a traditional form of landed, social
and political hegemony. Processes of power are transformative and in Chapter 3 I
questioned whether power is necessarily held exclusively at the disposal of the ‘landed
gentry’, where tenure review mediated a balancing between socially powerful objectives of
conservation and farming. Even if we do not accept that runholders retain social
hegemony, we can certainly say that the close, if not closed, social structure is important
in how the politics has unfolded around tenure review and that this is reinforced by the
spatial isolation of high country farmers from other groups within New Zealand society.
However, it is important to be reflexive with regard to how my personal worldview as the
researcher and the complexity of my positionality, has influenced this assertion.

4.4 Applying reflexivity

Mentioned previously, the importance of a reflexive qualitative research approach is a
point of agreement between post-structural and feminist research (England, 1994; Katz,
2001; 1995; Pedynowski, 2003) and within the scholarship of Bourdieu (2000; Bourdieu
and Wacquant, 2007; Grenfell, 2008a). From post-structuralism and feminism, the
argument for acknowledging the ‘situated’ nature of knowledge is confronted (Harraway,
1991; Nightingale, 2003). Challenging the priority given to positivism and objective,
scientific knowledge and therefore, the place of the expert, has led to a range of questions associated with the power intrinsic to the production of knowledge.

Embracing a truly reflexive methodology, Bourdieu (2000) considered that researchers must conduct research at all times conscious of who they are; how they influence the field, or, the network of social relations that constitute that field; and furthermore how the field influences the researcher and the inferences drawn from the context and its interpretation as knowledge. Research questions and conclusions are framed by the researcher and have real influence on how the field is reconstituted following the researcher’s entrance and departure. Therefore, as a scholar one must be vigilant about how their embodied habitus, perspectives and partial knowledge systems influence the approach and conclusions. Reflexivity is therefore about the users of knowledge produced being able to trace the research rationale, and which, if not addressed explicitly, and documented rigorously may cloud the partiality of a project and the assumptions made.

The scholar can too easily find themselves “mistaking the things of logic for the logic of things” (Bourdieu, 1990: 61), as a phrase of Marx that Bourdieu quotes. This gives too much objectivity to conclusions as truth claims, rather than actively acknowledging and reflecting on qualitative research as always a partial lens to describe a social situation, as a snap-shot in the emergence of relational space (Massey, 1999). The post-structural interpretation is that the conclusions drawn from a research project are always a partial interpretation, which a researcher represents in particular, power-laden ways (Chambers, 2009; 2008; Nightingale, 2003; McDowell, 1993; Gibson-Graham, 1994). Acknowledging such limitation is not to undermine the integrity of qualitative research, but to strengthen it. After all, specific positionalities can provide strength to research and access to a community, as I discuss below.

Situating the researcher

The field as a socially demarcated, bounded space highlights the need to attend to how as the researcher I am located and positioned within it. Katz (1994: 72) addresses, “I [as the researcher] am always, everywhere in the field”, reflecting how the field is demarcated for the purpose of research, I became an intrinsic part of the field. The bounding, definition and interpretation of ‘the field’ as a social space, relied on my logic and judgement. This

---

89 A core criticism of positivist science empowered with the enlightenment that has come under scrutiny with the cultural turn post-structuralist thinking around the situatedness of knowledge.

90 Such positioning within the field has been an ongoing focus of feminist scholarship around the concepts of reflexivity, positionality, of intersubjectivity and partiality of situated knowledge systems.
positionality also, has material influence on the field and the way it is understood by others, through my interpretation and translation of knowledge from it.

Positioning me in the research relies first on acknowledging my identity as a 26-year-old male Pakeha, New Zealander, privileged for having had access to a high level of education, as a university student and a social researcher. Such aspects of my positionality automatically locate me within a hegemonic category in New Zealand’s society, of which I must be attentive. What stimulated my interest in the current study, however, is a complex multi-positionality that is worth reflecting on, for it directly underpins the rationale to the research.

A passion for plants, ecology and conservation led to my undergraduate studies in physical geography and conservation ecology. Through obtaining the skills and knowledge within this education, I gained access to work within the ‘conservation network’ involved in the case study region as a short term Department of Conservation employee. This experience provided the opportunity to interact with landholders and public interest groups. With this work came the opportunity to experience the pressures placed on New Zealand’s major conservation organisation, in a difficult and resource strained political economic context. I am also from a rural background and the closeness of the case study to my ‘homeplace’ meant that I had existing connections with landholders in the study region. As the researcher, selecting and demarcating the field of study, positioned me within the field, neither as a knowledgeable ‘outsider’, nor an ‘insider’, between conservation and high country communities. Rose (1997; 1995) gives consideration to this positionality as an ‘inbetweeness’ that has had particular influence on the way the study was conceptualised from the outset, and therefore the methods employed and the subjectivities of analysis and knowledge that will be translated in the following chapters.

This ‘inbetweeness’ is a positionality worth acknowledging throughout the research, for I consider it provides sensitivity to both sides of what is generally understood a polarised debate.91 Such a multi-positioned stance provided strength to the research, where I had useful contacts and points of access into a farming community that has become wary of social research. Also, having worked with many of the DOC participants, I had developed personal relationships with employees who may have otherwise avoided politically sensitive topics. Many spoke candidly to me, which is a complexity I have had to negotiate carefully so as to not further inflame relations.

---

91 Reflecting back on Chapter 3, this was clearly depicted in the way the debate is set up in the Hansard discussions leading up to the enactment of the Crown Pastoral Lease Act 1998.
My positionality was crucial to the initial framing of the study. I perceived that previous academic critique had damaged already fragile relationships existing between conservation, agricultural actors, the public and the state. Media representations continued to suggest a thorny relationship between landholder’s, public conservation and recreation interests. This rift intensified around the coverage of Brower (2006a; 2008). I experienced this first hand a year prior to beginning the Master’s research project that developed into this PhD thesis, as a DOC employee driving a departmental vehicle on a road near Lake Heron. A member of the public, obviously aggrieved by DOC pulled the fingers at me. I struggled to reconcile why the image of the department had degraded to the extent of invoking this antagonism from a member of the public. DOC after all is foremost a public service provider to conservation management and recreational access. My ‘inbetweeness’ therefore underpinned a commitment to orienting the research project to explore values and attitudes, rather than further inflame relationships and antagonise political rhetoric on either side of the protection/production duality.

The study is grounded on an ideology that seeks to transcend conflict often depicted in mainstream and academic critique, which maintains a status quo of antagonism at the macro-level. I consider that higher-level context of opposition undermines progressing conservation strategies based on collaboration and more sensitive understandings of local subjectivities and values systems.\(^{92}\) I perceive that potentially, a focus on the ‘general’ perpetuates a polarity within the ‘particular’ of local space. As a geographer, I understood that embracing epistemological pluralism as important, so while the research is problem based and the theoretical and methodological approach is critical, the framework seeks to examine social complexity. I have pursued an understanding of ‘both sides’ of a constructed duality between production and protection, examining the polarised politics resting on the division between nature and society that guides New Zealand’s conservation orthodoxy. Such rationale firmly grounds a research approach and selection of methods that emphasise the exploration of pluralism to give voice to alternative understandings of locality.

4.5 The research approach

Ethnographic methods are embraced to investigate situated dynamics and examine the politics and power constructs that result in social marginalisation in and the meaningful

---

\(^{92}\) This emerges from the body of research that surrounds collaborative approaches to conservation management (Bodin and Crona, 2009; Bodin, Crona and Ernstson, 2006; Ohja, Cameron and Kumar, 2009), and the contemporary focus on human’s in ecosystem approaches to ecological protection.
creation of ‘local spaces’ (Ingold, 2007; 2004; Berg and Lune, 2004). Focusing locally in this way hopes to provide in-depth understanding of the complex relationship between production and protection interests and the impact that tenure review has had.

An interview-based approach was adopted to elicit ethnographic, attitudinal information, in order to identify particular mobile discourses and to explore the worldviews of a various participants. Seeking to understand the values, attitudes and changing practices of participants involved in the ‘co-production’ of high country social-space related to Bourdieu’s third principle emphasising the need to examine habitus. In turn, processes of ‘othering’ between farming and conservation actors were exposed in relation to tenure review, which implies power relations, and therefore, Bourdieu’s second methodological principle.

The research approach was not a linear progression. In reflection, the project involved two temporal phases (examined in Figure 4.2 below), associated with the project beginning as a Master’s study in 2010 / 2011 that was subsequently upgraded to a Doctorate in 2012. The transitions signify the iterative nature of the research process, where Lincoln and Guba (2000) explain, that the research strategy should always be a cyclical process that allows deep engagement with complex social issues in time and space. For example, the Master’s project allowed for deep probing into the case study context, before issues were followed up in more detail once the project was extended. The research approach evolved in constant reflection on theory and findings, advancing emphasis on reflexivity, and contributes to the bricolage between theory, methods and analysis.

The qualitative approach adopted sought to extract data from fieldwork involving in-depth, open-ended interviews, employed as an ethnographic method as the source of primary data in the current study. Interviews are an excellent qualitative technique for extracting rich contextual, ethnographic and issues based knowledge (Rubin and Rubin, 2011; Patton, 2005). For this reason, interviews are best for situations or a defined locality where the research seeks to understand with a high level of detail, the social experiences, values and ideology of participants (Baxter and Jack, 2008; Minichiello et al., 1990; Leary et al., 2011). This is opposed to surveys, which tend to be more quantitative and are conducted with larger numbers of people.

In the particular case, interviews offered the ability to examine attitudes of individuals working in an agricultural capacity and living ‘in-situ’; or working in a conservation capacity within the particular locality, but travelling up to 1.5 hours to access the region. By undertaking interviews, I experienced first-hand the politics and power
constructs that result in both the meaningful creation of ‘local space’, and the local outcomes and social struggle associated with tenure review.

Figure 4.2: The two phases of the research process

Accessing participants
A series of strategic decisions were made about the kinds of people involved in the research as participants. A thorough approach was taken to give all landholders on the properties within the four river basins the opportunity to speak with me. I also sought to interview
managers and others involved in farming within the valleys. This was because when undertaken as a Masters project, I emphasised the farming voice, which I perceived to be often misunderstood. On upgrading to a Doctorate, further landholders and a cross section of people involved with conservation and landscape management in the case study region were selected and approached. Participants included a range of DOC employees, Forest and Bird, Fish and Game, local conservation board representatives. Furthermore, a purposively selected sample of participants involved with tenure reviews within the region was approached. For example, representatives from LINZ, land valuation specialists for the Crown and leaseholders, and several lawyers, provided useful context and broader knowledge about the changes occurring. The core focus the research approach was to examine the complexity of local perspectives, landscape values and how knowledge claims were being negotiated in light of changes caused by tenure review. Therefore, it was important to not only include the well-educated and connected members of the farming and conservation communities, where those well versed in political argument may reveal ‘glossed over’ versions of reality and rhetoric (Minichiello et al., 1990).

In terms of accessing participants, attending the annual Federated Farmer’s, High Country Division conference in July 2011, was a useful inroad for making contact with a diversity of participants within the high country community. Attending the conference allowed the opportunity, on a social basis and in the ‘domain of the farming community’, for me to discuss the research and demonstrate to participants that I had a genuine and involved interest in the issues facing the community who live there.

The conference provided an initial platform for approaching participants, and many landholders indicated their interest in being involved in the research. Familiarity eased access issues and generally the people approached over the coming months were hospitable and keen to be interviewed on a formal basis. Attending the Federated Farmers conference also solidified the decision to focus on a localised case study, as the specific complexities of the various high country regions became clear.

The initial high country contacts were also useful in obtaining access to further participants. Dropping the name of a mutual contact into a phone or email conversation was a useful approach for getting a dialogue established. A snowballing technique came from this, and the connectivity of the high country network was useful to me as a social researcher. Indeed, there were few participants who did not recommend other people that should be spoken to. This led to interviews being undertaken with key informants beyond the particular case study region. Once a few successful interviews had been achieved with
some the key figures in the region, the community became aware of me and began to open up to the research.

Landholder participants were useful for obtaining a deep knowledge about the impact of tenure reform, habitus change and ethnographic data around values and connections to place. However, it became clear that speaking to members of the farming community alone was simply too limited. The expanded scope of the PhD led to a modified research approach that sought to understand both sides of the contested dualism between protection and production interests. In doing so, I sought to provide a balanced review of the diverse epistemologies associated with conservation and landscape management that could speak to the farmer perspectives that had been covered with depth. Some difficulty was experienced accessing conservation participants, which is explained when discussing issues of power within the interview (Section 4.6).

Participants who agreed to talk to me did so with trust. I explained the research approach openly, and many participants supported the open and balanced approach to the study, respectful of the complexity of the process, and the context, rather than an approach that fitted a preconceived argument.

I contacted each participant by phone, explaining who I was and my interest in talking with them. I subsequently made contact by an emailed letter that gave a brief summary of the research, and in the likelihood of their agreement to participate, what the interview would involve (see Appendix 3a). Upon receiving this email, some participants requested that they be provided with a schedule of questions.

A summary of landholders, other farming participants, and conservation and land management informants is provided in Appendix 3b, showing the specific codes that will be used to identify individual participants in the results and discussion chapters. While many participants were happy to be identified, it was decided that all participants would be anonymised. However, some specifics are retained for analytical purposes. Landholder participants are broadly broken into two groupings; being, established or long-term high country residents (living in the high country for longer than 10 years); others are defined as domestic and international ‘newcomers’. Notably, the farm managers spoken to were all relative newcomers to the high country context. However, many managers in the high country are long-term residents. One manager, while new to the region had grown up in

---

93 In such a small community, such as the high country case region, anonymity of views is difficult to maintain. Opinions, attitudes and personality traits are well known between neighbours.

94 In some cases, international owners have been part of the high country for an extensive period of time, reasoning why it is important to carefully specify rather than generalise.
the high country of Central Otago and he spoke of the affinity he held for the high country associated with ideas of pastoralism and identity he was exposed to by his father who was a shepherd on several stations. For the present study, engaging with the social connectivity’s associated with the traditional high country identity and way of life is important. Bourdieu’s thoughts and scholarship emphasise how reflections like those of the farm manager above, illustrate social orderings attached to a resilient habitus.

It should be noted that within the schedule of participant’s I have made gender and generational distinctions clear. The justification for specification in the coding system is that feminine / masculine voices and different generations may hold dissimilar relational concepts of high country place. For example, Dominy (2001) explained how patrilineal inheritance meant that often women had married into the high country from elsewhere. Similarly women who were born into high country families often had to leave the high country, because, except for a few unusual examples, there was less of a role for them in future ownership and management of properties. Morris (2002) also highlights how women relate differently to high country space compared to their male counterparts. Through a Bourdieusian frame, Morris emphasises how continuity of social roles within the high country, are a matter of social labour, the articulation of capital and differentiation.

4.5.1 The interview

In brief, this section examines the important principles of in-depth interviewing, and how the technique was applied to the current project. I begin by briefly outlining the importance of open-ended questioning – the distinction between unstructured and semi structured interviews, and how this modified reflexively through the current project. The need to seek understanding and clarity of interpretation is also emphasised.

Two key approaches for interviewing were employed. First, the dimensions of interviewer as supplicant are examined, and second, the post-structural framework seeks to highlight how the interviewee is an ‘active subject’ in the coproduction of knowledge within and beyond the interview process.

**Interviewer as supplicant**

In light of the intricacies of unequal power relations that potentially emerge in an interview, the technique of interviewer as supplicant was embraced. It is an approach that recognises that the interview process is a conversation, or collaboration, not an interrogation (Berg and Lune, 2004; Gubrium and Holstein, 2003).
Chapter Four: Research Approach and Methods

The approach recognises that the researcher is reliant on obtaining access to the knowledge of participants. From the outset, the success of the study relied on openness and candid responses to the interview questions. However, there is always the risk that interview participants will be wary of a researcher, which manifests as a nervousness or rejection of a powerful outsider – one who seeks knowledge, but holds the power of interpretation. This wariness to the researcher has the potential to modify the data a participant divulges. Therefore, approach and technique is important. For example the difference between getting personal opinions or superficial and political spin was a matter of inspiring trust (Rubin and Rubin, 2011; Minichiello et al., 1990). Getting the most out of an interview, in terms the quality and honesty of interview narrative, relied on my openness as the researcher and to the commitment to not polarise the political situation further.

In order to allay the fears of wary participant’s, acknowledging their superior contextualised knowledge on the topic in question was an effective way of gaining rapport. I often adopted the persona of an interested person who wished to examine the range of perspectives and values associated with the study area, and more importantly I needed the participants’ assistance to achieve this. At times this involved me being submissive. However, with dominant participants, in order to make the most of an interview I had to show understanding of what they were discussing with me and being submissive or naive was not an appropriate technique. I found on occasion that I embraced particular aspects of my positionality to build rapport and understanding between the participant and myself in an interview.

Reflexively, my positionality as a University of Otago student was useful for it suggested independence, with no affiliation to previously polarising research, like Lincoln University, or a particular ‘political’ organisation like DOC, LINZ or Federated Farmers. The inability for participants to place me as holding a specific political stance, as simultaneously conservation interested and from a rural background, provided access to participants more easily than ‘other’, more distinctly ‘outsider’ researchers may have experienced. Several participants supported my approach, stating that they perceived me to be, “less one-sided” (Male landholder 3) and “more impartial” (ibid.), and therefore, able to provide a “more objective” (Key Informant 2) slant on a complex debate than other researchers had provided. In reflection, this is an interesting perspective when addressing how perceptions influenced access to participants and the co-production of knowledge.
within the interview. But accordingly, as supplicant for knowledge, within the interview process I attempted to adapt my persona to fit a particular interview situation.

Active subjects in the co-production of knowledge

Embracing critical reflexivity, feminist and post-structural methodology addresses the need to recognise and attend to the articulation of power in the research process (Leary et al., 2011). Associated with attending to the ‘situatedness’ of knowledge systems mentioned previously, feminist scholarship and post-structuralism has drawn attention to the potentially unequal power relations between interviewer and interviewee (Kruks, 2014; Chambers, 2008; Katz, 2001). England (1994: 82) argued that the interview process is “asymmetrical and potentially exploitative”. Accordingly, the researcher is often assumed to be dominant within most interview situations. However, this is not always the case (see Section 4.5.2).

In response to the reflexive turn, a paradigm shift occurred in social research involving interviews. It is increasingly recognised that doing research ‘on participants’ or ‘informants’ reflects this power imbalance between the dominant researcher, as holder of ‘expertise’ and authority over ‘knowledge’, and the subservient participant as the provider of ‘data’ (Holstein and Gubrium, 2003).95 Emphasis is instead now placed on doing research ‘with participants’. It is a turn that represents a complete change in ethnographic approach, inciting reciprocity and respect within the research process, and acknowledges the participant’s contribution in the co-production of knowledge (Holstein and Gubrium, 1995). Balanced knowledge and a successful interview are reliant on dialogue and a mutually respectful accord formed between the researcher and the researched (Kvale, 1996; England, 1997).

Kvale (1992: 2) asserts that in qualitative research, interviews are the “construction site of knowledge”, through which data and experience is actively created into meaningful interpretations. Recognising participants as active and knowledgeable subjects in an interview, acknowledges how interviewers and interviewees are equal partners in co-production of knowledge and meaning, within the interview, and beyond with analysis and interpretation.

---

95 This is a characteristic of modernist and masculinist social research that feminists like Nightingale (2003), Whatmore, (2002) Harraway (1997; 1991) are deeply critical of. In each example, the expert is situated, refusing to accord primacy to expert knowledge associated with positivistic perceptions of objectivity and ‘reason’, compared to lay or ‘local’ knowledge. It is understood, that overemphasis on the ‘all seeing, all knowing’ expert overlooks alternative epistemologies rooted in locality (Chambers, 2009; 2008).
4.5.2 Undertaking interviews

The 84 interviews conducted for the research, 53 with landholders and other farming interests, and 31 with conservation and other NGO interests, were undertaken over an expanded time period between May 2011 and March 2013. This data collection had two phases corresponding to the research being upgraded from Masters to a Doctorate (detailed above in the research approach). A majority of the interviews with landholders were undertaken while the research was a Master’s project, prior to the parameters of the study expanding. Frequently, undertaking interviews with landholders was dictated by events in the farming calendar and participant availability. Interview length varied between 45 minutes and 3.5 hours (on and off), which meant a tremendous quantity of rich data was collected and managed through an effective filing system, coding and analysis approach, which is explained below.

As the research was a relationship-based undertaking, this extended period of time allowed me to form strong relationships with some participants. It also meant that reflexively, as my knowledge and contextual understanding improved, so too the interview approach. In hindsight, had I interviewed the farmers after interviewing the other participants, the interviews with many of the farmers may have been different and some of the questions posed, less naïve to conservationist positions. As most of the interviews with landholders were conducted early on without understanding the perspectives of the broader set of participants, undertaking interviews following expansion of the project into a Doctorate allowed me to engage somewhat more with the broadness of debates.

All interviews, except for one, were recorded following the prior consent of the participant involved. It was asked in several instances for an opinion to be ‘off the record’ and accordingly the recorder was switched off. In such cases notes were jotted at the time or immediately after the interview in a research diary. In one instance the interviewee decided that what was said was of critical importance and immediately repeated what was said following the recorder being turned back on. Only one participant declined having their interview recorded in which case, detailed notes were taken. Prior to the commencement of every interview, each participant was required to sign a written consent form that was presented and explained to him or her. This consent was obtained in accordance with the University of Otago requirements for ethical research (Appendix 3c).
An evolving interview approach

The approach to interviewing within the current project evolved from unstructured to a semi-structured approach as the themes in the data became clearer and targeted the research. The first eight interviews were undertaken as broad, unstructured ‘conversations’ that were flexible to move with participant insight. Participants were encouraged to discuss what they felt were important issues that the researcher needed to investigate. Simple questions were asked to probe more deeply into participant narratives and to expand on various points. A flexible approach such as this enabled the participants who were actively living the issues of context, only recently a focus to my studies, to inform me of problems for further inquiry. In this way, to a certain extent, early participants defined the parameters of questioning and inquiry.

Conducting interviews in a relaxed and unstructured way with these early participants was an effective way of forging strong rapport and respectful dialogue and built confidence both with the participants, and myself, who was new to social research. This strategy allowed me to get comfortable with the interview process and with how to approach and elicit information from participants without leading responses.\(^\text{96}\)

All of the initial interviews were undertaken with landholders defined as ‘long term residents’ in the coding schedule (in Appendix 3b) and several were informants I had met previously. Undertaking interviews with these informants first provided me the confidence to undertake interviews with unknown, varied and some politically prominent participants in the next interviews.

Due to the familial and neighbourly connections between participants within the case context, word of my intentions and ‘non-confrontational approach’ travelled quickly. It was also an approach that aligned with the stance of the research, inspired by starting a conversation between polarised interests, around issues of division encapsulated within New Zealand’s conservation orthodoxy encapsulated by tenure review. I also found that throughout the analysis that landholders became the predominant voice. Diverse perspectives arose from many of them, and were supplemented by opinions of the sample of ‘other’ interests negotiating the local case study region, whom I interviewed.

\(^{96}\) As an inexperienced researcher, I was eager, but found myself having to stop myself providing affirmation to participant responses, and ‘discussing’ rather than posing for more data or clarity.
Semi structured interviews

Following the exploration of a broad range of background and attitudinal information with the first 8 interviewees, a more targeted approach to interviewing was undertaken. Semi-structured interviews became the primary data source to the research. Following the conversational, unstructured approach employed in early interviews, the semi-structured technique allowed questioning around key themes identified in the theory and previous interviews (Rose, 1997). Semi structured interviews require planning and questions were designed around research themes that emerged from the theoretical framework and the eight initial interviews, which were treated as a ‘pilot study’ (Lincoln and Guba, 2000). Each interview was guided by an interview schedule that outlined in an appropriate order of themes the list of topics that were to be covered (see Appendix 3d) (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). The interview technique mixed open and closed questions; so not to lose focus and risk becoming unstructured by default. However, the schedule focused on themes rather than questions, so as to be flexible enough to allow me as the researcher to follow other interesting and relevant leads. Interview schedules were also targeted towards the specific interests of an interview participant (i.e.: landscape, ecologist, farmer/landholder or conservationist had varied orientation).

The ‘situatedness’ of informants, and their relationship with the case study context was important in the current project. At the beginning of the research I had a preconceived idea that participant positionalities as ‘conservationists’ or ‘farmers’ would be relatively firm. However, insight into lived experiences and perspective of particular local conservation activities expanded my insight into how ‘situated knowledges’ were being formed and negotiated, and to understand how habitus, attitudes and practices were changing. What emerged was how notions of positionality as a conservationist or farmer are more jumbled and complex locally than these divisions allow, which subsequently becomes a focus of discussion in Chapter 5. Targeting questions enabled me to begin positioning each participant upon a ‘participant values spectrum’ between productivist and protectionist habitus, which is used as an analytical tool in Chapter 5. The positioning of participants was interpreted on the basis of various recurring themes, issues and values, which made it was possible to cluster participants, and give some qualitative coherence to the complexity operating within the case study in terms of values. In later interviews, many interviewees constructed a diagram of ‘knowledge influences’, which supported this values spectrum as a heuristic device. I turn to explain this technique in the following section.

97 Reflecting Bourdieu’s third methodological principle (Wacquant and Bourdieu, 2007).
In addition to recording each interview, notes on emotion, intonation, gesture and the atmosphere or ‘vibe’ of the interview were recorded. A brief summary was compiled following each interview and provided a précis at the beginning of each transcript. These notes provided the ability to maintain context and the integrity of participant narrative. This précis underlies the first stage of analysis (Section 4.6 below). Reflecting on these précis allowed reengagement with the interview material and contextual cues that allowed me to understand the attitudes of participants as more interviews were undertaken. For example, the openness of the interview and the participant’s attitude to the research and the researcher, the ease of building rapport and the honestly and guarded nature of responses was recorded. All provide attitudinal cues as to how a participant reacted to probing questions and provided context, insight and depth to the interview data.

In addition to the interviews, on a number of occasions I was taken for a drive or a walk around respective properties. This was insightful as participants related to particular aspects of the landscape and property as they spoke or were interviewed. Boundaries between recently tenure reviewed land and operational farmland were often a focus point as participants showed evident fencing scars bulldozed along ridges, through gullies and around bluffs. This gave a material dimension to the erection of boundaries and the scale of transformations occurring. Vegetation characteristics, weed issues and understandings of ecological succession were amongst various points of discussion. Participants also related to how they felt about their properties, ‘their place’ within a property’s history and what changes had occurred or that they had undertaken in their time living there. As the researcher, I received the opportunity to experience how landholder’s understood a property through their embodied experience of it (Ingold, 2007; 2005). Participant attitudes towards particular practices, burning and irrigation for example, and changes to habitus associated with tenure review were insightful. Often, when walking or driving, was when landholders vocalised valuable attitudes toward tenure review, and when they reflected on what the outcomes would mean for a property. This reflected attitudes towards the ‘conservation other’, which critically is inflected with different power relations, grounded in attitude and influenced by spatial concepts that are currently under change.

While I was going around their properties, participants frequently encouraged me to take photos to get a particular point across. For example, about pig damage that had occurred since land was reviewed in the Rangitata, wilding pine spread and control on particular properties in the Arthurs Pass and around Lake Lyndon and Coleridge,
management strategies that were being implemented. Native species such as gentians and coprosma amongst low intensity pastoral paddocks were frequently discussed.

I was encouraged to ‘see for myself’ the values that continue to be present on high country properties from the viewpoint of lessees. I was introduced to other landholders, farm managers, family members and other visitors to properties. I was invited to stay for meals and brought groceries and a tractor part from town on one occasion. Evidently, a level of trust and mutual respect operated between participants and myself as the interviewer.

Overall, laying out the interview approach has illustrated how the research process was an evolving and inherently reflexive process, as it moved from a narrow focus to embrace different dimensions of a complex debate. All interviews were conducted in person except for two interviews with international interests that were conducted using Skype. Other participants, who were not formally interviewed, are detailed in the table in Appendix 3b and are referred to in Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8 as ‘pers. comm.’ (personal communication).

Elicited ‘knowledge influence’ drawings
To supplement the précis and interview material, the method of getting participants to draw diagrams of who and what influenced their values, knowledge, and attitudes is an interesting approach to reflect on. Participating in research in this way extends the post-structural understanding that informants are not passive in the production of knowledge from research (Rubin and Rubin, 2011).

The method employed was oriented as a self-derived process, with as little researcher probing and influence as possible. Following the interview, allowing the participant to be comfortable with the researcher, participants were asked to draw a spider diagram with themselves located at the centre. One photographed example of a participant’s ‘knowledge influence map’ is provided in Figure 4.3. The map is a particularly good example that indicates the many influences that have contributed to the male landholder’s knowledge and attitudes over time, providing a snapshot of prominent influences on his habitus. The questions I asked participants during this task were simple and non-leading, for example; “where do you get your knowledge from?”, “what experiences in your life have influenced your attitudes?” and “who and what do you

98 Interviews were previously understood as the ‘pipeline’ through which information was transmitted from a passive subject to a powerful researcher (Holstein and Gubrium, 2003; Bond, 2008).
interact with regularly?”. They are questions that challenged participants to think reflexively about how and why they think about the high country and their place within it, the way they do. The approach also sought to ‘follow the network’, through the self-reflexive analytical lens of individual participants, to understand the diverse interactions.

Figure 4.3: An example of a participant’s knowledge influence diagram.

The depth with which individual participants reflected on their interactions and sources of knowledge was variable. At times it was difficult to get participants to reflect upon the sources of their knowledge and the discourses they were exposed to. Uptake was variable, as some participants failed to understand the broader theoretical significance of the task. However, some examples were brilliant, with diagrams being highly insightful and

99 An approach that has certainly been applied previously in Act-Network Theory (ANT) methodology for understanding the operation non-human agency and interaction between human and non-human actants (Ruming, 2009). However, the current research did not have the breadth to examine social spatial hybridity through an ANT lens.
reflecting detail of where a participant’s value for conservation came from, or how they understood the appropriate place of farming in the high country. The temporal depth that participants explored was surprising, for example reviewing childhood memories of particular situations.

**Reflecting on the interviews - power and critical reflexivity**

The research involved entering people’s homes and workplaces (which for many high country landholders are one in the same) the ‘domains’ of participants, in which a range of interesting power relationships exist between the researcher and the researched operate (Minichiello, 2007; 1994). Minichiello *et al.*, (1990) provides detail regarding the raw insight and emotion one is exposed to on entering into the domain of participants to conduct interviews, and also the benefits, in terms of quality information, from participants feeling comfortable. There was a great variation in the depth participants were prepared to discuss with me – the ‘nature of talk’ and the atmosphere of the interview. Whether an interview and responses obtained were ‘all business’ or emotive and personally connected, was often a matter of personalities gelling to establish rapport.

As the researcher, I experienced feelings of switching between a position of power and at other times, disempowerment. The environment the interview was undertaken in, as well as the positionality and personality of the researcher and research participants, heavily impacted upon interviews. How participants were approached and the social / institutional position of the interviewee and the political wariness associated with how the research focus was perceived were sometimes problematic. Several participants, one whom was in a government role and the other two in higher-level NGO positions, perceived me as potentially problematic, for ‘over-problematising’ or ‘over-theorising’ the issue of tenure review. One respondent referred to tenure review as a “can of worms” with the way he perceived I was interpreting the situation theoretically, and suggested I should “let sleeping dogs lie ... it’s [tenure review] a dead duck” (Legal Representative 1).\(^\text{100}\)

In three instances, an invitation to be involved in an interview was rejected. On one occasion by a conservation employee and on two other occasions by farming participants approached. Two were not interested in the research or saw it as unnecessary to become involved. However, one of the farming participants who declined involvement was extremely aggravated by the process of tenure review and felt betrayed by previous

\(^\text{100}\) This participant had represented landholders in large tenure review cases and felt it was for the law to define direction. However, it is understood that legal frameworks tend to operate in a way that supports the neoliberal status quo (Castree, 2008a; Blomley, 2008).
social research in the high country. He apologised, wished me luck, but unfortunately, declined my request. Three other people approached were encouraging of the research but due to other commitments, scheduling did not work and after successive attempts the interview failed to happen. Participants once interviewed, however, generally felt satisfied that I, as the researcher, had sought their opinions regarding issues that were affecting them. Most interviewees welcomed the opportunity to be involved in the research, were enthusiastic about the research problem and candid in the way they responded to the questions posed. A number requested feedback, others wanted to look over their transcript in order to check or expand on what they had said. Accordingly, I allowed for this as it assisted with both the rigour and clarity of analysis and interpretations.

Domination in the interview
In two instances interviews were not easily conducted. In one interview, the first statement the farming participant made was “you make me very nervous” (Male Landholder 15). He referred implicitly to my interpretive power as an individual with the potential to misrepresent information. To him, I was someone who was “not local” (ibid.), and therefore, I may not have had a full understanding of issues affecting the high country region, and the status of leases within the context. It was an affirmation of dominance, but also defensiveness toward the challenge the agricultural order has sustained from academic and public coverage. This is suggestive of Bourdieu’s theory regarding how habitus, capital and the assertion of local status may be used defensively to retain the stability of a hegemonic order (Bourdieu, 2000). After explaining my position and rationale we continued the interview. It remained a difficult and stilted conversation throughout and the participant’s body language and discussion was cagey.

The second instance was particularly difficult, as the participant was an important access point to further participants within a key conservation organisation. It is a perspective that relates to the growing body of literature on ‘interviewing up’ and the sometimes challenging dynamics of interviewing elites or those in positions of power (Desmond, 2004; Elwood and Martin, 2000; Gibson-Graham, 1994).

The naive familiarity I had with the conservation manager underpinned a more casual approach to requesting their involvement, and the ‘inbetweeness’ of my positionality was challenged. Initial contact was made to a key informant by phone call, and then detail of the research was emailed to the respective participant. Subsequently, the request was made to provide a list of questions, which were in turn circulated to the manager’s higher
boss and were automatically deemed to be leading and politically sensitive. While the conservation managers in question welcomed the interview, they requested that the questions be rephrased so that they were less politically risky and “more objective”, and attempted to manage the parameters of inquiry. The higher-level manager also closed the possibility of interviewing other members of the organisation, quoting “you may lead them down a dangerous political path”.

The interview was undertaken with both of the participants and responses to the questions arguably reflected political spin. This was to the extent that one of the managers had printed the questions and written two sentence answers below. The interview became a ‘tag team’ situation. The male participant in particular held control. The way he questioned, probed and challenged me as the interviewer, his body language and the way he often raised his eyebrows was intimidating and limited my attempts to gain rapport. He actively disempowered me, rather than the researcher retaining control of the situation, and therefore, the power balance.

The experience of this interview in particular demonstrated the way that power can operate in an explicit way within an interview. The situation reflects how managers may be wary of political fall-out from critique of organisational structures and sensitive to a public image that is continually under scrutiny. In a broader sense, this instance demonstrates how an interviewer is at the mercy of a range of factors, that need to be managed, and similar examples of this reversed power relation are prominent in the literature (Morris, 2009; McNeal and McLaughlin, 2009; Smith, 2006; Desmond, 2004). Failing to break down barriers potentially risked the success of the study by limiting access to further participants in a key stakeholder group, and two highly political interviews were not sufficient to establish the variation within conservation organisations how they negotiate their relationships with high country farmers. However, when both managers lost their jobs during restructuring, I was able to approach others within the organisation and seek their involvement in the study.

The ‘vibe’ of an interview, the experience the researcher had and the way the interviewer is perceived by the participant each has a particular bearing on the way an interview narrative is conceptualised. This is a central concern behind the idea of ‘critique’, and during analysis I exercised a stance of critical reflexivity in the breaking down, interpretations and reconstruction of knowledge from qualitative data (Nightingale, 2003;).
4.6 Discourse analysis of interview data

As the researcher, I transcribed all interviews soon after completion. This was done, first, in order to maintain consistency and avoid warped interpretations of the material and second, so I was able to submerge within the material (Braun and Clarke, 2006; Bird, 2005; Crang, 2001). Cross-examination between transcript material and audio files occurred where ambiguities arose when analysing the material in order to ensure accuracy and dependability. Having established good rapport with participants also meant that I was able to follow up on leads and seek clarification on points within the interview material. I maintained a dialogue with some participants throughout the research process to discuss interpretations, debates and theoretical issues.

A rich, qualitative data set came from the interviews undertaken and I sought to approach data analysis in way that maintained the complexities and social nuances of individual discourse that I experienced. However, social research requires this often complex and multi-levelled data to be broken down and packaged in coherent ways that allow readers to engage with the knowledge and interpretations produced. Part of a reflexive approach is laying the analytical approach (as well as theoretical rationale) bare for critique, allowing users to follow the analytical process and understand the decisions, and therefore, assumptions made (Grenfell, 2008a; England, 1994).

I sought to systematically analyse participant worldviews, guided by reflection on Bourdieu’s ‘methodological principles’ examined above (Wacquant and Bourdieu, 2007). Analysis elicited critical information about values, ideology, attitude and worldview; to inform understandings of how habitus and what attitudes toward high country space are understood more or less appropriate. Analysis also enabled an understanding of the impact boundaries between nature and society were having on the construction of space, the attitudes of participants.

Woodack and Meyer (2009) explain that often verbal narrative is given less critical attention than written text, largely because verbal narrative is understood to be less concrete. Benefit of the doubt is given to oral ‘chat’ because a participant has less time to consider what is spoken in an interview, than what is articulated in written text. However, in whatever form, language articulates ideology that are structuring of social praxis, and intricately tied with the operation of power (Bourdieu, 2000). Therefore, a rigorous critical approach was taken with the analysis of all research material; primary interview data, secondary and contextual.
Chapter Four: Research Approach and Methods

The discourse analysis undertaken on interview material was achieved in two stages, on individual participants’ narratives and grouped thematic analysis of issues and attitudes. These stages are outlined below. Again, this process of breaking down, and organising the data in accessible ways was undertaken iteratively, allowing a higher resolution of analysis as my contextual knowledge and the themes developed.

**Analysis Stage I – Examining individuals separately**

Stage one of analysis began with each interview being transcribed and broader themes analysed as the interview process advanced. In particular, the strategy employed for analysis was useful in terms of addressing the research questions. I worked throughout this research with the supposition that applying the lenses offered by constructionism and Bourdieu to the worldviews of local people would be insightful for critiquing the divisive philosophy of tenure review. Deep insight was elicited with regard to tenure review; as a macro-level structural change having discernible impact on rural locality. Descriptions of space and place as well as social connections, attitudes and feelings towards boundaries and the conservation and farming ‘other’ were identified. As a researcher, it was difficult to negotiate between packaging data for coherence, argument and logic and losing the complexities and nuances that are so engaging.

Early on the decision was made to retain interview transcripts whole for the duration of the interview process. Examining each interview separately I sought to understand the history of a participant’s individual attitudes and ‘knowledge space’. This approach identified the different epistemologies that individual participants engaged with. Mentioned above, throughout each interview I had taken notes on attitude, tone and opinions about tenure review and the questions posed. From this, following each interview précis could be established, which expressed in a few statements the participants ‘worldview’. The statement of worldview allowed me to remain attentive to various complexities in participant perspectives. Undertaking this technique shortly after an interview was completed, allowed follow up with participants. This was undertaken in order to clarify or extend insight, or question participants around particular issues of attitudes, especially in situations I considered the interpretations being made were too vague and subject to my prejudgments.
Chapter Four: Research Approach and Methods

Analysis Stage II – Interviews and primary data

The 84 in-depth interviews undertaken, provided over 95 hours of interview data and thousands of pages of transcription data. Therefore, Stage 2 of data analysis was focused on undertaking two core tasks: 1) the thematic building of a coding scheme applied to the data was tied to the heart of the analysis chapters, but also linked explicitly back to the theoretical framework, in this way advancing the interpretive bricolage; 2) the diverse data set of ethnographic and attitudinal data was analysed deeply and systematically in order to break it down into ‘packages’ of theme and argument.

Analysing the interviews through building a thematic coding system was an iterative process involving several stages, as knowledge and themes changed and sub-themes emerged. This reflexive, stage-based approach provided an emphasis on letting participant insights define analysis and subsequent themes of inquiry and interpretation. This ensured rigour, as I actively avoided fitting data to preconceived categories from my positionality and theoretical research (Braun and Clarke, 2006).

I had begun the interview approach at the Masters level, and had undertaken coding and analysis in Microsoft Excel, breaking the material into thematic categories (identified in Figure 4.3 below). The system had worked well, and I saw no need to move to a system like NVivo. However, in reflection, coding and analysis of the interviews by hand and logging into Excel became the most time consuming aspect to the project and could have been undertaken more efficiently. However, reading and re-reading, coding and re-coding the data in many ways was effective because finer distinctions emerged with analysis and familiarity.

Coding data was undertaken in four stages, two of which were undertaken directly after the interview examining themes of discussion and participant ideology. After the completion of these stages, I moved on to the third stage, which was analysing these themes. When breaking data into thematic analysis (Stage 3), I applied an inductive approach; this was aided by analysing the attitude, history and values of each participant first. The inductive approach was influenced by social constructionism and Bourdieu’s

101 Rigorous colour coding was used to group and categorise emerging themes, topics and issues that were drawn to attention by participants, attitudes towards ‘other’ groups implicated in debate over high country landscape debate. Knowledge change became an important element of focus as more interviews were transcribed, coded and analysed, and then further interviews probed this theme more deeply, demonstrating the reflexivity that is part to a prolonged qualitative research process.

102 I found more minor themes, issues, potential case studies and leads for further investigation, useful in the presentation and writing up of the thesis.
principles, where I sought to elicit ideology and habitus transformation. The primary and secondary themes that emerged in analysis are displayed below. These themes were influenced by the literature, and simultaneously influenced of the research questions and the construction and layout of the four analysis and discussion chapters.

![Primary Themes and Categories in Following Chapters](image)

**Figure 4.4:** Primary Themes and Categories in Following Chapters

Stage four of the coding focused on commonalities, agreement and disagreement between participants from conservation and production groupings. Multiple subjectivities came through clearly within participant discourses. Few participants were simply ‘farmers’ or ‘conservationists’, and can be situated on more of a spectrum between productivist and protectionist values (discussed in Chapter 5). Many of the participants discussed their views
in ways that emphasised multiple affiliations with various interest groups and these reflected various social, cultural, economic and environmental interests. Overall, it was clear that complex values dimensions contributed to individual discourses and worldviews.

**Secondary sources: Background documents and media coverage**

A broad range of secondary material is readily available in the form of open access to media coverage and institutional documents. Such documents and coverage all contribute to the broader mainstream perceptions and ‘lived’ high country discourses. Media publications, non-peer-reviewed books and institutional documents are useful, providing the ability to avoid an over reliance on interview material as the primary data source for the study.

The use of media discourse provided a useful tool at the beginning of the thesis in order to frame the perceived duality between protection and production interest. Dow Jones ‘FACTIVA’ was used initially. The last 15 years of relevant media coverage was downloaded, read and coded thematically for key issues and perceptive material related to the place of conservation and production in the high country landscape. This was a useful initial approach that allowed an in-depth coverage of how issues had evolved during the time period of 1998 to 2013. Further, throughout the duration of the research, coverage of nationwide and Canterbury regional, agricultural newspapers including ‘Straight Furrow’, ‘Courier Country’ and ‘Farmers Weekly’, was informative in terms of the evolution of on-going high country management issues.

Particularly within media coverage, however, there exist inconsistencies between what was said and done ‘in-situ’ and what is subsequently published, and often a media approach focuses on a particular element or line of debate within a broader story (Woodack and Meyer, 2009; Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). Therefore, using media and institutional publications as secondary sources requires that critical ability of the researcher, who actively takes a call on the validity and reliability of material, and therefore, the approach is open to subjectivities. Similar to the analytical scrutiny applied to interview material, the use of all secondary qualitative material was approached methodically and in a rigorous manner.

Media material is used throughout the thesis to highlight positions within the debate, as a prelude to a deeper analytical discussion. Institutional material from sources, such as Land Information New Zealand, DOC and the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, are used as a tool to cross-examine primary interview data.
4.7 Rounding off

Overall the chapter has integrated together the various elements of the theoretical and methodological rationale that underpin an innovative approach that seeks to examine the specificities of an individual local case study. In exploring theoretical rationale, a range of methods was identified for interpreting the social questions central to the research. Explaining the research approach has illustrated the theoretical movements and methodological rationale behind the use of the chosen social research methods. The research approach borrows and expands upon the strengths of each method selected as the most useful for interpreting the complex range of issues and social dynamics within the selected context. Integrating various elements of the theoretical and methodological framework together in this way has begun weaving together an interpretive bricolage, which extends to inform the analysis within the remainder of the thesis.
5.0 Introduction

The previous chapter sought to ground the research strategy in the embodied and negotiated knowledge practices of people’s everyday lives. Where, as Relph (1991: 100) asserts, “in a postmodern world it is recognised that localities are not isolated; they are where individuals live out everyday tasks and every day, working and community lives”. The methodological stance reflects Bourdieu’s second and third principles, highlighting the systematic examination of habitus and positions on the field (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2007). Similarly, scholars like Murdoch and Pratt (1993) Zimmerer (2006, 2000), Thrift (2008, 2000) and Ingold (2011, 2000), emphasise the need to move away from theoretical abstraction and ground research in localised negotiations of ideology and values.

The following chapter examines the complex, multi-dimensional ways that interview participants related to and valued local space and nature, and subsequently, how values and ideology influenced attitudes towards tenure review. Section 5.1, with use of a diagram, analyses the composite dimensions of ‘plural’ values that emerged from interviews with the 84 participants. Values included social, economic and environmental dimensions, which have been packaged into typologies and are examined methodically (between Section 5.1.2 and 5.1.4). While I emphasise that these categories are not discrete and were not conceptualised mutually exclusively in the worldviews of most participants, undertaking this analysis offers insight into how participants’ advocated plural aspects of ‘the landscape’, in different relational ways. Examining these partial concepts of ‘social space’ that draw on various environmental, social and economic values and justifications, highlights the way different meanings are political and contested. They challenge static understandings of space and dualistic identities.

The chapter then moves to address how various values dimensions and typologies were intertwined within individual participant worldviews (Section 5.2). The way individuals negotiated personal attitudes and values, was interesting in terms of conceptualising ‘the community’. The majority of participants (‘productionist’ and ‘protectionist’) are located midway on the heuristic spectrum between productivist and protectionist values. However, subgroups of participants were more uncompromisingly ecologically or production centred. In section 5.3 it is suggested that the mid-range
positioning of the cross-section of participants’ relates to a strong refutation of the premise of division within tenure review. Many participants argued that dividing between production values and ecological protection values was a destructive and illogical premise in a landscape that has historically been integrated under the mode of State controlled, expansive leasehold tenure. It is suggested that division, between ‘production’ and ‘protection’, overlooks alternative values for space, as a hybrid social nature and ‘cultural landscape’ (Greider and Garkovich, 1994; Olwig, 2007; 2006). Hence, tenure review might be considered to entrench a more firmly neoliberal and constraining land ideology in the high country, by advancing privatised freehold title to previous lessees and restricted access to a State controlled ‘conservation commons’.

Positioning the current chapter in the broader progression of the thesis, the dimension of Figure 1.3 applied to the current chapter is provided in Applications Box 5.1. The critical emphasis within this chapter is on acknowledging epistemological pluralism and the hybridity of the high country, as a social space. Critiquing the duality constructed between production and protection links intricately with Chapter 6 and 7, where each contributes to extending a different aspect of the ‘deconstructive phase’ to the thesis. The constructionist and Bourdieusian lenses are applied to critique the assumptions encompassed within the narrow logic, split methodology and obfuscating rhetoric of ‘balance’ that surrounded tenure review (see Chapter 2). However, acknowledging pluralism and hybridity within the current chapter, also provides a ‘reconstructive’ potential, where in Chapter 8 I reengage with epistemic pluralism to examine the possibilities for a less dualistic landscape politics.

**Applications Box 5.1: Applying Social Constructionism**

Dualistic thinking fuelled tenure review as a ‘policy solution’ that sought to divide and bound significant inherent values away from production. Media and public discourse often represents the debate and relations between conservation and farming as inflamed on the basis of oppositional and incommensurable values and objectives for the high country.

Analysing the plural values and attitudes of farming and conservationist participants involved with negotiating localised space, complicates the dualism. Plural meanings and attitudes come to the fore of investigation, progressing the overall thesis argument emphasising the ‘hybridity’ of the high country as a complex, multi-layered social space.
Chapter Five: Interrogating Constructed Dualisms

5.1 Typologies emerging from the analysis of ‘placed values’

In earlier chapters I examined how coverage of high country land management and tenure review at times depicts confrontation between divergent production and protection interests. However, in this section I begin examining the complexities of participant ‘values’ and the intensely local, ‘embodied’ negotiation of worldview and attitude. Understanding the various typologies of values that are advocated by members of farming and conservation communities within a defined locality assists a critical examination of tenure review as a dualistic process of reform.

The complexity and richness of insight that participants exposed me to as they reflected deeply on their position within the social field was astounding. Conducting interviews, one-on-one with participants, unearthed diverse concepts and values for space, as well as shared vision between people living and working in protection and production capacities within the study region. To begin the chapter, I suggest that such diversity and common ground is often overlooked when abstracted into broader, generalised political and media understandings. Surrounding high country management, these macro-level representations often focus on clash between interests in conflicted areas like the Mackenzie Basin, with terms like “stymie” and “extremists” used evocatively in the media (see: Bruce, 2010; Littlewood, 2010a). As argued in Chapter 2, academic portrayal by Brower (2006; 2008) also did not challenge the dualistic ideology of tenure review, and as a consequence inflamed rhetoric with her work becoming a divisive critique.

During interviews participants were questioned about their values for the high country and understandings of its ‘conservation’ and tenure review. Examining values held by participants allowed a vocalised lens into individual ideology and attitude. Within a post-structuralist framework, emphasising the situated nature of knowledge – values, ideology and attitudes, are understood as inherently partial and contingent on the relations of their production (Kruks, 2014; Nightingale, 2003; Katz, 1998; England, 1994; Harraway, 1991). Following constructionist scholarship (like Braun, 2008; 2006a; 2006b; 2005; Lorimer, 2012), this suggests epistemological pluralism, and that each ‘space’ is multiple,

103 These emotive terms come from the media coverage associated with the lead up to the Environmental Defence Society’s ‘symposium on the Mackenzie’ in November 2010. Prior to this event heated coverage suggested an ‘uneasy compromise’ between production and protection interests were being sought (Timaru Herald, 2010) after the event was labelled an “Imposition” by landholder and at the time vice president of Federated Farmers high country, Donald Aubrey (Bruce, 2010). In the wake of the symposium the media emphasis changed tack. There emerged a forescen need to open dialogue and negotiation between plural actors in the region – the initial emphasis of the symposium before it combusted into a media frenzy as rational, regional and local media papers latched onto the coinage of ‘Imposition’, distracting from the deeper gesture associated with the event.
representing an abundance of things to people who relate with and co-produce it. However, within a Bourdieusian framework, values, attitudes and ideology are also political and manifest with power. For as Bourdieu (2000) suggests, perceptual frames affect the agency of individuals to act in particular ways that conform with the normalised habitus and justified practices within a field or social space (See also: Bourdieu, 1990; Morris, 2009; Knight, Cowling and Campbell, 2006; Tsouvalis, 2000; Tsouvalis, Seymour and Watkins, 2000; Harré and Gillett, 1994). Examining the foundations of ‘affect’ as individuated allows a more sensitive assessment of the complex and interplaying values imbued upon the high country as a complex social-space and locus of contest. As an older landholder explained, “landscape is tricky, us farmers value it too … you know, just from a different position” (Male landholder 14); which recognises that the landscape is more than a natural and aesthetic backdrop, it is a lived and worked ‘humanised ecology’ (Ingold, 2000).

Transcripts obtained from interviews exposed an in-depth data set of value-laden attitudes. A method of ‘clustering values’ that emerged from thematic coding of interview material was used to create Figure 5.1. Values occurring within the 84 interviews were overlaid within the values dimension – social, economic or environmental, to which they occurred most prevalently. Economic and developmental values are separated, as some participants, while focused on ‘viability’ and economic values, were less developmentally motivated. Environmental values are broken into ecologically centred and aesthetically centred values, typologising differing conservation visions held by participants. Values situated in the overlapping borderlands between economic, environmental and social dimensions are values shared between the associated clusters. This approach provides a visual tool to assess the range of values that were drawn on by the participants as they negotiated their personal points of view on social space. The high country landscape is comprised of a varied overlay of significances.

As part of constructing Figure 5.1, the methodological decision was made to combine the values that emerged in analysis, of all participants from both production and conservation communities. From the outset of analysis, this approach sought not to discuss values originating from ‘conservationists’ and those from ‘farmers’, or particular groups such as DOC or Fish and Game, as preconceived grouped identities and categories within the national discourse. Having worked for DOC, I understood that political

---

104 For example, in her analysis McFarlane (2011) grouped and analysed the positions of ‘Forest and Bird’, ‘landholders’, ‘Fish and Game’, ‘DOC’ and LINZ in relation to tenure review in the high country. While McFarlane’s analysis was thorough, it did not challenge the identities of these groups. I thematically grouped
identity and the macro-level representation of an organisation like DOC, or Federated Farmers, is diluted with focusing on individuals. Employment with DOC or affiliation to an organisation like Federated Farmers, is influential on habitus, but it is only one aspect of a composite, individuated worldview. Reflexively, I acknowledged that while tension sometimes erupts, there is shared accord between individuals from assumed opposing interests, an argument that is supported by Memon and Wilson (2007), Adams, (2004) and Zimmerer, (2000). However, the politics of division with a process like tenure review may obscure common ground from view, facilitating a landgrab mentality in pursuit of environmental salvation from individualist economic interests (Corson and MacDonald, 2012; Adams, 2004). By undertaking the composite analysis, shared interest that emerged between preconceived groupings on the basis of dualistic categories could be highlighted.

As is examined in Section 5.2, the distinction between production and protection interests was frequently blurry. Approaching complexity and diversity of individual social meanings in thematic groups rather than preconceived ‘interest groups’ is an important aspect of the reflexive, methodological approach. I seek to untangle the complexity of duality conventions and ‘essentialised groupings’, which is expanded by looking at the ‘social dynamics’ and power relations between collectives, through division with tenure review, in chapters 6 and 7.

Figure 5.1, depicts diagrammatically the complexity and connections (rather than ‘overlaps’ which has a single dimensional connotation, see Zimmerer, 2007) and interplay between social, economic and environmental values typologies, which were negotiated and discussed in diverse ways by all participants. Towards the centre of the diagram (Figure 5.1) are values discussed commonly by multiple participants from both ‘conservation’ and ‘farming’ groupings, again complicating the representations of conservation and farming identities in the national discourse. Further away from the centre are values most closely associated with the dimension in which they are located – social (and access), economic (and developmental), environmental (aesthetic and ecological) values. Development focused values justified a separate sphere from economic values for the reason that fewer participants shared a developmental vision for the high country, but many expressed value for economic security and social sustainability. Similarly, aesthetic/landscape centred and

all interview narratives to look at the subjectivities and sensitivities of individual worldview, and sought comparisons across stakeholder groups. This sought to identify shared values and common accord, rather than placing the positions of individuals into the preconceived identities of their ‘actor groups’ to whom they were affiliated. For within these groups, I understood there to exist internal complexities and rifts.
ecologically focused valuations are represented distinctly. Although there existed overlap between people who explained both aesthetic and ecological aspects, participants most frequently focused more towards either, aesthetic or ecological valuations of space (explained below, Section 5.1.4). Such assessments had particular implications on the assemblage of socio-ecological relations and for proposed interventions in the landscape to influence ‘social nature’ in specific trajectories of ‘becoming’ (Massey, 1999). Access values are also separated from social values, as such values were shared by a range of participants, with a number of landholders appreciating the aspect of sharing the cultural history of properties with visitors, and the people interactions that the high country position and identity entails. Such alternative values motivated tourism diversifications and farm stays in several cases, which supported arguments against the division logic within tenure review, discussed in later sections within the chapter.

Some landholder perspectives’ were oriented towards productivist goals of profit, efficiency, increased production and growth (Rosin, 2013; Burton, 2011, 2004a; Burton et al., 2008). Equally, however, this was matched by valuations motivated by social and environmentally centred attitudes. Frequently landholders explained values for economic, environmental and social dimensions of high country space, with varied emphasis on each, which highlighted complexity and overlapping between economic, social, cultural and environmental value dimensions. However, some conservation participants’ stated values focused firmly on ecology and landscape aspects of the high country. In the following sections I examine each composite value typology outlined. This works with the presumption that perspectives directly influence habitus (Bourdieu, 2000; Grenfell, 2008a), and assembled meanings of the high country as a multi-layered space (Ingold, 2011, 2000, 1993; Stephenson, 2010; 2008). Examining participant discourse, I illustrate how various socio-ecological assemblages emerge from different values based constructs of social-nature (Lorimer, 2012), identifying the importance of attending to the partial ideological frames by which participants give meaning to high country space. This argument extends the need to examine the plural claims of participants, to understand all knowledge as situated and partial recognising the call of post-structural scholars (like Katz, 2001;1998).

105 The examination of social spatial becoming by Massey (1999) resonates with Deleuze and Guattari’s (1988) description of ‘events’ and ‘becomings’ (see: Lambert, 2006). Massey’s corpus has been focused on illuminating how space and place are processes, under constant social-material production (both capitalistic and social-semiotic).
Figure 5.1: Simplified overviews of value typologies.
5.2 **Social imprints and cultural values – “there’s no going back”**.

To begin, a sample of insightful quotations are provided in Table 5.1, clustered around primary themes identified in coding analysis of social and cultural values for high country space. Prominent themes of coding included: value for the mode of *traditional pastoralism*, the *uniqueness and distinctiveness* of the cultural landscape, as a historically pastoral space; *sense of place, family and historical connections, knowledge, community and relationships*; the *lifestyle and the way of life* attached to high country space and the *diversity* of space and landscapes.

**Maintaining the pastoral mode**

The traditional mode of pastoralism, its unique history and modifications to the landscape emerged as prominent values with most landholders and several conservation interests empathic towards high country farmers. Many informants considered pastoralism to have an important cultural imprint that is telling of the high country as a transitional social space.

Intervention in the landscape under such schemes of valuation poses a nostalgic attraction to retaining pasturage; understood as “low intensity” (see quotations 1 to 7 Box 1, Appendix 4a) and a ‘custodial’ mode of tenure (quotations 1 - 6, Box 2, Appendix 4a), which is “in-keeping” (participant 42) and “less obviously modified” (participant 17), compared to alternative, more intensively productivist modes. Retaining the socio-spatial/ecological relationships that had created and retained a homogenous landscape form and its “landscape integrity” (Forest and Bird Adv. 1), was understood to be an assemblage of nature and society relations that holds social, cultural and lived values. However, agreement around whether this was a matter of custodianship was a focus of tension associated with competing values and protection logic (See Box 1, Appendix 4a).

The traditional mode was also perceived as under transformation with pressure from economic forcings – and understood an ‘out-dated’ production system in several examples. Tenure review along with the increasing flexibility of the Pastoral Lease regulations under the CPLA 1998 underlay a transforming production system. A number of social valuations underpinned nostalgic and evocative valuations for a pastoral mode. A selection of such participant insight is displayed in table 5.1 and discussed in the following subsections.

---

106 A number of participants gave examples of where the flexibility of the CPLA (1998) was allowing for intensive development on pastoral lease land, indicating a broader state impetus to free up all high country land for production.
Table 5.1: A collection of quotations that arose within participant narrative, depicting aspects of social and cultural values for high country space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Pastoralism</th>
<th>1. The land works with farming (Male Landholder 5).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. … farming is a naturalised part of the high country landscape. It’s like trout and salmon in the rivers, they have value but they are not indigenous (Female Landholder 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. It is a uniquely pastoral landscape … those 160 years of farming can’t be taken away . . . there’s no going back (ibid.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness, distinctiveness</td>
<td>4. … the uniqueness of the farming and the historical continuity that it has it is point of difference. It is the story that is our point of strength (Male Landholder 16).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. I value the cultural heritage, the story of high country farming its distinctiveness to New Zealand, its special (Landscape architect 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of place, historical and family connections</td>
<td>6. … family connections and history are really important. I mean our family have farmed here for four generations now. There is a family connection which we are really keen to maintain (Female Landholder 8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. There’s a passion for the land up here, for family farmers the station isn’t really seen as an asset just to be traded, for most families it has a deeper sense of identity… but to stay here we must make dollars (Male Landholder 12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Conservation is part of the heritage of the place, it was an aspect of the pastoral lease… it adds [economic] value (Liaison 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge, Community and relationships</td>
<td>9. (a.) … the thing with the high country is the resource in the people who live there. They are well educated and informed and generally open to advice (Male Landholder 8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b.) … the community up here, there are heaps of amazing people. Tough and resourceful, many have had a gutsful though (Male Landholder 15).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. There is a huge community ethic in the high country, we are all connected and have always talked to each other and supported each other (Female Landholder 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. It’s a collective culture that is self-sustaining (DOC Manager 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle and ‘way of life’</td>
<td>12. We have got to stick with farming it’s what we are all interested in and good at … The stock and the property are important to me. It has been a way of life for me for 30 years and my father and grandfather before (Male Landholder 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. I think that we have a very flash lifestyle, we don’t have a lot in the way of free cash and gadgets, it isn’t a wealthy lifestyle, but where we live, we can afford to go skiing, we live in a beautiful place and my kids appreciate the nature that is all around us (Female Landholder 7).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“The land works with farming”

Sample quotations in Table 5.1 illustrate landholders defending pastoralism on the basis of the land “working with farming” (Male Landholder 5) argued by an older generational landholder; and farming as “intrinsic” and “naturalised” within the high country landscape (Female Landholder 4); a cultural imprint that “can’t be taken away” (ibid.).

Uniqueness and distinctiveness

All farming participants and a number of local conservation participants raised ideas of cultural history and significance attached to low intensity pastoralism. The pastoral landscape and the cultural stories held within this space were valued and at times tied deeply to notions of identity and nationalism (refer to the sample of participants insights in Appendix 4a, Box 3). However, relational tensions emerged surrounding the idea of a singular ‘landscape character’ that arguably should be retained as a static (a point made clear in Chapter 2 and 3). The pastoral lease was perceived a distinctive mode of farming compared to other agro-systems globally and in New Zealand. Importantly, it is a mode of production that through expansive grazing has created a distinctive and homogenous landscape character, the complexities of which are examined in Section 5.1.4).
Chapter Five: Interrogating Constructed Dualisms

Sense of place, historical and family connections

Pastoral heritage provided a sense of place and “being part of the high country” (Female Landholder 3), its landscape and the community. Attitudes expressed in Table 5.1 (quotations 6, 7, 8) illustrate value for the human labour in the “landscape character”, which in some accounts was expressed as a static essence to “the landscape”, represented as singular.

Numerous landholder participants expressed the lived stories and histories of different properties and the connection of people to ‘family runs’. But also, five conservation participants referred to the multi-generational histories of connection some families held with stations; inferring both an ethos of care and also a vested interest in the economic success of properties. The quality and type of products (originally wool and meat, but now diversifications like tourism with game estates (Figgins and Holland, 2012)), the history of ‘sustainability’ for a particular family/property and the cultural myths associated with specific runs were attached to identity. This was especially the case on prominent properties, such as Mesopotamia, Mt Peel, Erewhon and Castle Hill, where pastoral history was intrinsic to their ‘story’ and contemporary constitution. Dominy (2003) expands these insights into connections, her study focused on grass, the production of wool from that grass, connections with farmer subjectivities, and national and global interconnections of production and social meaning. Such recognition has importance in Chapter 6 where following tenure review and the division of the landscape, properties are smaller (refer to ArcGIS Map in Chapter 6, Fig. 6.1). The pastoral heritage and the network connections, both social and economic, reliant on growing grass for pastoralism are changing (Dominy, 2001).

Many landholders related to “deep seated connections” (Female Landholder 6), family passions and “love for the land” (Male Landholder 17). The feelings of several long-term ‘high country people’ affirmed how the high country landscape and pastoral mode has had a profound impact on them and perceptions of farming in New Zealand. Several voiced sadness about the intensification of land use in the Mackenzie Basin, explaining it to be an “inappropriate use of land and water” (Male Landholder 10), but qualifying that “it’s not like that around here” (ibid.) referring to the case study region. Similarly, a landscape architect who had been bought up in the high country stated how the landscape had “shaped [her], it is who I am, I am passionate about its landscape and community, its ecology, its farming, and I love merinos” (Landscape architect 1). The participant highlights that even though she now lives distant from the space of her upbringing, the
landscape remained significant to her. Interestingly, the participant integrated both ecological and social elements of the landscape into a socialised attitude towards high country space.

The sense of passion for properties emerges in both example quotations (6 and 8) in Table 5.1. However, each is buttressed against an appeal for social and economic sustainability. Importantly, the pastoral mode and the co-production of the landscape are attached to a ‘habitus’ that in some instances is transforming. This is an argument that in Chapter 6 is developed in detail, associated with perceptions of pastoralism as a custodial practice, and the subjectivity of protection as a concept.

Custodianship and resilience

The pastoral mode was imbricated by conservation and production informants with ideas of custodianship by the State retaining the production under centralised regulative control. For this reason, representing the feelings of other landholders, one lessee stated the high country community as being “streets ahead” (Female Landholder 6) of other farming models and low land production systems in terms of commitment to an ethos of environmental protection. The pastoral lease represented a forward thinking tenure approach, legislating shared interest between the state and landholders with emphasis on land management.

Connections to properties and identity were frequently evoked around perceived contributions of custodianship, stewardship and protection, with leaseholders required to live on and manage properties. The argument that “conservation is part of the heritage of the region” (See Quotation 8, Table 5.1) reiterates the perspective of several landholders, and touches on concepts of landholder custodianship. Ideas of custodianship were a very prominent theme of discussion and value within diverse participant interviews. However, to do justice to the complexities of landholder custodianship as a highly contested concept, it is only referred to briefly at this point and then examined deeply as the theme central to analysis in Chapter 6.

In this example, the elder female landholder argued in comparison to the Canterbury Plains farming system, asserting the reason that conservationists are interested in the high country is that the pastoral system has retained values. She states; “there’s nothing left that’s worth fighting over [on the Canterbury Plains]” (Female landholder 6). A second participant related to how a French woman who came to lead discussions on the Rangitata Basin becoming a UNESCO heritage site stated; “if this were France I would pay you to stay here and manage these lands” (Male Landholder 8).
As the examples provided in Box 2 Appendix 4a, it was interesting how many participants working for DOC and other protection organisations were sympathetic to farmers and their position in the landscape, and therefore, supported ideas of landholder custodianship. Interestingly, this understanding challenges dualist political identities of ‘conservationist’ and ‘farmer’. Affirmation of the sense of connection to properties (Identified in Appendix 4a) came from several arguments that understood ‘the Stations’ as more than a tradable asset, which was a perception they felt national representations alleged, such as the critique of Brower (2006a). Rather, many landholder participants and some conservation interests noted that high country stations are intricately tied with family history and identities, and the context of family struggles and successes. For example, an independent liaison between LINZ, DOC and lessees during tenure review argued that “at times you couldn’t give high country properties away...” (Tenure review liaison 1), indicating that pastoral leaseholds have not always been valuable for amenity reasons, were not easily saleable and at times families felt trapped on properties. The participant engaged a discourse of resilience when he referred to the 1980s and early 1990s, when as he noted high country farming was on “the bones of its arse” (ibid.) and many properties were becoming insolvent due to market strains following neo-liberalisation. However, he considered that the collective memory and public recognition of these extremely difficult times has dimmed in place of a ‘politics of envy’ associated with greedy farmer rhetoric within tenure review coverage. In particular, the participant’s perspective illustrated how many farming participants understood they had withstood political-economic and environmental flux and periods of downturn, which led some farmers seeking to optimise tenure review outcomes. Linking into the economic values typology below, resilience and commitment came through as strong themes, with many farmers having faced economic hardship.

Several leaseholders argued that focusing on the boom in the last 20 years from distance denied understanding the trials of years previous. Therefore, there was an understanding that productivity must be maximised, one participant stating “we’ve got to make hay while the sun shines, cause you never know when it’ll slump” (Male Landholder 4), illustrative of how the unpredictable economic mode was dialectically intertwined with productive habitus. The social narrative of resilience contributed to the identity of ‘a property’, and often pride in the succession of those who farmed it. Resilience was broadened out and applied to concepts of the high country community.
Knowledge, community and relationships

All landholders and managers identified themselves with ‘their properties’, and many, expressed longevity of connections, which underpinned a tacit place based knowledge accumulated from living upon and working specific properties and confronting change. Meanings and identity were tied to notions of ‘the pioneering heritage’, and a sense that landholders under the pastoral lease “learned to live within the environment” (Tenure review liaison 2). To not farm within the environmental constraints led to economic and environmental failure, in the view of many informants (this is a debate analysed in Chapter 6). ‘Placed’ knowledge was grounded in understandings of the landscape from embodiment ‘within it’ rather than passing through it (Ingold, 1993).

Connections between families and their placed histories were referred to frequently by 11 landholders, indicating value for the community ethos associated with the high country region, inferred as an aspect of the pastoral mode. In Table 5.1, the sample of participant insight (quotations 8 and 9) illustrates an understanding of the farming community as a well-educated resource, adaptable, supportive of one another and ‘open to new ways of doing’. DOC Manager 4 stated the notion of ‘self-sustaining collective culture’, in a complementary way, suggestive of community connections. However, the ideas of “self-sustaining collective culture” is contested in a Bourdieusian frame, where collectives form around shared habitus that accumulates capital that may be used defensively. Examining participant narratives, three ‘conservation’ participants highlighted arguments analogous to Bourdieu’s interpretation. Self-reinforcement was represented as a “closed mindedness” and the “stubborn production focus” of the farming community (DOC manager 3 and DOC employee 1 respectively). Farming practice / productivist habitus was self-reinforcing, in the sense that “farmers communicate and socialise with each other” argued DOC employee 1, and therefore perpetuate farming practices, which in his opinion have “been proven destructive” (ibid.).

Other participants suggested that collective connections within and between the communities and passions for properties that remain, with focused effort and a non-attacking stance, could be channelled in a way that is transformative of habitus; expanding and reintegrating divergent knowledge cultures through social learning and dialogue (Tsouvalis, 2000; Tsouvalis, Seymour and Watkins, 2000; Morris, 2009). Importantly, these

---

108 Such a perspective links integrally to Bourdieu’s conceptualisation of the social reinforcement and continuation of habitus and practices associated with acceptability and affiliation to particular social groups (Bourdieu, 2001; 1998, and extended in the New Zealand dairying context by Jay, 2004).
insights connect with the subsequent analysis in Chapters 6, 7 and 8, which look deeply at division between production and protection values with tenure review.

Lifestyle

Lifestyle was discussed in contested ways. Three sample quotations in Fig. 5.1 illustrate this with different attitudinal dimensions of lifestyle emerging from varied lived realities. Male landholder 4 (quotation 12) outlines farming lifestyle as a ‘way of life’, a productivist self-definition and historically connected vocation – a way of knowing the high country through its production. Whereas, the following participant (Female Landholder 7) exemplifies concepts reiterated by other participants who indicated the distinctiveness of the pastoral lifestyle, “so unlike city life”, where one lives “close to nature” (ibid.). Female landholder 7, believed her family’s lifestyle as not wealthy, but rich in ways that people in urban centres envy. The participant’s perspective was that traditionally, the scale of the high country run provided the flexibility to “make a crust” (ibid.); which reiterated the understandings of many other landholders who explained how spatial scale and geographical location was such a significant determinant of economic success under the pastoral lease (an argument engaged with in Chapter 6). In the example of Female Landholder 7, living on a small property on relatively low altitude and high fertility flat country, she considered how her husband’s decision making was increasingly pressured by the imperative to intensify. On the property this concentration on the flat lands had been on-going since the 1960s with the retirement of ‘the tops’ for soil conserv (McCaskill, 1969; 1973). Such scale transformation was a precursor to potential impacts from tenure review.

The insight into ‘lifestyle’ provided by quotation 14 (Table 5.1), suggests a distinctly different relational experience of high country space. The perspective highlights the lived reality of an urban newcomer to the region. Her impressions of ‘lifestyle’ had changed. When she lived in Auckland she saw only the mystique of the high country, but since moving she had developed a more practical perspective. Owning a small, high altitude property with her husband, she explained how they had “haemorrhaged between 80 and 150 k a year” since arriving in 2004, and money from her previous city career and inheritance had braced these loses. She was not alone in her reservations towards the glamorisation of ‘the high country lifestyle’. However, the newcomer perceived that there

---

109 The participants clarified the term haemorrhaged to mean “made losses” of the stated amounts, which she understood as “ridiculous”, and argued that high country properties should be able to make a profit.
was an alleged public idea that “more land means more money” (Newcomer landholder 1). Therefore, the public believe that because high country properties are often large, they are extremely productive and profitable. For this reason, she rejected a perceived assumption that lessees “are rich” (ibid.) and that excess funds should go towards conservation.

In various other examples lifestyle was often discussed in a way that sought to reconcile how the ‘urban other’ perceived the high country farmer. Female Participant 10, who grew up in Southland made clear this aspect of lifestyle, emphasising how a historical representation of high country lessees continues today. Akin with the analysis of Eldred-Grigg (1981), the participant stated:

… the public have always understood the high country as gentry. When I was growing up, they were always in flash vehicles, … all about Range Rovers and Landcruisers, private schools … back in the day, when my father was slogging on the lowlands, in the high country you put the sheep out to the tops and headed off, gallivanting around town.

However, other participants understood this dimension as not “the general” today (Newcomer Landholder 1). It was perceived in many cases that urban people and conservationists did not understand the challenges of having a livelihood reliant on a climatic and economic system widely acknowledged for flux.110 For landholders, especially on small properties or those marginal environmentally,111 the past 20 years was understood to have been variable, but “extremely tricky” (Male landholder 4) economically in many examples. For example, focusing on properties such as Minarets Station on the edge of Lake Wanaka, the successes of Tim Wallis (who was a deer industry pioneer and ‘broke in’ Minarets Station, establishing it as a continuing success with the entrepreneurship of the next generation) and other such prosperous stories often the focus of cultural veneration, were perceived at times to betray histories of harsh social and economic realities from other properties. Traditionally, such tales were embodied in notions of resilience and weathering adversity, tied to farmer subjectivities and stoicism represented in concepts of identity (Dominy, 2001; Morris, 2009). Importantly, all of these ideas suggest disagreement

110 Being sensitive to local complexities, if to retain a property under pastoral lease more land represented higher expenses, higher rental but incrementally higher productive capacity depending on variables such as altitude, climate and soil quality. The capacity to diversify, intensify or the amenity value of properties were understood as the most economically valuable attributes to a property, and were held in the capacity of tenure review to freehold land or restrictions of the CPLA 1998.

111 Environmentally marginal properties were understood as the leases of high drought proneness, high altitude and therefore, short seasonality between winter and summer, which constrained the growing season for pastoral grasses. This is a discussion returned to in Chapter 6.
between how landholder participants perceived themselves to be understood nationally in contemporary representations, and the ‘way of life’ that they actually experienced in the high country.

Brower’s (2006) argument regarding how lessees, conceived of as social elites, worked through a captured bureaucracy to exploit benefit from tenure review, was challenged by several participants. Brower (2006) was understood to have not examined the grapples for control that underpinned tenure review, but her views intensified an existing resentment for what lessees were assumed entitled to in public discourse. DOC manager 3 also rejected some aspects of Brower’s argument, asserting that “you really can’t generalise about any of the properties and tenure reviews, all of the properties are so diverse” (DOC manager 3). To the manager, the challenges of tenure reviews he had involvement with, illustrated the incredible difficulty associated with the premise of division to maintain economic and social viability, while separating natural values. Division became the focus of politicisation and power play he argued, not a premeditated motivation for farmers to capture the process.

In broad terms, DOC manager 3, considered how about one third of high country properties are ‘premium’, in terms of production development, diversification and amenity potential (examples included, Minarets, Dingleburn, Alphaburn Stations around Wanaka and Mt Peel Station in the study region). Another third are properties that have typically fluctuated just above the profitability line, prosperous when meat and wool is buoyant but struggling with market slumps. The other third are properties that ordinarily have struggled to retain viability, often due to climate and location, and/or major historical issues with rabbits and now *hieracium pilosella* and wilding pines (Ledgard and Norton, 2008; Peden, 2011; 2011a). They are often properties that are high, dry, cold or small, and have remained reliant on the flux of markets and restrictions of the pastoral lease regulations. Due to this, these properties are often debt encumbered. Tenure review therefore offered ‘freehold benefits’ – freeing up capital for development and removing regulations to encourage diversification.

---

112 Exceptions include remuneration received by the lessees of Mt Peel Station and Mesopotamia Station (see Chapter 1 and Chapter 7). Landholders frequently rejected division, but the situation became about “taking the money and running” (Male Landholder 4) for it provided economic security and insulation from political flux. Attention was drawn to the amount of state funding that went into Nature Heritage Fund purchases of Clent Hills, Mt Possession and Barossa Station’s for the Hakatere Conservation Park, but because such conservation accumulation was less struggled over it had lower political and media focus.
The assertion I make, is that understandings in the national discourse are often drawn from leases conceived of as ‘premium’, holding high national prominence, but forget properties less fortunate in terms ‘natural’ assets and capacity to capitalise on amenity and production potentials. Under the Land Act 1948 and leasehold system, these ‘marginal’ properties were held under Marginal Lands Leases, which were argued a much more sensitive way of managing lower viability properties (Male Landholder 32; and pers. comm. Aaron Radford 5/6/2014). Often participants from ‘high, dry, small and cold’ properties were critical of the vagarious notion of lifestyle and sustaining a viable high country landscape and pastoral industry was more prominent on their agenda.

Diversity
Different nostalgic constructs were critical to participant ideas of the high country landscape, attaching social identities to fundamental, static notions of space. The way of life, the imagery, ‘the yarns’, both folklore and actual of run-holders, pastoral history and connections to the land, are each significant aspects of the high country as a cultural landscape and are defended (Dominy, 2001). Keeping these meanings relevant and alive is suggested by Dominy (2001) to provide a challenge to modernity and the standardisation of landscape. Massey (2005) however, suggests how nostalgia for an objectified spatial identity is often mobilised to avoid or discursively cover contemporary complexities occurring in the emergence of social spaces. Harvey (2007; 2005; 2000) asserts the worst, or most dangerous concepts of space are those that are wrapped up in an image or façade that allows for inequitable neoliberal orders to entrench. Each example of a theoretical vignette attaches how social-spatial diversity, changing and diverse landscapes, which were important to a subsection of participants, may be thought of conceptually.

Mentioned above, the cultural imprint of traditional pastoralism was often accepted and at times celebrated, as a layer of cultural meaning – pastoralism “fits within the landscape” (DOC employee 2) and did not “devalue it” (Male landholder 4). However, landholders emphasised the diversity of landscape was important, for it illustrated new social context and landscape patterns. For example, in the range of participant insights (quotations 15, 16, 17 and 18, Table 5.1) value for ‘diversity’, also justified a particular rationalisation of change to space, articulated as value for the “people aspects” of the landscape as a place rich in changing social context. While several of the perspectives selected border on developmental visions (see Figure 5.1 and Section 5.3 below), a core of more immoderate individuals explained excitement for human transformation and
intensified use. These participants highlight a particular, local concept of change and diversity that provides a vitalist understanding of the dialectical relationship between local society and nature (see quotation 18), which within an eco-centric episteme may be considered destructive (Robinson, 2011). This more economistic vision for high country space, provides a smooth segue into examining economic values prominent in interview material.

5.3 Economic values: Viability, security and social sustainability

The complex range of economic values illustrated in Figure 5.1 is grouped around the economic themes of viability and security in Table 5.2 below. Participants who appealed to moderate economic aspirations tended to advocate the traditional mode of pastoralism be retained. Scale especially was understood to be an important aspect of the pastoral lease’s viability and conservation and farming participants perceived the pastoral lease regularly as a less exploitative agro-system; a habitus based socio-natural assemblage that interview analysis highlighted as distinct from developmental aspirations (separated in Figure 5.1 and analysed in the subsequent section).

Table 5.2: A table of illustrative quotations clustered around the core economic values themes of political, economic and environmental security.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viability and Security</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political security – value for stable and informed policy</strong></td>
<td>1. The alternative to tenure review was not knowing what the rentals and policy situation would be … the uncertainty, the instability of government was really scary and uncomfortable (Male Landholder 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. National will only be in for so long and Labour will be back to turn it upside down again (Male Landholder 7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Lessees were being pushed and squeezed by the [Labour] government to enter tenure review (DOC Manager 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. …we were asking for secure tenure, we couldn’t keep farming with such unpredictable rents, merino values were low all sorts of things were against us (Male Landholder 13).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Tenure review personally for us was about security . . . and freehold achieved the stability for us to be flexible… to diversify, to be entrepreneurial and it also gave us capital (Male Landholder 12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. …why us farmers went into it was for security, it gave our families options. When I argued that we should have kept the pastoral leases, I am arguing from</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>168</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a national perspective for landscape values, not the situation we found ourselves in (Male Landholder 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tenure review was about getting away from politics, providing options and security (Male Landholder 11).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. … it [tenure review/freehold] has given us long term security and the ability to plan for succession, my son can now do different things (Male landholder 18).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. … tenure review was a matter of looking for other options under a very insecure economic situation that has always been pretty marginal because of where these properties are … the environment (Male Landholder 7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It doesn’t matter what we do, it is really difficult to make a profit, we might one year but it certainly won’t cover six dismal years, drawings and borrowings … Last year [2013] we lost many lambs with the snow (Female Landholder 10).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I mean last year we had nor-west winds stripping the soil moisture, this year in summer there was so much rain, it was taking the soil down through the streams and was blowing out all the culverts and flood protection everywhere. Then we had early snow and it’s really difficult to watch when there is four feet of snow and wee lambs being born (Recent landholder 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. … when you do have a reasonable year [climatically] you get a bad pay back for your lambs. It can be very high risk and insecure economically (Female landholder 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I think that the Arthurs and Porter’s Pass runs have always been very difficult to make a living from. They are very high in most cases. Ours is a relatively small run in a harsh place. It certainly hasn’t been all beer and skittles, the incomes that have been earned from these properties (Male Landholder 17).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. … with meat and wool, it used to be quite spikey, you’d have times when if you were paying your bills you were doing ok, and then for a couple of years you’d be absolutely killing it. But now it is just fluctuations slightly above and below the bottom line. That will happen with globalisation (DOC Manager 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Freeing from debt burden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a.) …one huge positive of tenure review was that it allowed us to free ourselves from a debt burden that has been a problem since my dad bought in (Male Landholder 18).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b.) … tenure review freed up some capital so that the farmer could develop an irrigation system and provide some strength to a farm that is smaller after tenure review (Male landholder 15).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c.) Tenure review reduced the carrying capacity of some properties quite significantly, however, it also reduced the debt burden of some of the families (DOC Manager 3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Political security

Security of tenure and insulation from political and economic flux were recurring themes of value and concern, and the most frequently stated motivator in volunteering for tenure review (examples provided include quotations 1 to 8 in Fig. 5.3). Many participants raised issues associated with evolving political policies with incumbent governments. For example, lessees were concerned with the flux of the rental system, exemplified by quotation 3 (a discussion revisited in Chapter 7). Several conservation participants were sympathetic about this insecurity associated with the pastoral lease. A number of conservation and production participants were scathing of how political interests in tenure review had such bearing on the process. For instance, tenure review had stagnated by the late 1990s. Then, increased impetus came from political pressure to advance the process of division, focused on the Labour government’s ambition for establishing a ‘Six Pack’ of grasslands parks, under Prime Minister Helen Clark who was a keen conservation supporter (see: Armstrong et al., 2008; Cabinet Business Committee, 2007a, 2007b; 2003; Cabinet Policy Committee, 2005; 2003; Cabinet, 2004).

The process of review was perceived an on-going “tussle for control” (Male landholder 4), between the State and landholders as expectations from the process and political motivations transformed. It was seen by some conservation participants, who were wary of the current government’s policies, which tenure review has turned in the opposite direction with the election of National (Sage, 2012). For example, whereas under Labour, the conservation lobby had accumulated extensive areas of land through both tenure review and NHF purchases (supporting a modernist ideology of park accumulation), under National, the process of tenure review was perceived by participants to advantage leaseholders. This point was affirmed, when a DOC manager stated that the current government “just want to push the bloody process through” (DOC Manager 1, in reference to what he perceived as the attitude of Al Morrison, Director General of DOC at the time in 2012). Associated with this was also the dramatic change to social and public expectations of the process and perspectives of the high country landscape in the interim period chosen for analysis (between 1991 and 2012). Brower (2006a) was instrumental

113 Helen Clark was described on two occasions by leaseholders as “the Crimson bitch”, and then “Helen Mugabe”, after the Zimbabwean dictator referring to the perceived draconian conservation accumulation policies and ‘anti-farmer’ stance of the last Labour “regime” which was used in a negative sense that explicaded aversion to the Clark government’s high country policies.

114 Several participants explained that depending on when a property was volunteered for and completed tenure review during this period, the outcomes of the process differed dramatically for lessees. Early in the process, the cash incentives of doing tenure review were not especially high. Whereas, the Labour
in this, facilitating what one landholder recognised as the “falling from grace” of leaseholders in public perceptions (Female Landholder 5). Another asserted, “she [Brower] slandered all farmers on the basis of the actions [and outcomes from tenure review] of a minority” (Male Landholder 13).

Participants who argued to retain the pastoral lease system tended to claim that the leasehold was a secure tenure, whereas, those who supported division, disagreed. Such a position holds a particular historicity with landholders seeking freehold as the most stable tenure and platform for investment. Security and threat also had a historical lineage associated with the fallout from neoliberal restructuring and the dramatic effect it had on high country farming (Le Heron and Roche, 1999; McFarlane, 2011). In some examples this underlay a severe distrust in the State, which is an issue discussed in depth is Chapter 7 with regard to tenure review. A prominent landholder discussed the complexity of the situation his family found themselves in when faced with tenure review; where in principle, he was opposed to the process of division and the “meaningless boundaries was worrying [to him]” (Male landholder 1). However, he along with many others argued that tenure review was all about security – “about drawing a line in the sand and telling the Crown where to sling their hook” (ibid.). A root of common concern and shared ground between local DOC and landholders emerged from discussion about political and economic security, which is described in Applications Box 5.2 below. Information around tensions with the DOC-centric conservation strategy, and the simultaneous idea of DOC as a centralised ‘scapegoat’ conservation organisation was highlighted by both landholders and conservation participants. It suggests a policy disjunction between the national level and those trying to reach solutions, build relationships and ‘make do’ within the local conservancy, focusing on shared understandings and effective relations that did exist.

Such informant insight suggests strong linkages to constructionist critique of conservation boundaries, which have the potential to alienate local communities from shared goals, understanding productive use and nature protection as incommensurable (Adams, 2004; Bryan, 2012; Zimmerer, 2010; 2007; 2000). Describing these tensions of bounding and estrangement associated with conservation strategy, also lays the foundation to analysis and discussion in Chapter 7. Analysing political insecurity, and its grounding in government were perceived as operating with an “open chequebook” of public money (Male landholder 4), on an ideology of preservation and extracting landholders from the landscape to further an ambition of a grasslands national park. More recently under National there was anecdotal evidence from participants that division has gone more in favour of landholders retaining production land as freehold for economic development.
competing, ideological claims links intricately to issues of economic and environmental security, which in the high country are regularly challenging. It is notable that insulation from political, environmental and therefore, economic insecurities were the primary values stated for motivating lessees into tenure review negotiations.

Applications Box 5.2: The insecurity of fluctuating strategy

Many participants highlighted that political expediency was problematic within tenure review, as the strategy of division was subject to fluctuating agendas. Politicisation of conservation objectives was also understood to drastically impact on the success of current conservation strategies in the high country, separate from tenure review.

Several landholders were empathetic towards DOC; expressing feeling sorry for local DOC employees for the way higher level strategy was chopped and changed as “Labour government supports conservation extravagantly” (Recent landholder 2), and subsequently “National cuts the conservation budgets austerely” (ibid.). The landholder reiterated feelings of many conservation staff that understood DOC, to be a ‘political scapegoat’ under constant change and budgetary constriction, suggesting a lack of higher level political will. For example, in relation to restructuring, which after a long period of uncertainty was finally implemented in 2013, DOC Manager 2 stated, “the government keeps us up in the air so we can’t plan … we can’t settle in because our goals are constantly moving”.

As a further aspect to this tension however, DOC’s divisive approach to ‘preservation’ focused on indigenous ecology was argued by a number of landholders to alienate them from protection. Several DOC and landholder participants suggested that the organisation since “falling out” (DOC manager 2) from the Department of Lands and Survey and the Forest Service in 1987, has struggled to obtain the support of the farming community. DOC’s objectives and identity is seen in opposition to production, unlike the Forest Service and Lands and Survey that shared joint conservation and production objectives. A prominent landscape ecologist asserted, “DOC have antagonised landholders up and down the country” (Grasslands ecologist 2), on the basis of ideologically challenging and highly political aspirations that understand DOC as the primary conservator.

Economic and environmental security

Economic and environmental security was intertwined in most landholder narratives. Early in the research process (August 2011) a Rakaia landholder expressed frustration at what he perceived was the “public illusion that farmer’s don’t care unless it involves personal gain” (Male Landholder 12). He referred to the productivist and post-productivist transformation occurring within the region on freehold and pastoral lease land115, and

115 Participants gave examples where land retained under pastoral lease had been developed (intensively with irrigation and other technologies and diversified), as State emphasis has increasingly meant the regulations of the CPLA 1998 and hence the restrictions associated with the Pastoral lease have become increasingly flexible (for example, hunting development on Stew Point Station and tourism diversification on Upper Lake Heron and Glenfalloch pastoral leases). This challenges perspectives in media coverage that argue tenure
related to the particular economic situation and productive capacities of various properties. ‘Economic use’ is more diverse than simply ‘farming’, and understanding transition requires sensitivity and avoiding generalisation, as Brower, (2006; 2008) was argued by this participant to have relied on.

Numerous participants explained economic motivations into tenure review with the difficulty of maintaining the economic viability of pastoralism in the past three decades (1980-2010). “[M]any of us walked” explained a female landholder referring to liberalisation and the subsequent slump of fine wool and other high country commodity markets in the 1990s. Synchronous with this, between 1990 and 2010 was a period of steady accumulation of wealth in national urban centres. This was in some cases seen to be associated with rural peripheralisation with the closing of many high country schools and the “loss of diversity within the communities” (Landscape architect 1), becoming more ‘cliquey’ with land use, and ownership structures transforming (see: Cloke, 1996; Conradson and Pawson, 2007; Johnsen, 2004; Panelli et al., 2003; Press and Newel, 1994 for further understanding of this process of rural transformation associated with liberalisation, post production and multi-functionality).

It was understood by several leaseholders that by 2003 the fortunes of some high country regions and properties had begun to transform, and some that had undertaken tenure review had begun to capitalise. For several landholder participants, this represented needing to “make hay while the sun shines” (Male Landholder 2), and “ride the boom” (Male Landholder 3), as history suggests variability. For example, one property manager stated that hunting and diversification, while “currently a cash cow” (Manager 1) will likely only be temporary, which resulted in him reaffirming productivism and farming habitus as the best option for landholders. For properties that remained dependent on pastoralism, 2011 was signified as the first successful season for pastoral products for “at least 10 years” (Male landholder 7), and previously, the social and economic sustainability of these properties had been marginal (LINZ, 2012; Figgins, 2013). The spoken reality for a large number of participants was not of wealth but of flux. Historical capital or that from external sources was at times backing dramatic economic losses, such as at Mt White.

review as leading directly, as a singular contributor to intensified development in the region, and instead suggests that tenure review has been one contributor to a situation of increasing flux and challenge to the traditional constitution of the high country’s socio-spatial order.

116 This improved economic position was associated in particular with the increased demand for amenity values and the inflow of international and urban domestic capital in some desirable high country spaces such as around Queenstown and Wanaka (Woods, 2006, 2007; Brower, 2006)
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Station, anecdotally stated to have lost $250,000 in 2011. Even though the property is 84,000 hectares in area, more size equates to more expense, which the lessee argued influences towards tenure review or international ownership. Decision-making was often on economic sense and in several examples, economic survival, whereas one participant, who was especially oppositional towards high country farmers, passed such arguments off as a “sob-story of economic deprivation” (Landscape architect 3) and “poor farmer guff” (ibid.).

A sample of attitudes is provided in Table 5.2 (quotations 9-16). Small property owners voiced most concern with climatic and environmental challenges. However, others such as Mt White and Glenfalloch are large, interior properties faced with prolonged summer heat and winter cold and dry with a short growing season. The perspectives of participants (quotations 10, 11, 12 and 13) each depict characteristics of the difficulty of sustaining livelihoods on some properties. In particular, Recent Landholder 5 (quotation 11) was a female landholder who described feeling browbeaten by a public portrayal of farmer wealth. Marginality was attributed disproportionately in her situation to climatic adversity and the need to have a buffer of enough profit in good seasons to sustain the bad. What tenure review offered for lessees was the capacity to diversify, and in a number of examples, a way of freeing a property from debt burden (see: Fig. 5.4, quotations 15 a, b and c).

Underpinning economic values was a call by many landholders to retain social sustainability of the region as a lived and productive space not devoid of people. Participants advocating the social sustainability of high country space, at times invigorated a discourse of rural peripheralisation. In so doing, participants defended a nostalgic vision for the ‘integrity’ of a tightly connected community to be retained (as it was argued to be under the pastoral leases system). Sustaining a traditional, pastoralism based livelihood was tightly intertwined with representations of the high country identity as a somewhat extreme proposition imbricated with and often objectified and masculine identity of resourcefulness and resilience (Law, 2006; 1997; Dominy, 2001). Such arguments also show the distinct linkages between economic and social values typologies, where the traditional pastoral assemblage of social-space was perceived a “nicer” (Male landholder 17), “more sensitive” and “lower risk” (Landscape architect 3) mode of farming. In one-example qualities of the pastoral lease as a mode of “gentleman farming” (Male landholder 10) was discussed, recalling the earlier examination of the ‘southern landed gentry’ (Eldred-Grigg, 1981). Each is a statement of how ‘the landscape’ and its relational co-production
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influence locally negotiated, individual subjectivities and collective habitus (Morris, 2009; Haggerty et al., 2009).

Visions emerging from developmental and environmental typologies were the focus of highest contest between local actors. However, following his methodological call for researchers to explore the intricate complexities of micro-politics, Woods (2007) explains that developmental and environmental valuations were not altogether divided in rural contexts. Woods (2007) highlights similarities to the current study context, where there existed complex understandings of where each fitted into high country space. Such complexity is important for reconceptualising emphasis on clash between protectionism and productivist objectives in macro level debates and the national discourse. The focus on social clash between generalised ‘nature preservation’ and ‘destructive farming’ agendas, is challenged by positing space and landscape as dynamic and plural, where meanings are constituted through varied relationships (Lorimer, 2012). In Chapter 6, it is highlighted how under the pastoral lease, the assemblage of society-nature relations stabilised a long-standing landscape character that has established social-cultural value. The opportunity to freehold with tenure review, but also, the increasing flexibility of pastoral lease regulations and intensified emphasis of productivism,117 is facilitating the complex reconstitution of relationships with local spaces.

5.4 Developmental values’ – an emergent landscape definition

The value statements that emerged from interviews with development oriented participants could generally be clustered around three core thematic categories; ‘flexibility and dynamism’, ‘productivity and profit’, ‘innovation, modernisation and pride in production’.

A sample of attitudinal insight from participant interviews regarding development valuations and changing production values is clustered around these themes in Table 5.3, and are discussed in the following sections.

117 Banks are supportive of borrowing for expanding the current intensified mode, which correlates with a basic analysis in a farming industry newspaper that relative return from intensive dairy production is $11,000 per hectare annually; whereas, sheep are $3000 per hectare and arable $800 per hectare return per annum (CountryWide, 2012).
A flexible, open-minded and dynamic concept of ‘social space’

The few landholder participants who held developmental visions for space advocated strongly for a more flexible approach to landscape management. They asserted similar insights to that exemplified by Male Landholder 12, with the perceived need for ‘open-mindedness’ in order for “all the opportunities in the high country to be explored” (Quotation 1, Table 5.3). Proposing flexibility came with claims that “entrepreneurship”, “innovation” and “making money” should not be discouraged (see quotations 9, 10, 11, 12). A narrative of productivism and its attachment to national economic resilience at times underlay such claims, imbricated with a historical sense of symbolic capital associated with farmers as the ‘back stop’ of New Zealand’s economy (Brooking, 2010; Rosin, 2012). There is also a symbolic capital that reinforces productivism as the role and identity of the high country landholder. Such economic resilience discourse is analogous with Jay’s (2004) investigation, which noted social capital associated with dairy farming in support of
national economic growth. However, over focusing on productivism may narrow social consciousness to other modes of economic growth (Hendy and Callaghan, 2013; Jay, 2004; Rosin, 2004; Walford, 2003), where high country farming has traditionally been more than just production; embodying people, their practices, their identity and connection to others, human and non-human, the environment, the sheep and the products produced (Dominy, 2003; Morris, 2009). Broadly speaking, for developmental visions, ‘improving profitability’ with different modes, rather than ‘maintaining viability’ of the pastoral mode was prominent.

How the subset of participants communicated their perspectives highlighted how ‘landscape’ and objectified ontological concepts of ‘nature’ and ‘space’ are continually under deconstruction and reconstruction; dynamic and emergent with provisional social meanings (Braun, 2008; 2006a; Tsouvalis, 2000; Massey, 2005). This is a theoretically informative discussion connecting with social construction literature examined in Chapter 2. Development focused participants highlighted the need to negotiate and mediate between plural definitions, where participants of a green or eco-centric disposition may understand discussions of development negatively. Reflecting on Table 5.3, various participants stated in respective statements that, “we should move with the times” (Quotation 2), and that “development should and will happen” (Quotations 3). The second passage was emphasised with the participant’s assertion that, if it is understood that the landscape, in its current form, is ‘nationally significant’ then the New Zealand public should incentivise farmers to retain it. A point of tension existed here, where a handful of participants argued farming should not be a part of the fragile landscape at all. Such an assertion linked with the assessment of the DOC Manager 4 in quotation four, depicting the pastoral mode of “farming as increasingly shagged” and economically uncompetitive. He therefore argued the need to move towards a conservation-based economy, instead of pushing what he argued to be a redundant production system and one, which was unsustainable, both economically and ecologically. However, the possibility of enhancing such a transition to a conservation economy in the high country is questionable when tenure review has actively separated conservation and production land and objectives; an issue examined in Chapters 6, 7 and 8. Furthermore, many farmer participants were excited by the ‘improvement’ of land and the farming industry. Following tenure review, productivist and niche innovations and post-productivist diversifications were adding to the social and symbolic capital of what it means to be a ‘high country’ farmer. Different modes of production were justified in varied ways, but retaining the pastoral mode was
often mobilised in a way, that fetishised landscape as a commodity, valuable for marketing and identity, but less viable as the primary mode of income for most properties.\footnote{This argument links to critique of localities commoditised with the fetishisation of spatial imaginaries by scholars like Massey (2005) and Harvey (2005; 1984). It also highlights dimensions of the and neoliberal natures discourse with authors like Foster (2010), Castree (2008a, 2008b; 2004) Bakker (2010), and Bakker and Bridge (2008; 2006) highlighting how neoliberalism is transforming spaces in complex and contradictory ways as a resource base for new forms of capitalist exploitation.}

For some development centred participants, the evolving “patchwork” (Female Landholder 7) of development across the landscape, drawing attention to the Mackenzie and Omarama Basins, indicated an improved level of prosperity and vibrancy in the landscape (see quotation 5). Productive change represented improved levels of security and capital in a landscape that has seen periods of severe economic decline (Holland, 2013; Peden, 2011; Acland, 1975; Chapman, 1996). For other landholders and non-landholder participants, intensification represented a less sustainable, more individualist landscape where people were more heavily leveraged and not farming within the constraints of the high country environment. Intensification suggested the “domination of nature for economic gain” (Landscape architect 3), importing an “alien landscape form” (DOC manager 4). The sentiments of these participants are captured in Tom Scott’s cartoon in Figure 5.2. A satellite passes over New Zealand and one of the astronauts notices the ‘vile green stain’ spreading across the Mackenzie Basin, which is affirmed to be dairy farming. Intensification is understood vile by opponents who perceive it as ruining the landscape by introducing effluent from the irrigation. Subjectively however, developmentalist understandings raised by some participants in the current study suggest this to be a vitalist change and productive ‘improvement’. Subjectively, the greening of irrigation is represented both positively and negatively. Questions arise around how such divergence relates to habitus changes associated with division between protection and production interest with tenure review and the contestation of positions within the field, turned to in subsequent chapters.
Reflecting on other dimensions of value expressed in Table 5.3, numerous participants identified value for innovation, entrepreneurship and ‘subsidy free farming’ – an aspect of symbolic capital that stems from liberalisation and discourses of resilience (signified to some extent by Woods, 2009, 2007; and Brower, 2006 associated with adapted farmer identity from pastoral farmer to developer, entrepreneur and environmental manager). Concepts of sustainability and sustainable products were mobilised in a discourse of modernisation and improvement, but also, social pride. The perspectives from an international landholder and his wife, for example, were especially notable for their developmental aspirations. The challenge of development and “sustainable modernisation of the properties” (Int. Landholder 1) were prevalent in their interviews. However, the participants had also made considerable progress with fencing off all waterways on the property, chopping out willows with DOC and a range of other conservation activities (Int. Landholders 1 and 2). International landholders articulated several of the exemplary insights above regarding developmental visions in Figure 5.4. In short, there was no common / generalizable vision of the development of high country land by international
land owners, and like domestic participants, interviewing 11 international participants introduced further complexity regarding values and attitudes towards the high country.

There is insufficient breadth to cover such complexity in detail and instead I have compiled some important aspects to this discussion in Appendix 5a, providing leads for further inquiry. However, by way of providing broad overview, foreign investment has long been a significant aspect of high country ownership structures. More recently, maintaining the pastoral mode, intensification and diversification has required considerable capital investment. Tenure review provided the potential for original landholders to free money from properties, but in some cases, properties have subsequently been sold, and on occasion to foreign investors. This has faced public criticism. The inflated value of property tends to favour large enterprise and foreign capital, especially where national policy is receptive to this (Overseas Investment Office, 2012), making high country land increasingly less accessible to New Zealand national interests.

Usually international interests are capital rich investors, providing the ability to diversify into other options like tourism and different modes of production like forestry or tourism enterprise. However, it is impossible to generalise, and I experienced significant diversity with regard to attitudes and reasons for wanting to own high country land. Broadly, reasons included:

- A safe political system and investment context.
- The beauty of the landscapes and quality of the environment.
- The mystique of the high country story.
- Isolation and ability to live reclusively for temporary or extended periods of time.

Many of the international interests did have a particularly developmental approach to the high country. For example, the development of large scale forestry by Canadian investors in the upper Rangitata was entirely an economic proposition. However, it was rationalised as a carbon sink, and as an inherently ‘clean and green’ mode of production, compared to the widespread grazing on land, and the management protocols for wildling tree control were understood to be much more thorough than those for uncontrolled shelterbelts of similar species on neighbouring properties.

‘Development’ was inherently difficult to define, and often international owners had understandings that challenged conventional high country farming praxis and understandings. For example, several had positive attitudes towards access and conservation. Within the case study area, amongst various other international interests, the low profile Erdman family already owns the Coleridge Downs, Dry Acheron and Annvale.
stations and purchased Big Ben into its existing farm operation in 2015. A third of the land accumulation is protected under QEII open space and conservation covenant and walk ways are being established throughout the properties, allowing for public access. However, such examples are illustrative of land accumulation by wealthy interests, and attitudes towards tenure review varied. Some buyers sought to purchase only freehold land to allow for development security (such as with Big Ben and Forest Creek), whereas others understood that the pastoral lease was flexible enough to allow developments to be undertaken.

At a more conceptual level, from the developmental values typology emerged a direct challenge to the lock up mentality and nativism of ‘fortress conservation’, shrouded in a discourse of economic value and the costs to losing production to the national economy (Littlewood, 2010a). This is a critique that returns to the ethical position of Cronon (1995; 2002). However, it suggests a stifling discussion when conservation and economic practice were represented in opposition within several participant narratives. In a number of cases landholders spoke to a perpetuated dualism between that which is ‘economic’ and productive and environmental protection, which was at times represented as “wasteful of good productive land that could be put to better use” (Newcomer landholder 1).

As is examined later in more depth in Section 5.2, many individuals were moderate in their views, whereas others vocalised extreme positions at either end of a continuum between ‘fervent greenie’ and ‘resolute productivist’ (see: Participant Attitude Spectrum, Figure 5.4). However, the participant whose partial vision for intervention in the landscape is expressed in Applications Box 5.3 below was not alone in explaining a need for open minds toward development, and what the informant considered landscape improvement. It is evocative however, for the way his vision offers opposition to eco-centric values of retaining and restoring indigenous ecology. With deeper theoretical attention however, the vision informs the challenge to how ‘landscape’ is often conceived of as static (as in Chapter 1 and 2). Instead, the landscape as a hybrid, composite of social and material relations and ‘things’ is emergent and semiotic meanings transform as they are renegotiated. The participant’s dialogue emphasised how there exists contrasting perspectives locally, as well as in higher-level representations of high country space. The diversity, between those of environmental and developmental positions in space, highlights the need to adjudicate between plural visions for the potentially drastic transformation that particular habitus may entail.
5.5 Environmentally centred values

Environmental values were a central focus of contestation between participants, but often centred on different aspects of ‘the environment’. Notably, all participants described material / biophysical / environmental values. However many environmental values centred on either, landscape and aesthetic arguments, argued as perception-based values by some participants, or ecology based values by others. The distinction between aesthetic and ecologically centred values is made for the reason that participants of a more ecologically centred disposition tended to argue that landscape and aesthetic qualities were subjective. Several interviewees considered that focusing on subjective debates over landscape and aesthetic values distracts away from ‘more objective measures’ of environmental decline, such as biodiversity loss and degraded water quality. Complexities
of landscape visions arise from these tensions and divergent political ideas of what interventions should be taken to influence the emergent ‘trajectory’ of landscape evolution (Lorimer, 2012; Massey, 1999).

**Aesthetic typology: subjective landscape[s]**

Generally all participants guided by aesthetic values promoted retaining low intensity pastoralism. They perceived that the traditional mode would maintain the homogeneity of the short tussock and a “balanced landscape” (Grasslands Ecologist 3). In many examples, such participants rejected division, understanding low intensity pastoralism as more beneficial than the outcomes of rigid tripartite partitioning of land between ecological conservation, access and production values.

Similar to developmental positions, most aesthetically centred participants argued in that the landscape is “far from natural” (Landscape Architect 1), but it has both cultural value to its landscape character and a level of ‘indigenous’ value worth protecting. As an aesthetically valued landscape, it was understood dynamic, but that retaining the pastoral mode would have kept a relative stasis and could have been managed in a way that prevented intensification.

Referring to Table 5.4, the themes of aesthetic valuations that emerged from interviews are laid out. Many participants spoke of the transformation of the ‘pre-human landscape’ and also the cognitive/perceptive changes that have occurred in terms of how the landscape is represented. Several considered how when their relatives were farming they were respected as part of the parcel of high country custodianship, protecting fragile lands, whereas today, there are questions regarding this custodianship (Forest and Bird, 2009). Highlighting the above points, changing social representations are clearly illustrated in the tourism poster in Figure 5.3. The touristic imagery of the 1950s included the high country pastoralist, as part of the aesthetic landscape, and the image captures a nature meets man imaginary. Whereas, in contemporary marketing imagery, 100 per cent pure is prominent, where man has limited space within depictions of purified wildernesses.
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Figure 5.3: This image by Marcus King was used for tourism advertising between 1950 and 1959. It depicts social context within a ‘natural space’ by showing a musterer on horseback with sheepdog and sheep, along with pylons in the middle distance extending into a towering high country valley with snowy peaks in the background. (Source: National Library of New Zealand, courtesy of Tourism New Zealand).

“The snow tussock was up to the horses bellies at the time of European settlement” DOC Manager 1 stated, affirming a dynamic transformation to what exists today. However, he was nostalgic about protecting and restoring snow tussock communities and rich native diversity, a disjunction from the many participants who were nostalgic for and advocated pastoral stasis, as is illustrated by insight in Table 5.4 (quotations 1, 2, 3, 4). The current short tussock ecosystem is imbued with cultural values, even though modified and relatively mono-cultural, and often holding low levels of indigenous diversity. Other themes of value spoken by aesthetically oriented participants
included: the distinctiveness, scale and openness of high country space, and the landscape and landforms, now discussed.

**Distinctiveness, scale and openness**

The 17 participants who oriented their worldviews around aesthetically centred values advocated for the value of landforms, natural character and the uniqueness and distinctiveness of the biophysical landscape. A “landscape of colour contrasts” (Landscape architect 2) was perceived as being of high cultural value, signifying the aesthetic authenticity of a partially natural state that is certainly not politically neutral.

In Table 5.4, quotation 5 is piercing for the way the scale and character of the landscape is understood to be of no economic value, and therefore, low value to landholders. This perception of ‘low value if no economic value’ is a potentially damaging generalisation, articulating a root of alienation and opposition towards relative others within the social field. Contrary to this perception, many landholders valued expansiveness. One farmer argued, “the openness of the natural grasslands is what makes the landscape special” (Male landholder 8); a contested perspective in itself, for the way grasslands is articulated as ‘natural’. However, in many cases landholders rejected the impression that the grasslands are ‘natural’ and instead posited them as a valuable cultural phenomenon/landscape.

**Table 5.4:** A sample of insights on the aesthetic typology of valuation for the materiality of high country space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetic Values</th>
<th>Insights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retaining stasis</td>
<td>1. I’d like to retain the landscape as it is because I highly value those landscape values, to me it is a system of farming that fits with the landscape (Landscape architect 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. I want the status quo or improvement, I like how the landscape is now, I don’t want it to change anymore (Advocate 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. [Irrigation, wilding pines, weeds] would displace the whole ecology, it would be totally different (DOC Manager 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The key thing to retain is the impression that there are not many people, just those tussocks blowing in the wind and how the light interplays with the land and its colours (DOC Manager 3 – emphasis added).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale, space, openness</td>
<td>5. In the Heron Basin, the scale of those swamps and that landscape, there are few places where you can tramp through or even drive through and be simply awe inspired. It is really important to protect the integrity of that, but it isn’t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
 really a lot of value to landholders because they’re not worth anything (Landscape Architect 3).

6. For me personally, the most important aspect of the high country is its wide open spaces. I don’t just mean views, I mean the freedom and unencumbered space (DOC Employee 2).

7. The isolation is important, the openness, few people around, no heavy production, and noise and mess, I can accept a few sheep grazing (Conservation representative 2).

8. The ability to let your mind wander is really valuable, somewhere to be alone and drift (DOC employee 2).

9. ... just the openness of it and being able to walk around... I think that we are incredibly fortunate.” (Female landholder 3)

10. I love the openness and the low cover of golden grasses. The space, I mean the ability to get away into a landscape that doesn’t have humans, that feeling of space and isolation (DOC manager 1).

11. Go through the trees as you head to Lake Heron, wow. Go over the top of Burkes Pass, and it is vast. It is a huge landscape. I love central Otago, and the vastness of the Maniototo. Those wide open skies that go forever (DOC employee 1).

12. The vastness of the high country is what the beauty of it. The clean obstructed, wide openness, the low growing pasture. The biggest issue here (in the Rakaia) is the threat of woody weeds (Male landholder 15).

13. Kiwis do relate strongly, even the ones that know it just from afar really feel an essence of iconic New Zealand value. It is that classic high country character that I really, really treasure (Landscape architect 1 – emphasis added).

14. I value the landscape, its uniqueness, it is special even though it’s not natural (Male landholder 7).

15. The geological formations. You couldn’t get a more legible glacial geomorphology, and the cover that needs to be kept (Landscape architect 3).

16. A moraine should be dry and low growing, it is dry and arid looking because that is how it should be (ibid.).

17. There is a real lack of understanding of the very nature of those landscapes DOC are protecting (Landscape architect 1 – emphasis added).

Participants focused regularly on how landforms ‘ought to look’. For example, a landscape architect stated, “people don’t understand the very nature of the ecology and landscapes that DOC tries to protect” (Landscape architect 3). She advocated nature as if a static essence of a ‘thing’ that was objectively knowable. However, the assumption of the
‘very nature’ of outwash plains, alluvial fans and moraines is subjective. Such an argument also came through as politically divisive, where several landholders comprehended that the low altitude, moderate gradient of such geological features on steep properties was more valuable when lush, green and productive; however this was understood “wasteland” in the perspective of Landscape Architect 3. Moraines and fans, like the valley flats (Weeks et al., 2013), have become nodes of contestation within the landscape, as a confluence point for divergent concepts of how an aspect of the material landscape should look aesthetically. From an eco-centric perspective, such features are defended for being rich in lowland ecology and distinctive character. To a farming episteme they are potentially landforms of high development potential and production advantage (the pressure on which increased with reduced scale subsequent to tenure review, see Chapter 6). As features, they become socially complex, relationally constituted for divergent meanings and the focus of associated knowledge controversy regarding their value and ontological state (Whatmore, 2009). With division, who holds the power over such a landform? In tenure review, I argue that this manifested as a matter of which social group held the property rights in order to control the development trajectory of particular features, as either ‘productive’ or ‘protected’. The policy situation therefore, became a contested impasse as to whether, alluvial fans, for example, should be ‘locked up’ for protection or cast off to freehold intensification. Simplistic as this is, I suggest tenure review has implanted such a categorical territorialisation defining and entrenching division of what was a previously more integrated social-nature. Becoming bounded in the subjectivities of farmers and conservationists, as exclusively farm and conservation land in the narrowest conventional definitions of intensive or pastoral farming and ring fenced conservation (Morris, 2009; Norton and Miller, 2000). Drawing from international literature, Brockington and Ingoe (2006) are highly critical of ring-fence conservation approaches to conservation, and particularly protected areas for Rhinoceros conservation in Africa. They query how such logic frequently leads to evictions on the basis of social selectiveness about what species (including, humans) and things fit within particular spaces. Brockington and Ingoe (2006: 454) assert that “evictions are carried out in Nature’s name, but often also in surprising ignorance of Nature’s processes”, which generally subvert social categories and boundaries. In Chapter 6, I examine this argument more deeply, but first, I present ecological valuations and the trajectories such arguments propose.
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Ecological Typology: ‘objectivity’ and the ‘life saving capacity of nature’

A sample of ecological values is detailed in Figure 5.5 grouped around common themes that emerged from coding analysis, these themes include, ‘ecological integrity’, ‘resilience and threat’ and ‘intrinsic values’. At the conclusion to this section I seek to highlight the complexity of multi-natural trajectories associated with the varied interventions participants proposed for the future becoming of the high country landscape.

Ecological integrity

Some participants prioritised concepts of ecological integrity over subjectivities of landscape and aesthetic values. A collection of concepts were referred to by various conservation participants, including: “natural integrity” (DOC Manager 3); “natural heritage” (Forest and Bird advocate 2); “representative ecosystems” (DOC manager 2); “maintaining ecosystem services” and “ecosystem function” (Landscape architect 3); “high indigenous biodiversity” (DOC manager 5); “significant indigenous ecology” and “native vegetation” (Planner 2); “intrinsic values”, intact ecosystems” and “endemism” (Female Landholder 7). Such values, in the claims of many participants’, placed primary emphasis on indigeneity and features of pre-human ecology. However, it was not only participants within the predefined ‘conservation grouping’ who emphasised sustaining indigenous ecology. For example, male landholder 10 stated, “functioning ecosystems and protecting native values should be a priority, but it is how that is achieved that is important”. With this comment he referred to the Ō Tū Wharekai wetland’s initiative in the region, which had focused on obtaining landholder buy in. 119 “[T]he swamps” (Farm Manager 1) were understood as gaining priority in the region as a focus of this initiative. Each participant suggests how ecological protection is recognised as a high priority within the case study region. However, individual attitudes varied regarding whether grazing threatens indigenous ecological values.

119 One million dollars has been allocated to the Ō Tū Wharekai project over the six years prior to 2012, recognising the indigenous lowland and wetland diversity in the region. Increasingly Ō Tū Wharekai has encouraged local buy in, but it is still “DOC’s project” (Female Landholder 12) – and as proven by the last restructure people with institutional knowledge moved on and the efficacy of the program is now under threat. Subsequent to the recent restructure known as the ‘2013 cuts’, has been the loss of key people in management positions, institutional knowledge and long term strategic relationships associated with such projects.
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Resilience and threat
Frequently value for the resilience of indigenous ecology was mobilised in response to perceived threat. Highlighting this is the sense of threat to humanity, and the “duty to protect what we have left” illustrated in quotations 6 and 7 in Table 5.5. Rarity and indigeneity are prioritised in both examples. Another participant emphasised the shocking history of New Zealand’s “biodiversity destruction” in rural landscapes (Landscape architect 3). Farming in various accounts was framed in opposition to biodiversity protection. In quote 4, the destruction of New Zealand’s unique biodiversity is followed by the transplantation of a generic ecology that is not native, and therefore, not as valuable. “[S]natching away from destruction” was an expression used by DOC manager 3 to depict what tenure review sought to achieve by removing significant inherent values from the threat of production, through separating them into conservation reserve.

Intrinsic values
Protectionist perspectives often drew justification for protecting nature and biodiversity from the concept of intrinsic values. Conservation policy is laden with this concept, which ties deeply to ‘non-anthropocentric’ valuations for living things. In New Zealand’s conservation discourse, indigeneity and rarity are especially prominent in concepts of intrinsic value, such as in the New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy (2000). The five conservation participants and one female landholder (she held a particularly eco-centric disposition compared to the ‘norm’), who discussed concepts of nature’s intrinsic value, did so in a way that often opposed economic and anthropocentric values. Participant insight is included in Table 5.5 (quotations 8, 9, 10, 11). In one example, the participant stated; “I don’t really know [how to define an intrinsic value], but I think most business people can’t or are unwilling to rationalise intrinsic values” (Landscape architect 3). Automatically, the protection of intrinsic values, or Significant Inherent Values as the focus of tenure review, is set up as beyond the knowledge culture of economically minded individuals. Therefore, the concept of intrinsic value may become a potent force of alienation between interests, where it is oppositional to the social value for capitalist growth (Castree, 2008a), and instrumentalist/utilitarian values for nature (Robinson, 2011).
### Table 5.5: A sample of participant values insight addressing ecologically centred values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecological integrity</th>
<th>1. … any of the remnant native vegetation that is left ... I mean the Matagauri to me is just precious. ... The loss of the indigenous is what offends me most ... something invasive and exotic taking over the indigenous (Female landholder 7).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. I personally have a real sense of duty to protect what we have left, towards those species that are significant and rare (DOC manager 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Those wetlands are incredible, they are full of diversity, removing impacts and enhancing them is crucial (DOC manager 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. I regard our native grassland and shrublands, our indigenous biodiversity as distinctive, they are what identifies us as that's New Zealand. To freehold them opens the landscape up to something that isn't distinctive, it's generic, not native (Landscape architect 3 - emphasis added).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. … the water, good water, it is vital that we protect it (Male landholder 16).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience and Threat</td>
<td>6. My understanding is that the loss of biodiversity is a greater threat to humankind, if not bigger than climate change. It's basic ecological theory more monospecific populations they can adapt and will be wiped out (Landscape architect 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. If we don't have biodiversity we are doomed really (DOC employee 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Farming certainly doesn't have a good track record of biodiversity loss (DOC Manager 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic value</td>
<td>9. … distinctive organisms have an intrinsic right to live (F&amp;B advocate 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Conservation values don’t really have a strong economic incentive, but that’s not a good enough excuse to ignore them. I really do think that there is such a thing as intrinsic value... people seem to forget that intrinsic value isn’t our value, isn’t us putting our value on it, it is the fact that that bush is there for its own sake, whether it is any use to us, because it is pretty has nothing to do with it. It is there and deserves to be there (Female landholder 7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Ultimately it is about trying to not be anthropocentric. It is not necessarily about what is best for us, it is about letting nature live and be resilient on its own, because it has intrinsic value... allowing a place for it without making it fit human objectives (DOC employee 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. … if it is made to be ‘all about humans’ it becomes a division between if it makes money it is all good and it doesn’t make money it isn’t worthwhile (ibid.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A constructionist stance recognises the political and power laden constitution of arguments for intrinsic values. In quotation 9 (Table 5.5) for example, the participant argues that distinctive organisms, suggesting indigenous species, hold intrinsic value. However, what does such a judgement of distinctiveness mean for less distinctive organisms, and does such a claim support a particular ideology of what organisms justify protection? Distinctive and less distinctive are each subjective and reliant on social categories and justifications as relationally meaningful thing or phenomena, which is inherently a political contest over values (Lorimer, 2012; Trudgil, 2001; Sanderson and Redford, 2000). The assertion that an intrinsic value is not ‘our human value’ (see quotation 9) discursively hides that inherently, an intrinsic value is indeed a social value for material aspects of nature. Proclaiming that without relation to other ‘things’ and human society, nature is of no value, however, leads us down a spiral of degenerative relativism. There is undeniable value for biodiversity, indigenous species and environmental standards. Politically, however, such a stance recognises that while couched in often venerable attempts to advocate for the environment and sustainability, there exists the potential in social framings of nature and its intrinsic values to operate in an adversarial way towards those who do not share the same understanding of what are often static notions of ‘value’.

“Pastoral grasses” and “gutless grasslands”

Under an aesthetic valuation, the short tussock landscape character, while understood to be highly modified was perceived as being a ‘more natural’ and less intensified landscape, in keeping with a cultural imaginary of how the space ought to look. Partly this is the result of how the landscape is represented in popular discourse (for example, reflecting back to the powerful works of artists Grahame Sydney and Michael Hight in Chapter 2). In several accounts, participants argued that low intensity grazing should be used to maintain grassland character. However, this was a point of contestation between ecologically centred and aesthetically centred typologies.

The claim to maintaining the aesthetic character of the landscape, as a ‘tawny brown’, pastoral grassland was understood to “protect an image” (Landscape architect 3). However, grazed grasslands were argued to be degraded and ecologically “gutless” by ecologically focused participants, depicted in the examples below:

It’s a pretty stuffed landscape … For goodness sake, much of it is exotic species anyway. There is very little tussock anymore it is brown top and dried fescue tops, low cover of shitty pastoral grasses and weeds with a few scruffy tussocks and a Coprosma shrub or Spaniard if you’re lucky. (Landscape Ecologist 3)
… the landscape’s an entirely cultural phenomenon. It looks good because its golden brown, but it is gutless there is no diversity. (Female Landholder 7)

It looks wonderful, it is golden brown but the public misconception is it’s natural (sic.), and better conservation outcomes can be achieved my taking the sheep off. (DOC Manager 5)

For this reason, it was perceived that grasslands should have grazing and use removed in order to achieve conservation of previously grazed biodiversity, to re-establish a dominance of native species. Evidence and support of similar arguments is found in the scholarship of Mark et al., (2009) Mark et al., (2006), Coomes et al., (2006) and Allan (2007), highlighting that the short tussock character is more resilient than the sensitive inter-tussock species that grazing may damage (such as the South Island edelweiss (Leucogenes grandiceps), leptinella species, orchidiae and gentiana species).

Ecologically centred participants challenged grazing and pastoral use, and in so doing, frequently justified division between protection and production with tenure review. “It depends whether you see low intensity pastoralism as a conservation or farming agenda? And the next thing on the farming agenda is development”, asserted Female landholder 7. She perceived farmer prerogative was more towards a profitable farm and that ‘low intensity’ often borders on high intensity grazing, and therefore separation from pastoral use safeguards Significant Inherent Values. However, this is a highly contested debate, where a number of participants perceived the pastoral lease to a conservative mode of farming that retained landscape and biodiversity values. Where unlike other national ecosystems, no known plants have gone extinct under high country pastoralism (pers. comm., Dr Brian Molloy). This raises two pertinent questions. First, regarding what the landscape on different properties will succeed back to following tenure review; and second, it queries the place of grazing management options for maintaining landscape values.

120 This introduces a significant high country knowledge controversy between prominent ecologists including Emeritus Professor Alan Mark, Professor Kevin O’Connor, Dr Brian Molloy and Dr David Scott who have each contributed to the debate over high country grasslands. It was also a point of dispute between DOC and landholders. Many landholders were critical of DOCs broad-brush ideology of restoration across the entire landscape by removing grazing and ‘lock up’ conservation. In particular they highlighted the complexity of the local region. There are considerable differences in the potential for regaining native ecologies on a property like Mt Peel where there is a high rainfall, lower altitude and more moderate temperature gradient and seed banks of higher order native species, than a property like Mesopotamia, which is arid and pest species such as gorse, broom and Pinus contorta and P. radiata are the higher order successional species. This underpinned a fear of what some properties would transform to post tenure review under DOC management.
All participants acknowledged that the current landscape is vastly transformed from a pre-human state; as a multi-layered novel ecosystem or hybrid ecology comprising assemblages of ecological and biophysical features, social values and economic dependencies (White, 2006; Hobbs et al., 2009; Hobbs et al., 2006; Seasteadt et al., 2008). However, participants advocated different visions for intervention in the future trajectory of the high country as a hybrid space (Lorimer, 2012; Braun, 2006a; Zimmerer, 2000). Applications Box 5.4 highlights the complexity of three broader ecological typologies regarding the place of grazing and ecological vision for high country space that emerged from participant interviews. I have classified these as: 1) the ‘restored hybrid’; 2) the ‘flourishing hybrid’, and 3) the ‘balanced hybrid’. Each adds further layers of complexity, complicating the Figure 2.4, which provided a straw-man depiction of economic, social and environmental values.

Drawing out the main threads from the three ecological interventions, it is notable that the preservation approach intrinsic to a restored hybrid was deep seated within the divisive ideology of tenure review. However, 16 participants, in both the farming and conservation communities, were sceptical as to whether the landscape would succeed to a seral/ecological community dominated by indigenous vegetation species with grazing removed. There also existed a clear argument that intensive management of the vastly increased accumulation of high country conservation land locally was unrealistic. Division with tenure review therefore, assumes continued state impetus for a particular restoration ideology with support and financial backing of DOC as the centralised organisation with control of ecological conservation. In the current political economic environment this was questioned. The flourishing hybrid is also complicated by successional theory where, especially in arid parts of the high country, the climax community will likely be highly competitive exotic vegetation, like broom and coniferous species. This is an argument that ties in with long-term debate between high country grasslands ecologists, exemplified by exchange between Mark and Molloy (Mark. 1980; 1990; 2004; Molloy, 1984; McSweeney and Molloy, 1984).

The balanced hybrid, asserts the status quo, maintaining a pastoral management system. However, this is challenging, where the current nationwide impetus is for more

---

121 Where it is examined in Chapter 6 and 7 that division has had a range of impacts on the high country landscape, as well as the cognitive habitus and praxis of participants. I suggest that division, seeking restoration, may have undermined more conservative approaches to using the high country landscape, which were to an extent established under the pastoral lease (see Chapter 6).
productive, profitable modes of agriculture (Hendy and Callaghan, 2013; Overseas Investment Office, 2012; NZ Treasury, 2013), and tenure review has allocated freehold. Additionally, the outlook of pastoral lease was perceived as an ‘out-dated’ mode of tenure by several lessees who were keen to embark on new production systems; and by numerous conservation participants whose epistemologies focused on reserving ecological values within state control. However, much of the local landscape, was argued by a range of informants to be better managed with a sensitive grazing regime, as pragmatically, it was reasoned that vast land areas cannot be intensively managed long-term by a constantly resource constrained DOC. Importantly, this argument relates intrinsically, to a rejection of division as the most prominent theme of participant discussion within interviews.

5.5.1 Balance between divergent interests or a destructive division?

Overall, human dimensions of the landscape interested landholders, often mobilised through discourses of ‘livelihood value’ and also the cultural heritage of high country farming. Therefore, negotiation in tenure review was more complicated than allegedly “a simple matter of dividing between land best for production and land to be protected” (Male Landholder 12), and became a contested matter of allocating values (Redford and Sanderson, 2000). Interview material exposed a diverse range of perspectives associated with the “mentality of division” (Female Landholder 10), on which tenure review is premised. Some participants argued in support of division (for example, separation offered diversification capacity on freehold, or protecting ecological values under DOC control). Others rejected separation outright, argued in one instance as “environmental Apartheid” (Male Landholder 9). Local perspectives from landholders and conservation participants expressed how issues with the process highlighted the extreme difficulty of dividing between land for protection and land for production in a landscape characterised by the inherent vacillation of where such delineations lie.
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Applications Box 5.4: Typologies for ecological interventions in the landscape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restored Hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A number of ecologically oriented participants argued the need for the high country landscape to be restored. They acknowledged that the landscapes current state was vastly transformed from a pre-human ecology, but perceived it to be more valuable when restored. For example, female landholder 7, a woman with a particularly eco-centric worldview, although married into a fourth generation leaseholder family, stated: “No, I don’t accept a hybrid landscape, I think you just pile money in and restore native values that are destroyed by grazing”.

Most participants orientated towards the restorative vision exemplified by this landholder, asserted the need to remove grazing from the high country grasslands, and invest in rangeland restoration. Several participants argued that alternative modes of economic basis would emerge from a restored ecology. Often eco-tourism was emphasised by participants, assuming that an economic basis is required in the high country, but this could take an alternative form to farming and further pastoral development. However, it was believed by others that the “constant prioritisation of farming [as an economic basis]” (DOC Employee 1), undermines the potential for these alternative modes, that were argued to be an ecologically, socially and economically sound compared to current intensification trends. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flourishing Hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Several participants advocated the potential for what I define a flourishing hybrid ecosystem. The participants argued the need to divide and remove grazing. However, intensive management was not required as it was with the aforementioned ‘restored hybrid’. Land with existing indigenous values was argued to need setting away, to be able to flourish as a hybrid-matrix with exotic species. There was perceived value in establishing a flourishing novel ecosystem that was free from pastoral use. This understanding of a hybrid ecology is depicted by a quotation from Landscape architect 3:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

> “I see value in novel ecosystems, with maybe a very predominant or even minor presence of native species, so long as they aren’t being taken over by exotics it doesn’t matter if it’s say 75 to 25 per cent exotic”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balanced hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Many participants supported the ideology behind the ‘balanced hybrid’, which is developed further in Chapter 6 when examining grazing management and lessee custodianship. In so doing, several participants referred to the ideology of prominent grasslands ecologist Dr Brian Molloy, who advocates the idea that strategic and well managed grazing maintains a balanced hybrid of exotic and indigenous species. In light of this, participants in both agricultural and conservation groupings argued that stock management over areas of the high country means that invasive pest species do not outcompete the indigenous. A balanced hybrid was understood an equilibrated novel ecosystem.

This mode of intervention was advocated, in particular, where landscape values are threatened by invasive species such as wilding pines and broom. “You can’t be a Luddite about it, we have to be flexible ... it’s give and take, and it’s pretty undeniable that grazing has had a management role” asserted Male landholder 10. |
Rejection or support of division

The separation of protection and production values in tenure review was rejected by interviewees from both ‘conservationist’ and ‘farmer’ groups, who had concerns and questioned the wisdom of an exclusionist approach. Various issues with division were illuminated, as a focus of intense dissatisfaction in many participant interview narratives. Lessees often rejected the premise for it did not recognise previous efforts with custodianship, which was the second most discussed topic within interviews. For this reason, I only briefly refer to such issues at this juncture and concepts of custodianship and the rejection of division is examined more deeply in Chapter 6.

Some participants, however, supported division by emphasising benefits coming from the separation logic at the core of tenure review. Some supported division for the benefits created in places like the Rakaia Gorge, where when retained as pastoral runs properties were low productivity and marginal, but with the allocation of freehold, other productive potentials could be developed (examined further in Chapter 6). One particular example given in several interviews was Glenrock Station, a property where the landholders have developed an arable crop (wheat, maize, barley and other species) farm on a flat, alluvial fan in the upper Rangitata Valley, which traditionally would have been an unusual production option for high country land. Also, in terms of improved viability in the high country, tenure review has allowed for more secure investment and diversification into alternative modes. For example, there have been developments of tourism operations. The airport developments at Twizel and Mt Cook (Glentanner) were referred to on several occasions.

In particular, the influx of global and urban capital attached to post-productivist amenity, recreational and tourist values has made options to subdivide and diversify viable in some regions. This issue caused considerable consternation for Brower (2006a; 2009). She emphasised the transformation occurring in high amenity regions due to processes of migration associated with often-wealthy urban dwellers and international interests, fuelling demand for property in high country spaces. For example, Brower, (2009: 175) asserts, "If there were no urban dweller willing to commit global capital in the South Island high country, the highest and best use of the high country and lakeside land around Wanaka, Hawea, the Mackenzie Basin - might well remain pastoral grazing or deer farming". However, amenity migration is much less of a consideration in the study region, where the make-up of the space subsequent to tenure review is more clearly delineated between DOC (public) land and farmland (private freehold). This is a debate that is examined fully in
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Chapter 6. What I emphasise is that the landscape is inherently transformed by the networked flow of capital and market demands (Dominy, 2003; Lorimer, 2012); where both internal / domestic and external capital and transforming international processes are impacting upon the high country as a continuing cultural landscape, transforming it into a more diversified and at times intensified landscape (see Chapter 6).

Participants who exemplified more eco-centric dispositions, at times supported separation logic, emphasising what they perceived to be value from preservation in both economic and non-economic schemes of value. In particular, several DOC participants referred to the economic value of preservation focused land use on DOC land, in what are referred to as ‘Conservation Parks’ like the Oteake, Hakatere (which includes the Ō Tū Wharekai wetland complex) and Ahuriri reservations. Such aspects of value were recently researched with focus on the Ahuriri Conservation Park with an Economic Impact Assessment undertaken by the Tourism Research Council and commissioned by DOC, 2012). The report illustrates the direct and indirect economic benefits for communities like Twizel coming from preservation based uses and the recreational amenities of conservation parks. However, there are clear limitations where the reports primary focus is on tourism expenditure, but as an institutional report, it does not refer to the politics associated with receiving recreational land through tenure review, or what is occurring on non-state owned land. Similar conclusions can be drawn from the visitor surveys undertaken for Mackenzie region Conservation Parks (undertaken 2008), Ruataniwha Conservation Park (2007), Ahuriri Conservation Park (2006), and the Hakatere Conservation Park in Canterbury (2008) (Thompson et al., 2008; Carr, Lovelock and Wright, 2006).

In terms of emphasising alternative values and partly stimulated by tenure review, several participants referred to Balmoral Station, held up as an example of how flat basin country could be managed alternatively to current intensification trends. As a historically large scale Mackenzie Basin property, the owners have chosen to actively avoid intensification and have recently begun a process of transforming the economic model of the property while retained under the pastoral lease. The majority of the property has recently been placed under Queen Elizabeth II (QEII) covenant, and the future strategy emphasises balance focused on preservation and restoration of grasslands, tourism and some strategic traditional production. Similarly, Mutt Lange has recently placed the four high country properties, Motutapu, Mt Soho, Coronet Peak and Glencoe Stations, a vast land area situated between Wanaka and Queenstown, under QEII covenant. Having
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purchased the properties over the last 15 years, Lange has a large workforce installing public walking access tracks, removing wildling pine and exotic pest species and actively restoring native habitats. Lange’s approach is held up as an exceptional example of international ownership and an illustration of how alternative values can be focused into different trajectories of development (see: Young, 2014; Williams, 2014a; 2014b). However, a significant amount of conjecture surrounded QEII covenants appeared in participant interviews, where covenanting offers an alternative to DOC orthodoxy of State-centralised control. The potential of DOC to interfere is weakened because landholders retain management control, used to stop “DOCs grab and control mentality” (Fish and Game employee 1). Therefore, covenants were understood as being used alternatively to tenure review, which begins to lay the foundations to understanding the tussle for control manifested with the logic of division intrinsic to tenure review, which is a debate examined more deeply in Chapter 7.

Molesworth Station, is an example of a State controlled approach to managing an original pastoral lease for both conservation and heritage farming values. At 180,476 hectares, Molesworth Station is New Zealand’s largest farm. The property is an amalgamation of four separate pastoral leases - Molesworth, Tarndale, St Helens and Dillon - abandoned to the Crown between 1938 and 1949 because of rabbit infestation, stock losses in snowfalls, and economic recession. On 18 December 2004, the government announced the transfer of the Station from Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) to the Department of Conservation. Since the transfer the Department of Conservation has engaged in considerable conservation works, including archaeological surveys, the repair of Molesworth Cob Cottage and the repair and maintenance of the Acheron Accommodation House (McClean, 2007). The approach is understood to be a means of emphasising alternative values, not just production, allowing the active engagement of the public with the history of pastoralism while enhancing varied ecosystems. Various participants agreed and others disagreed with the approach undertaken at Molesworth Station, and several farming participants in particular questioned why ‘the Molesworth’ could not have been managed by leaseholders, without necessitating the strict control of DOC. To theses participants, the approach emphasised how pastoralism and the leasehold system could be used as a broad scale management method, challenging the logic of separation within tenure review.

A range of other participants (26 from 84 total), revealed issues associated with tenure review as a destructive division by: 1) prioritising indigenous values and restorative
ideology within the state centric control of DOC (which relates to the political stance of scholars who question the nature society dualism Cronon, (2014; 2002; 1995), White, (2006; 1995)); 2) participant understanding also highlighted issues with division between protection and production, as an element of conservation habitus within tenure review that conflicted with pre-existing understandings of the high country as a less bounded space under leasehold management, which retained a more flexible understanding of the landscape; 3) division was also rejected for the way it set groups in opposition, focusing on difference rather than shared values and commonalities between various actor groups, as the concentration of critique in Chapter 7.

Two significant issues for the current research arise from binary-based arguments supporting tenure review. These two critical issues frame the argument for the remainder of the thesis:

- First, an entrenched mentality of division perpetuated in the national discourse and in policies such as tenure review fails to recognise or encourage more sustainable and sensitive assessments of nature, and engagements with it, on either side of the material and intellectual boundary between nature for protection and production, when defined in opposition.

- Second, division holds the potential to transform spatial concepts of ‘the landscape’, which with tenure review is becoming bounded and territorialised between ‘enclosed’ nature for protection and ‘opened-up’ nature for production. With this, objectives of groups depicted as divergent in their generalised ‘order of social space’ and knowledge cultures become increasingly alienated and oppositional, inflected in transforming productive and conservation habitus (the focus of Chapter 6 and 7).

These two assertions interlink the contingency of micro politics; emphasising contextual sensitivity to individual discourses and positioning’s within the field, with an approach to understanding broader transformations to habitus and collective relations associated with tenure review. Thus, they are statements aligned with the methodological principles of Bourdieu, seeking to strike a balance between macro/micro levels of analysis (see: Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2007; Grenfell, 2008b). Importantly, however, the examination of interview material complicated ‘common-sense’ dualisms between aspirations of protection and production. Experience and attitude are individuated, but analysis of patterns from the composite dataset can inform the broader debate, for this reason, I seek to speak to this broader collective in the concluding section to the chapter.
5.6 Complicating the protection / production dualism

Delineations between groups associated with social objectives of protectionism (preservation and conservation) and production became blurry when speaking with participants involved deeply with high country land management. In most narratives, there was an encompassing range of values discussed, and in many examples social, economic and environmental values were not viewed as mutually exclusive. Examining the values of high country place through the eyes and narratives of various participants highlighted the complexities and cloudiness of values, complicating the division of land between protection and production categories.

Locally, people held plural values and were not necessarily opposing in their attitudes and relations towards others. There is explicit recognition of different epistemological claims, where economic and environmental “knowledge spaces” (Turnbull, 1997: 553) should be ‘situated’ as different, but neither should be prioritised over the other. Production and protection, each emerged as valued, but differently understood dimensions to high country space. Highlighted are the complex ways in which diverse understandings were negotiated by participants and entwined into a composite point of view on hybrid social space.

How individual participants related to the ‘landscape’ is highly significant in terms of how it is created as meaningful. People’s values and attitudes reflect individual dispositions and the internalised/embodied process of knowledge construction, they also reflect associations with collective habitus and the exposure to alternative ‘ways of seeing’. Bourdieu (2000; 1990) suggests that amongst any community or society, the performance of dispositions forms an observable range, potentially a spectrum, of preferences and allegiances to particular orders, values and partial social-spatial understandings. This inspired an important objective of the interviewing method, which encouraged participants to reflect on what had influenced the subjectivities of their attitude, and how their habitus had changed over time (see Chapter 4, Section 4.5.2, and

---

122 Personal subjectivities and values are relational, in the sense that one’s relationship with social space is mutual in the co-production of meaning.

123 Such an argument illustrates how dispositions (ideology, and attitude) are performative, enacted as a habitus of practice (Bourdieu, 2000; 1990; Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2007; Grenfell, 2008a; 2008b). A habitus therefore, represents a public declaration of one’s worldview, for which they may be held to account; where dispositions infer a particular stance on an issue, political allegiance, but also lays bare and open to critique, ones preferences and the partialities of their habitus.
Figure 4.1). This was to allow a more critical and sensitive examination of the different definitions of space that were operating within the local context.  

Each participant (84 in total) is located on a community spectrum diagram in Figure 5.4. The worldview statements of Participants A, B and C, identified in the spectrum, are examined in Appendix 6a however, their identities are detached from the coding schedule (see Appendix 3d). The three participants are used as examples that identify the complexities inherent in the ways that participants negotiated their ideology and subjective position within social-space. Each illustrates how worldview and the relational ways that dilemmas are made sense of at a personal level. By analysing each individual’s narrative in a similar way to the examples provided in Appendix 6a, emerged an understanding of the negotiation of worldview and ‘values’. Locally, people are exposed to diverse understandings and values for space and identity politics are tied to a complexity of reflexive capacities as an individual negotiated a position within the field (each as an individual of a particular life stage, a member of a family, a social group, a broader community).

Importantly, this self-definition is always fluid. For example, Participant A (Box 1, Appendix 6a), understood herself as “the wife of a farmer”, originally from ‘outside’ the high country community. She states arriving from her West Coast background, where she grew up in a coal-mining town, as “very green” and holding what she perceived as a “different understanding” of high country space. She explained how her values had become “greyer with time” and this was a multi-positionality that she found challenging, as both a landholder but also a conservationist, balancing livelihood (and the aspirations of a development focused husband) with her green ideals. Participant B was a landscape architect connected to the high country, whom had lived at a distance due to not inheriting her family property for it went to her elder brother (exemplifying ideas of patrilineal inheritance explored by Dominy (2001)). Referring to Box 2 in Appendix 6a the contradictions that appeared in the participant’s personal discourse were interesting. Participant C intertwined different meanings/values dimensions for social space to draw attention to differences between varied regions that comprise the ‘high country’ as generally defined. He advocated simultaneously for the value of the pastoral lease and its cultural history but also the need to understand ‘the landscape’ as dynamic and a process.

124 The two methods employed were, first, for the participant to construct a knowledge exposure diagram, and second, using these diagrams and the interview précis to draw inferences to construct a participant worldview statement.
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Or, what post-modern theorists, such as White (2004) Braun (2008, Zimmerer (2000), Ingold (1993; 2011) might assert to be a contingent, relationally coproduced hybrid-ecology, which is lived and interacted with in different ways.

The location of each point on the spectrum is derived from the analysis of individual worldviews statements (Chapter 4, Section 4.5). Some participants were polarised in their visions for the socio-natural trajectory of the high country but a number more are clustered within the middle ground upon the spectrum between productivist and protectionist. Locating participant A, B and C (Appendix 6a) upon the spectrum accounts for the complexities identified in their negotiated worldview, as presented to me as the researcher. However, while the schematic provides an interpretive tool, it rests on the assumption of a more balanced ‘middle ground’. Rather than identifying participants by the most predominant element of their perspective, for example productivist or protectionist or a grouped identity (for it was more complex that this for many participants), I sought to maintain the integrity of such complexities in the way participants are represented in Figure 5.4. For example, Participant A stressed having her wish to be preservationist constrained by the economic imperatives of living on the property. Participant B held value for a broad range of constituents in the formation of the high country landscape but tended towards a more protectionist valuation for the high country’s unique indigenous ecology. Participant C held elements of value for intensifying productivism, but was adamant for the need to protect the cultural and historical continuity of pastoralism.

Complicating the dualism often constructed between protection and production is a core aspect to the current thesis. As the subsequent chapters progress it becomes clear that while common ground exists, structural issues perpetuate a divisive context that has a marked effect on the habitus and relationships between conservation and farming interests. A precursor to opening a plural spatial politics is challenging the conventions of an existing debate and deconstructing the facets of the issue. Understanding the problematic of ‘division’ integrates diverse issues in the remainder of the thesis. This position is reinforced by the ethical commitment of constructionist scholarship, critical of the dualism between nature and society deeply embedded within social consciousness and environmental politics (see: Cronon, 1995; White, 1995, and extended by such as Tsouvalis, 2000; Whatmore, 2002; Zimmerer, 2000, Braun, 2006a; 2006b; 2008; Lorimer, 2012).
Figure 5.4: The attitudes of 84 study participants were assessed and located on a spectrum between productivist and protectionist values positions. Participants labelled A, B, C are provided as examples of how this positioning was achieved. Each correspond to the individuated analysis undertaken on participants (Appendix 6a), examining interview narrative, précis and worldview diagrams, which depicted a snapshot into the fluid knowledge of individual participants. This approach to positioning participant reflected how worldview is a complex, relational and embodied achievement in the sense that one's attitude and values are the focus of internal and external negotiation with related 'others'. However, it has clear limitations and assumptions.
5.7 The broad message from the chapter

As Olwig (2007: 581) contends, “it is one thing to study landscape as an assemblage of material objects, [but] quite another to study peoples aspirations with regard to landscapes” (emphasis original). In this milieu arises vitalism as people advocate ontologies comprising hybrid forms, mixtures of social meanings, needs and non-human components. Nature, space and society are rethought as relational achievements and power-laden hybrid constructs that emerge from assemblages of interactions. Diversity is given; difference is wound up in the process of becoming and ones relationship with place. This fluidity of landscape, “the ebb and flow of different organisms within a landscape through time” (Manning et al., 2009: 193), is of critical influence to the current study, challenging the fixity of categories that have been adhered to in tenure review. This chapter has examined deeply, a sample of the plural forms and landscape value assemblages, highlighting how the material environment, practices, social meanings and biodiversity are interwoven.

Braun (2008) claims that recognising the pluralism and vitality of social space is not enough, and does not promise a better approach towards diverse socio-natures, and may instead fuel divisive fires. In light of Braun’s assertion, the following three chapters seek first to examine issues with division: 1) how the dual category approach to tenure review is changing habitus and the social parameters of ‘the landscape’ (Chapter 6); 2) how division between ‘protection’ and ‘production’ interests underpins an intensification of oppositional politics and the articulation of power between social groups affiliated with such objectives (Chapter 7). Then, following this critique, Chapter 8 seeks to conceptualise a different political future for the emergent high country landscape. Focusing on flux and diversity rather than fixity; connections and overlaps, rather than cordonning off and bounding; contributes to a creative politics of ‘nature’ and the negotiated management of a hybrid social ecology like the high country (White, 2004; Braun, 2008; 2005; Lorimer, 2012; 2005; Whatmore, 2006). It extends beyond divisions by encompassing plural meanings, highlighting overlapping land definitions and subverting the associated predefined socio-political affiliations (conservationist/farmer, Forest and Bird/Fish and Game), positing individuation and subjectivity, rather than nature as objective and uniform. Such a stance acknowledges that space, landscape and nature, are not the same things to everyone, and therefore, questions how to work forward allowing for pluralism? The following chapters focus on this inherently political exercise of futuring (Bingham and Hinchliffe, 2008; Braun, 2006a; Thrift, 2004).
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6.0 Introduction
The previous chapter questioned duality constructs between nature and society perpetuated in tenure review by examining some of the composite values dimensions participants overlaid upon high country space. Analysing participant interview discourse uncovered varied and at times contesting attitudes towards high country space and nature. However, analysis and reflexively how data was presented also depicted some more closely aligned values within the interpersonal subjectivities of participants. This recognition complicated polarised depictions between production and protection objectives often portrayed in higher-level discourse and within macro-level political-economic and legal critique. Lorimer (2012: 599) suggests how environmental governance structures must work with this “epistemological pluralism”, in an emerging global multi-naturalism, characterised by complex co-productions between nature and society.

The current chapter begins by reengaging with the debate commenced in Chapter 5. In Section 6.1, I detail how tenure review reflects divisive ideology within conservation habitus through separation of ecological values from production. Tenure review attempted to achieve conservation through isolating ‘nature’ in reserves, while maintaining production through allowing claims for freehold tenure by lessees (see Chapter 3). After tenure review, many landholders and conservation participants disagreed with this division, which transformed space and removed cultural layers and social meanings that were enmeshed within the leasehold model. In Section 6.2 I examine how the pastoral mode was deeply linked with farmer subjectivities of ‘productivist custodianship’. Morris (2009) has examined this subjectivity in depth previously. In Section 6.3 I begin to understand the scale changes that have been occurring within the case study region. Initially, I employ an ArcGIS map to examine broader spatial-scale and boundary transformations at a regional level (Section 6.3.1). This analysis shows that separating land prioritised for State-centric preservation under DOC and granting freehold for the purpose of production is leading to broader changes to productive habitus. However, this is complex at the individual farm level and cannot be generalised, reflecting the call of Murdoch and Pratt (1993) to account for the complexities of neoliberal rural transformations.
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The analysis highlights the theoretical positioning of Chapter 6 and Chapter 7 within the thesis. Each expand the examination of interplay between macro and micro level politics over tenure review, broadening from an individuated level in the previous chapter, to a more abstract focus with the application of Bourdieu. By way of contributing to the deconstruction phase of the thesis, the two chapters highlight how boundaries are modifying the well-established set of relations: 1) between landholders and ‘nature’ which under the pastoral lease were regulated as a pastoral habitus (Chapter 6); 2) between landholders and the conservation ‘other’ involved within high country landscape management, but on a separate landholdings following tenure review and thus, categorised as being for “different purposes” (LINZ liaison 2) (Chapter 7).

Such a discussion expands on the conflict within Harvey’s (1989) discussion of the production of space, which focuses on the macro-level analysis and trends, examined in Braun (2006b). The analysis conducted by these scholars highlights the importance of balancing critiques of capitalism at the level of global abstraction with consideration of local habitus and productive attitudes, inter-personal contingencies and the agency to resist neoliberalism as a hegemonic socio-logical ordering. Reflecting back to Figure 1.3 in the introduction that outlines the components to the thesis, Applications Box 6.1 highlights how such a theoretical position is progressed in the following chapter.

Applications Box 6.1: Applying Bourdieu's metaphors of habitus and field

Bourdieu is applied in the current chapter as his metaphors of habitus and field are useful for conceptualising landscape transformation in terms of transforming farming and conservation habitus.

Focused again on empirical data and participant responses, the chapter seeks to interrogate issues with division between nature and society, as a central focus of constructionist critique of modernist preservation orthodoxy.

The chapter contributes another puzzle piece to a thesis seeking to push the politics surrounding high country landscape management forward by identifying existing conflicts as arising because tenure review re-categorises on the basis of a around a resilient duality between ‘protected’ space (or public ‘DOC land’) and ‘productive’ space (privatised ‘farmland’).

6.1 Division and the prioritisation of ‘naturalness’

As mentioned in Chapter 5, division was the most prominent theme in participant interviews. This chapter examines this discussion more deeply. Justifications for division between protection and production values were the basis of tension between the attitudes
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of many participants. The conservation focus of separating indigenous values from grazing when reclassifying the landscape in tenure review and the associated over-prioritisation of ‘naturalness’ was the primary reason for many landholders, and also several conservation participants rejecting the approach of division.

Such perspectives understood the high country landscape as a highly modified social ecology rather than a natural space. For example, a lessee argued “there is an attachment to the naturalness of the high country, but us farmers know that’s not entirely the case … it’s changed a lot, even just in the last two generations it’s changed a lot, but some of it still looks natural. (Male landholder 8 - emphasis added). In a similar vein to the landholder, a grasslands ecologist stated that “[i]n my own research there has been a constant demand to protect natural systems … [but] the high country is a novel ecosystem … and it should be managed [in a way that includes all values]” (Grasslands ecologist 1).

While such statements are inherently political, a number of participants explicitly prioritised naturalness. The terms ‘natural’, ‘original’, ‘pre-human’ and ‘pristine’ occurred frequently within interviews. Several participants from conservation backgrounds attached high value to the ‘natural state’ and original character of the high country landscape and ecology prior to human habitation, supporting the typology of ecologically focused values and the ‘restored hybrid’ expressed in Chapter 5. A minority of participants with more strongly ecologically focused ideologies offered interesting perspectives for conceptualising the resilient schism between nature and society. This duality is undermining more holistic and sensitive approaches to land management and relations between actors within landscape politics (Braun, 2008; Zimmerer, 2006; 2000; Cronon, 2014; 2002; 1995).

The constructionist lens, and in particular Cronon (2002; 1995), White (1995; 2004) and Adams (2004), query whether by venerating the ‘natural’ diverts attention from encouraging more sensitive practices within ‘less natural’, modified natures. The following quotation from a landscape architect identifies the risk of reducing focus on the practices occurring on modified landscapes:

… [A] special landscape to me is a more natural landscape so I guess I ignore other landscapes, I don’t see modified landscapes… they have lost their values, they are not important to me cause they have lost their naturalness (DOC employee 1; emphasis added). 126

125 When fronted with such signifiers I questioned the participant how they felt such concepts applied to the landscape with varied and insightful responses.
126 This quote came midway through this participant’s interview and his subsequent clarification provides an interesting lens into the fluid negotiation of worldview: “I guess it is not to say that there isn’t value in trying
Similarly, a second participant outlines this compartmentalisation:

*Natural landscapes* to me are healthier landscapes and farmed landscapes to me just signal environmental destruction, water pollution, overstocking, effluent stressed and abused animals, industrialism and profit. There are all those meanings attached to a farmed landscape. (Landscape architect 1; emphasis added).

Revering natural values, which is achieved by erecting boundaries, is questionable. It is a position full of political lacunae that underpins a contest between those who live and work the landscape and elements of a policy and national discourse motivated by ‘locking up’ nature, and seeking to remove human intervention.

Such an argument brings attention to the high country region as a “borderlands” (Zimmerer, 2007: 227), in which it is a region of conflict wedged between land that is entirely modified (for example, the Canterbury Plains were referred to in two participants opinions as “highly modified” (ECan, 1) and a “destroyed” nature (Conservation representative 1)) and land viewed as ‘indigenous nature’, which is enclosed in National Parks such as Fiordland and Arthur’s Pass National Park (referential locations close to the South Island high country). To some participants, isolating nature with tenure review represented an effort to restore the high country’s various indigenous ecologies, whereas a landholder contended that the high country is a “landscape not quite bugged enough to write off for all out development” (Male Landholder 13). The participant drew attention to ecological succession, a longstanding point of knowledge controversy between various ecologists (expressed in Chapter 2), and emphasised that the landscapes management should balance and enhance value, not create further alienation between divergent objectives. As McFarlane (2011) contends, the core mandate for the ecologically sustainable management of Significant Ecological Values was side-lined from tenure review when negotiations became conflicted as production, ecological and public access values dominated. To an extent, this issue is associated with a ‘natural state politics’, where through divisive ideology held within preservation visions for nature, ecological protection to conserve degraded landscapes, but it’s different conservation”. Here he suggests how there is a different degree of conservation for less and more degraded environs. He extended by saying, “I have to be careful because I get caught up, people say that ‘it’s sad all these irrigators are going up, they are cutting down the trees [on the Canterbury Plains]’, I used to say whoopie shit, only shelter belts and pine trees, who cares?” (ibid.). The qualifications made were that the plains are now a “cow shit covered monoculture” (ibid.), the trees provided habitat for lower order biodiversity, and they were also the plains landscape he recalled from his childhood. Such a shift in attitude illustrated the recognition of cultural landscape values and potential for valuing less natural aspects of a modified ecology. However, this participant’s attention in the high country was drawn to the restoration of indigenous values.
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was set as an externalised category of land use opposed to agro-production in an already ‘used’ landscape.

Many participants were critical of the emphasis on naturalness that tenure review advanced. Connections with constructionist scholarship highlighting the complexities of ‘nature’ as relationally produced and political phenomena, examined in Chapter 2 and in Chapter 5, were highlighted around issues participants had with division. Tensions emerged regularly over the narrow institutional vision for the conservation of “only the indigenous values” (Male landholder 15), which was suggested to guide conservation management as a form of habitus. As a result, cultural values and connections from the high country as a ‘social ecology’ were erased, despite the layers of living and working in the landscape that gave meaning to the space for many landholders (Ingold, 2011).

A sample of participant quotations in Applications Box 6.2 express the opinions of several landholders, who were critical of transformations that occurred following tenure review. Each quotation provides an interesting element to the discussion over conservation and the erasure of human influence from nature.

**Applications Box 6.2 – Erasing social-cultural layers.**

[T]he thing to change with tenure review is the removal of the social aspects of the landscape, the farming stories, the huts, the things that were meaningful with the farming. There are huge changes. (Male Landholder 19).

It all changes with tenure review, the management changes, the practices that kept the landscape change (Male Landholder 8).

... things that had significance in time disappear with a conservation agenda. DOC took over a lot of land, all the fences went, some of them were historic fences, there have been huts bulldozed, they had stories that went with them (Male Landholder 15).

It is the people side of living and working in the landscape and the stories disappearing. That is my concern with rigid partitioning with tenure review, we need to try and accommodate all the different values (Recent Landholder 2).

In particular, insight within Applications Box 6.2 takes issue with conservation habitus that perpetuates a modernist separation between nature and society, rather than seeking more integrated approaches to managing cultural landscapes (Bryan, 2012; Foster, 2010; Forsyth, 2008; Stephenson, 2005; 2008; 2010). The fourth quote posits this concern especially well, suggestive of accommodating values in an integrated way, rather than piecemeal land parcels of ‘use and non-use’. 
A range of participants, including several DOC managers and employees as well as multiple landholders, challenged the divisive approach of tenure review. Such argumentation tied back to the concepts of tenure review as a ‘green empowered land grab’ and imposition based upon ‘locking up’ nature, as literature themes (see: Corson and MacDonald, 2012; Armstrong et al., 2008). These were also themes that emerged while reviewing media and institutional coverage (for example see Loe, 2008; Beer et al., 2006; Broad, 2005; NZ National Party, 2005; NZ Parliament, 2005). A farmer noted that “conservation has constructed the idea in public minds that land is only legitimately protected if they see a green and yellow DOC sign” (Male landholder 20). Another considered that his “uppity” defensive attitude towards “greenies” transpires from the attacking attitude of some employees and the “insulting premise that values cannot and have not been protected on high country properties” (Male Landholder 14). On this reading, conservation in the public consciousness is an activity done by DOC. For example, in total, 35 of 51 landholders referred to feelings of alienation from conservation objectives advanced by DOC, even though interviewing did not directly address this issue.127

Perceived ‘benefits’ but also complexities of separation logic
A number of participants who advocated the benefits of separating indigenous values from use identified grazing as representing exploitation and damage (examined in the final section to Chapter 5, associated with restoration and flourishing hybrid typologies).

A DOC manager explained that “protection and public access needed to be allocated explicitly and freehold represented the neat outcome of division between exploitation and protection” (DOC Manager 3). It is interesting how this statement represents the way boundaries have become normalised in the habitus of conservation actors, as the justified way of protecting ecological values. A second conservation manager, argued that under the pastoral lease “optimal conservation targets couldn’t be met” (DOC manager 1). However, such an opinion is juxtaposed against the understanding of some developmentally focused participants, who argued the pastoral lease was constraining development as “land could not be pushed for maximum production” (Newcomer landholder 2).

127 Regardless of whether documents such as the Canterbury Conservation Management Strategy (CCMS) (DOC, 2002) and the management objectives of Ō Tū Wharekai (Sullivan, 2012) state explicitly that landholders are primary stakeholders in the 9 Canterbury conservation units.
The notion of ‘optimal conservation’ versus ‘maximum production’ is troublesome when the current project is focused on examining an ideology advancing division between protection and production interests. Such an ideology may legitimate the “writing off of land” (Landscape Architect 1) to intensified land use on the basis that ‘othered’ land is isolated for extrinsic preservation of extant indigenous biodiversity. This brings the net conservation benefits obtained from tenure review into question (PCE, 2013). Scholars like Bryan (2012) and Adams (2004) suggest that nature protection is potentially made peripheral to society and economic production when boundaries are erected in between these concepts.

Landscape architect 1 reiterated the strength of the pastoral management system for maintaining the landscape as a balanced system. Reflecting on Chapter 5, the concept of the balanced hybrid was an argument supported by many participants who questioned the idea of land and ecological values being ‘restored’ when returned to full State-control and ownership. Many participants emphasised that this had not happened with tenure review, and the restoration ideology was considered tenuous in many cases. This links to the work of Cronon (2002) who considers restoring values to a static indigenous state to be a nostalgic and utopian vision that is unrealistic in the context of contemporary globalism. As I began to establish in Chapter 3, the origins and political aspirations of what is understood to be a ‘conservation’ philosophy is grounded on preservation goals at the heart of New Zealand’s ecological protection orthodoxy (Moon, 2013; McFarlane, 2011; Norton and Miller, 2000; Rainbow, 1993).

When reflecting back on the critical stance of constructionism and conservation geographies, the lexicon and practices of fortress preservation are inherently at odds with the notions of hybrid socio-nature and the fostering of a conservation/sustainability ethos, which is workable across society and all land uses. Such an ethos would conceive sustainability as ‘conservative’ and sustainable management of production land and humanised natures, not just preservation of land allocated for nature protection. This highlights the current emphasis in conservation geography, which focuses on how net-conservation and sustainability benefits should be obtained on private landholdings, by encouraging sensitive production and obtaining community buy in with conservation objectives (Bryan, 2012; Zimmerer, 2010; Adams, 2004). However, as Brechin et al., (2002) asserts, communities only buy into conservation objectives when they are socially and economically justified and feasible, as well as ecologically gainful.
In New Zealand, Norton and Miller (2000) highlight a similar discussion, arguing that pragmatic conservation attention is needed in agricultural landscapes. Crown land and DOC conservation estate comprises approximately 30 per cent of New Zealand’s total land area, whereas 70 per cent of New Zealand’s land area is under private ownership. Therefore, in order to achieve maximum net conservation benefits, native biodiversity conservation must occur on private landholdings and landscapes that are also providing a productive return to land owners. In this regard, Norton and Miller (2000) highlight the importance of connecting ecological fragments, and refocusing conservation away from pristine parks and reserves and towards hybrid ecosystems. With regard to tenure review, Stephens, Walker and Price (2008: 48) explained how tenure review’s reserving of mostly high elevation land “did little to mitigate biodiversity decline”. Tenure review frequently led to the privatisation of easily developable lowlands, freeing land from lease restraints but also threatening landscapes valuable for lowland native habitats that are underrepresented in the conservation estate and increasingly subject to intensification pressures. The prediction Stephens, Walker and Price (2008) and Ewer et al. (2006) make, is that biodiversity will rapidly deteriorate over time as a result of tenure review. This highlights the divisions created by tenure review and the politicised outcomes of the process.

6.2 Interpersonal subjectivities - scale and custodianship

Many participants identified that in their view, conservation and production had worked together or were integrated under the pastoral lease and that integration was lost through the division enacted by tenure review. Participants argued that tenure review and those who had progressed the policy failed to understand the broader level of management oversight the pastoral lease provided. It regulated production at an expansive spatial scale, which was consistent with how the high country has traditionally been conceptualised. Concepts of spatial scale and leaseholder custodianship were intertwined in participant discussion of the pastoral lease, which was understood to characterise a relative stasis that balanced protection with production under the pastoral mode (Allan, 1994; Floate et al., 1994; Floate, 1992).

Norton and Miller (2000) suggest that to effectively conserve native biodiversity in rural landscapes four key issues need be considered: (i) what might be realistic goals for native biodiversity conservation; (ii) how might we better arrange different land uses to meet both native biodiversity and production goals; (iii) what is the optimum arrangement of native biodiversity; and (iv) how native biodiversity conservation can improve productive returns to land managers.
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“[T]he line between [production and protection values] has traditionally been less distinct” argued DOC Manager 1. He and many other participants contended that the pastoral lease maintained a level of dialogue and shared interest between the Crown and landholders. There were close relationships between Crown Land Advisors who operated to administer the Crown’s interest in the Pastoral Lease and support farmer land management. Productivist as it was, all landholders and many other participants, perceived that the pastoral lease maintained a relationship between the State and lessees, and also a higher level of regulative control over land use. 129 As one landholder stated,

The Pastoral Lease was about accepting that a pastoral lands officer could come and tell you what you were doing well and what you were doing badly, you had to answer to them … you were accountable for bad practice. (Male Landholder 23).

The quotation suggests a level of social control that was regulated in the pastoral lease but which was also an aspect of farmer habitus. Many participants reflected frequently on the relationship between higher-level controls manifest in localised social subjectivities and praxis (several examples are provided in Box 1, Appendix 4a).

Claims of custodianship emerged in the assessment of values (see Chapter 5 and Box 1, Appendix 4a), as part of a recognised habitus of pastoralism within high country space. A “low intensity” (DOC employee 2) and “expansive farming model” (Landscape Ecologist 1) are phrases that exemplify ideas of custodianship expressed by many participants. Most participants, both conservation and farming, discussed personal understandings of ‘farmer custodianship’, stewardship and protection, whether they agreed that low intensity pastoralism was a protective measure or not (illustrated in Chapter 5 as a knowledge controversy). However, many participants frequently perceived pastoral practices as conservative and lower intensity compared to contemporary productivist potentials (with irrigation technologies and more industrialised modes).

Farming sensibly and making concessions to the climate and environment were concepts intertwined with ideas of custodianship and a historically rooted understanding of prudent high country farmers being risk adverse and farming within the ‘constraints of nature’. Most landholders understood that the grazing scheme needed to let the tussock seed and to not stock too heavily. As an older landholder communicated, “I think that generally people stock to look after that land, overgrazing was never to our advantage, I think most farmers understand that the vegetation is fragile and under that is a dustbowl”

129 The Perpetual Pastoral Lease under the Land Act 1948 provided rights to pastoral grazing, and Crown Land Advisors regulated stock limits. The lease entitled no rights to interfere with the subsurface, unless prior consent was obtained from the Commissioner for Crown Lands.
(Male landholder 11). This was an aspect of the farmer’s habitus that reflected the erosion potential of the high country valley in which he operated. In the narratives of many participants, existed an underlying notion that “nature will always have the last say” (Male Landholder 14). This statement signifies the exertion of environmental / non-human agency in nature society relationship between the leaseholder and the environment, and many other landholders discussed how the scale and risks of pastoralism in the high country influenced their habitus. However, several individuals perceived that keeping pastoralism / production within the constraints imposed by the environment was a practise particular to older generations of farmers, and that new technologies offered different and more lucrative production potentials. It was acknowledged by these participants that technology (for example, irrigation) allows the variability traditionally associated with the need for conservative grazing to be attenuated and “made safe” (Tenure Review Liaison 1). However, with this reliability of income and lifestyle many traditional landholders would argue an element of the high country identity is lost as the mode of production becomes less of an “intrepid proposition” (ECan representative 1).

Traditional visions of high country space invoke pastoralism on a large spatial scale and a particular “way of life” (Male Landholder 4), a traditional mode of “low intensity farming” (Landscape Architect 3) and an identity associated with what it means to be a high country farmer (Dominy, 2003, 2001; Morris, 2009; Haggerty, Campbell and Morris, 2009; Chapman, 1996). The spatial scale at which properties were traditionally farmed on a pastoral basis has given rise to a range of values commonly held by local conservation and farming participants. For example, participants that valued aesthetic aspects of space often discussed the cultural value of the high country with notions of expansiveness and vast spatial scale. For these informants the high country’s value rested not with its naturalness, but as a highly modified nature where the landscape remained expansive. These participants valued the high country as a homogenous grassland system, as distinct from patchworks of small paddocks developed into irrigated pasture, intensive crops and green feed. It is interesting how different levels of modification were represented and perceived by participants, with each having varied levels of acceptability, accentuating the relational construction of spatial values.

Under the pastoral lease, the large spatial scale of high country properties had provided productive advantage and economic and environmental resilience. For example, spatial scale corresponded to the different ways that properties were farmed, where leaseholds were broken into categories like the steep and snow prone ‘summer country’,
and ‘sweet’ or winter safe terrain on sunny low slopes. Farmers were exposed to scalar
conventions of traditional generationally resilient pastoral practices that had become
deply established in the social-spatial habitus of group membership as a ‘high country
farmer’ and imbued with symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 2001; Dominy, 2001). An example
of this is associated with maintaining the inter-tussock matrix, examined in Applications
Box 6.3, where a number of older generation landholders explained how Tara Hills High
Country Research Institute was a major contributor of knowledge about range
management.

A number of conservationist participants also agreed with the benefits of low
intensity pastoralism locally. A DOC manager argued this convincingly, asserting
productivist stewardship as an aspect of the pastoral lease that has been beneficial for
maintaining landscape stasis, rather than intensifying decline. He stated:

… land that’s been used in a low intensity way is generally in good condition,
some of it you can’t tell either side of the fence what has been grazed and what
hasn’t, at Hakatere Station when it went back to DOC, it was pristine tussock
lands. … In my opinion there have been minimal impacts on the country from
grazing after the Land Act, simply because of the scale farmers have farmed
with … impacts are spread … there has not been a lot of biodiversity loss in the
high country since the early days, there were huge losses before … it hasn’t gone
backwards too much but it hasn’t really recovered either (DOC Manager 1).

Importantly, such a perspective emphasises how there are different understandings of
protection, where the participant recognises that to an extent farmers protected the
landscape for production, but indigenous/conservation values were somewhat retained.
The broader perspective I seek to highlight is that enlightened farmer habitus has tended
to emphasise maintaining the resilience of the native-exotic matrix and a well-balanced,
conservative grazing regime.

Several DOC participants similarly argued, that tenure review was ill-conceived in
the way in which it removed the ability to graze from any land ceded back to conservation,
consequently setting production and biodiversity protection apart as mutually exclusive
categories. They contended that the pastoral lease enabled the high country to be
maintained as an expansive, grassland landscape that functioned in a relatively integrated
way, which provided flexibility to managed change in the economic conditions and as well
as management of the environment’s fragility and sensitivity to production.

---

130 A large amount of sweet country often determined a successful pastoral property, for it was attributed to
longer growing season, better pasturage and the ability to get more stock through long winters.
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Applications Box 6.3 - Knowledge exposure inflected in pastoral habitus

Several participants identified Tara Hills Research Institute as the major contributor of knowledge about low impact, integrated land management. Many emphasised the role of mixed pasturage and maintaining the inter-tussock matrix – the moist area between a group of tussocks that provides an important microclimate for establishing rye grasses, clovers and other pasture species. Maintaining this microclimate was understood as good farm husbandry (Pedofsky and Douglas, 1987, Allan, 1994; O'Connor, 1998b; 1998c). The resilience of mixed herbage was productively valuable because the indigenous species were drought tolerant, whereas the lush growth with over sewn pastoral species was seasonal. The native inter-matrix provided a more resilient pasture, and unless under severe dry conditions there was something for stock to eat.

The native character of this hybrid matrix also provides the golden brown landscape character of aesthetic and cultural value (see Chapter 2). There was conflict between understandings of this inter-matrix when examining conservation perspectives and literature. The microclimate that provides for pasture species is also the microclimate where ecologically precious and often sensitive indigenous flora is likely to survive (Mark et al., 2009). Therefore, this micro-scale environment becomes a focus of politics and a number of participants drew on these different concepts of the inter-matrix to justify their positions (for example, forming the backdrop to the knowledge controversy over aesthetic and ecological valuations of space in Chapter 5).

The important emphasis here is that institutions influence knowledge and therefore, the productivist attitudes and practices (the habitus) of landholders. The two examples given by landholders were relationships with Crown Lands Advisors and Tara Hills. This is a particular aspect of analysis in Chapter 8, where with tenure review and subsequent restructuring, a lot of this institutional capacity has been lost, and a narrowing logic of production improvement has taken place of more custodial practices.

The following quote exposes some of the subjectivity that is inherent within locally negotiated concepts of custodianship by highlighting the clash between eco-centric and utilitarian concepts of custodianship. The participant views’ broadly fitted with the ‘developmental values’ disposition referred to in Chapter 5). However, he has retained the pastoral lease on the basis of cultural heritage, stating that:

There is a well know ethic of leaving the land in a better state than when you found it … there is an expectation that each generation would build on and improve on the previous generation for the benefit, not only of increasing production output, but for the sustainability of production and the care of the land. On these properties natural assets are not apart from the productive assets (Male Landholder 8).

Such a perspective integrates ambitions of increasing production and care for the land often perceived as incompatible, where conservation ideology is oriented around an intrinsic values frame. Although farming sensibly within the constraints of the environment was attached to concepts of landholder custodianship it was contested, as
often it was imbricated with concepts of economic production and productive improvement (Pawson and Brooking, 2013).\textsuperscript{131} In rare examples, less moderate eco-centric participants regarded arguments of custodianship as rhetoric and wash. Claims of landholder custodianship depicted contested imaginaries and normative ethics of protecting ecology as restored indigenous ecosystems, a cognitive understanding that was based on a resilient separation between nature and society. This protectionist ideology presented an ideological quandary when farmers were understood to be oppositional in some accounts, as “production oriented” (DOC employee 4) and constantly “looking for profits” (DOC Manager 1). The counter argument that emerged in opinions of those critical of farmer custodianship, however, was that the doors are now open to intensive development with division and allocation of freehold land title. A contradiction emerged in this participant discourse, where some ecologically focused participants advocated strongly for division with tenure review to retain values, establish parks and remove land from use. However, most rejected outcomes of intensification, which they perceived to arise from tenure review.

Several participants suggested that conservation done by farmers was by accident and to do with low stock numbers rather than planned conservation, and retaining productivity was most important. This perspective restates arguments within the previous chapter, regarding a resilient perspective of conservation as an extrinsic endeavour. It is a position that questions whether conservation by accident while ‘under productive use’ is a justified form of conservation; where preservationist logic on which New Zealand’s conservation ideology frequently advances (through emphasis on establishing parks and reserves) seeks to extract humans from the conservation estate to protect nature as authentic and unadulterated by social use. This binary framing reiterates the critical arguments of Cronon (1995) and White (1995), and draws questioning on what is lost or

\textsuperscript{131} The concept of ‘improvement’ was highly contested but is ingrained within high country understandings established in early productivism, within the Land Act 1948 and within contemporary documents. Legislation and regulations such as the Catchment Board Run Plans put limitations on ‘unimproved’ marginal lands. The imperative was to develop and improved agricultural capacity. The ‘Skinny Sheep Policies’ of the 1970s entrenched a social discourse of quantity productivism over quality productivism. However, the harsh times faced by the farming community with the removal of subsidies with neoliberalisation in 1984 has continued to underpin a deeply rooted distrust for the State, and rhetoric of productivist development to ensure economic resilience and independence from centralised politics remains prevalent. More recently, the CPLA 1998 (under which tenure review is administered) specifies in exacting terms the parameters of agricultural improvement. It continues to frame productivist development as land improvement that many conservation participants disagreed wholeheartedly with. Improvement is conceived of as development to make the landholdings easier to farm or more economically productive within this higher level discourse, which certainly suggests that modernist productivist imperatives are retained in higher level political echelons with drastic influence locally.
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gained when conservation and production are combined. Some broader conclusions in the regard are drawn from analysis in the final chapters to the thesis.

Such analysis once again brings to life the different conservation ideologies of participants, ranging from emphasis on the intrinsic values of nature, through to cultural and utilitarian ideologies and ‘neoliberal conservation’ of nature as an economic resource (Robinson, 2011; Brockington, 2004; Castree, 2008a; 2008b). However, highlighting issues with the erection of boundaries between conservation and production, tenure review is facilitating scalar change with the operation of high country farming. I assert that the “black and white” (Landscape Architect 1) re-categorisation of space, which is orchestrated by the State, is underlying the centripetal pull inward of ‘capsulised nature’, bounded and enclosed for State centralised preservation. Whereas local government takes a more pro-development approach due to the influence of their rural voters and the control of land is increasingly decentralised as freehold landholdings are created through tenure review.

Often, governance institutions are understood as development biased and landholder dominated in rural contexts (Goodwin, 1998). I suggest that this binarised restructuring of space and landscape is enabling a more neoliberal farming logic to become entrenched in the context of freehold land use, while enabling restricted public access to the conservation commons, which is managed centrally by DOC.

To what extent is their substance to productivist custodianship?

Peden (2011a; 2011b) reassessed a long time controversy over the pastoral use and previously perceived abuse of the high country grasslands. In particular, he challenged what was previously perceived to be the indiscriminate use of burning by colonial pastoralists. Peden asserted how historical use and management, within a productivist frame of mind, was perhaps more considered than previously understood, and therefore, questioned whether more substance could be accorded to arguments of landholder custodianship, sometimes passed off as rhetoric in public representations.

The issue of developing the high country into a more intensively productivist landscape has become a potent focus of national scrutiny. However, as evident in the above discussion, many landholder participants clung to concepts and subjectivities associated with custodianship. Conservation of soil, vegetation and water was understood within the frame of conservative productivism, challenging modernist ideology of fortress conservation, and the use of boundaries between production and protection values. This highlights how the current paradigm within conservation ecology has shifted to encourage
sensitive production relations and humans-in-ecosystems approaches to biodiversity conservation, recognising the always hybrid constitution of social natures and novel ecosystems (Hobbs, Higgs and Harris, 2009; Harris et al., 2006; Bryan, 2012; Norton and Miller, 2000; Adams, 2004; Robinson, 2011).

In light of Brower’s (2006a; 2006b; 2008) critique, a perspective in support of farmer custodianship may be considered to be evidence of the tenure review process being captured by social and capitalist agrarian hegemony. This is an issue briefly discussed in the following section. Historical concepts of custodianship were situated in a different social context, where land and agricultural improvement and animal husbandry were understood to be motives and outcomes of stewardship (Peden, 2011; McAloon, 2013; 2011; Round, 2009). Working for DOC and having connections with lessees in the study region, I experienced landholders seeking to do a “good job” (Male Landholder 9) of protecting landscape and ecological values. Many valued such aspects of high country space, which supports my view that a contemporary ethos of productivist custodianship is more important than is often recognised in distanced portrayals. The ‘knowledge spaces’ and visions for ‘nature’s trajectory’ may differ (Turnbull, 1997), but the intent of the farming groupings traditional discourse of custodial use is genuine. While not ‘use free’, the majority of participants recognised the importance of the low intensity pastoral mode at an expansive spatial scale for retaining the valuable landscape qualities, which was described as being notable for being “homogenous” (informants 10, 13, 35), “golden brown” (informants 35, 47, 60, 62, 63) and for its “unbroken, continuous landforms” (DOC employee 3). The aforementioned examples illustrate participants’ understandings of a particular ontological state of the high country landscape, which is perceived to be authentic but which is relationally constructed and prone to change. This subjectivity of custodianship could potentially have been directed in a more sensitive way than the method of “environmental apartheid” that was explained by Male Landholder 9 to rest at the heart of tenure review.

The traditional ethic of custodianship based on broad scale pastoralism is under transformation in some cases. However, focusing on ‘naturalness’ and the potential for a “pristine high country landscape” (Tenure Review Liaison 1), and extreme examples of

---

132 The tenure review negotiator asserted in an email:
“Firstly, except for Fiordland and parts of South Island national parks, I don’t think a pristine natural high country place exists. Humans have changed the face of the South Island high country... We can’t turn the clock back, but we can provide better management of the land resource so that differing activities can co-exist to the advantage of humans and indigenous/exotic species. I firmly believe farming,
intensive development, skews the debate away from plural visions and enables shared values for spatial becoming. The debate swiftly becomes a contest between two generic social groups, ‘conservationists’ and ‘farmers’, at a perceived and conceived level of social space (Lefebvre, 1973). Contrary to the perceived impasses between the “banner waving fraternity” of Federated Farmers (Landscape architect 1) and higher-level conservation rhetoric, looking closely at the local context shows that there is substantial active negotiation occurring between actors. However, tenure review division may reduce crossover between diverse habitus, by erecting a fixed boundary between production (private) and protection (public) objectives.

6.3 Tenure review, ‘a mere blip’ of policy or a destructive split intervention?

Various participants reflected on the different political agendas that have impacted on the high country community. Some were fleeting, others more influential on the constitution of high country space. At various times, politics associated with the conservation of the high country have emphasised plant values, ecology, soil conservation and mountaintop erosion (Cumberland, 1941; 1944; McCaskill, 1973; McSaveney and Whitehouse, 1989). Some have led subsequent sea changes in the way the landscape is conceptualised and the place of production within it. Parallel to this, one lessee believed tenure review represented “just another blip” (Male Landholder 10) in the high country transition, as a community who he perceived to have been “poked and prodded and used as a political football for years and years” (ibid.). However, several other participants challenged this lessee’s opinion that tenure review would be a ‘blip’. They suggested that if all properties completed tenure review there would be an aggregate transformation to the high country production system that would undermine the high country as a cultural landscape by significantly reducing the scale of properties. The process is influencing how the landscape is

133 With regard to such a relationship and political issues, several participants suggested that current relationships with the landscape and conservation interests, would continue irrespective of the process, indicating an understanding of productivism and conservation increasingly operating as ‘separated’ land uses following tenure review. This argument is the critical focus to Chapter 7.
conceptualised spatially, and therefore, the activities that occur within high country space and relationships between actor groups that are under transformation. For this reason the study stands at an important confluence point in the trajectory of high country landscape transition.

Reflecting on the range of participant insight within interviews, division represented re-territorialisation of land between narrowly defined categories of ‘conservation’ and ‘farm production’. Concepts of spatial scale emerged as a prominent analytical theme, increasingly evident within the contextual subjectivities of landholders and conservationists. The risk associated with an inflexible vision that land needs to be allocated for production, conservation and public access is that space becomes “boxed up” (Female Landholder 4) into “ordinary farms” (ECan representative 1). The potential for a holistic / integrated landscape understanding and management approach is undermined, whereas under the State leasehold public access could have been legislated for and ownership structures could have been focused on regulation that encourages collaboration for beneficial and shared outcomes. This collaborative management of a ‘commons’ is more difficult when freehold rights are allocated with tenure review, and landholders are strongly influenced by neoliberal imperatives of a competitive and profit driven productivist political economy, governed by a logic of national growth on the basis of limited (and differently conceived) land resources.

At a regional level, with tenure review, the case study region has become increasingly complex spatially. Visible on the ArcGIS map in Figure 6.1 is the evolving boundary between farming and conservation land. As of June 2013, existing conservation land is identified in light green, and more recent conservation land obtained through tenure review is identified in mid-tone green. Land reserved through Nature Heritage Fund purchases is visible in dark green (this is a process of whole farm purchasing for conservation accumulation that operated parallel to tenure review. Clent Hills and Hakatere Stations were purchased in full from this process). There have been no further tenure reviews completed since this map was produced in June 2013, but clearly a significant proportion of leasehold property has been returned to Crown control for conservation under DOC management.

The previous leaseholders are generally left with a small section of the land area that comprised the pastoral lease (identified in red), but as freehold land, smaller holdings have development rights (whether for diversified or more intensive use). For example, the allocated freehold land from tenure review on properties such as Mesopotamia, Mt Peel,
Mt Potts and Double Hill has reduced productive areas substantially. However, often this freehold is the valley floors and flat lands with intensification potential. The presence and administration of local governance and conservation agencies blurs the boundaries between local and non-local, rural and urban (Wilson, 2004). The case region is administered under the auspices of Environment Canterbury. However, as detailed on the map, it is divided between different local councils (the administrative boundaries dividing the council areas are identified in pink). The Rangitata Gorge is administered under the Timaru District Council, the Ashburton Gorge / Hakatere Basin is administered under the Ashburton District Council, and the Southern and Northern Banks of the Rakaia are administered by the Selwyn District Council. Similarly, DOC management in the region is divided across the region, with the Rakaia controlled by the Canterbury Conservancy and the Ashburton and Rangitata Gorges controlled by the Raukapuka Conservancy. North Canterbury Fish and Game and South Canterbury Fish and Game also divide administration over the area. To a limited extent, such overlaps and complexities allow this research to provide a lens to support exploration of the ‘dynamics of nesting’ between the institutions fundamental to high country environmental management structures in the local context.
Figure 6.1: A GIS map illustrating outcomes from tenure review and relative split between freehold and conservation land in the case study region.
i) Examining the regional level

Situating the conceptualisation of custodianship in relation to my own positionality, the sense I obtained was that people who live and work in the study region are deeply influenced by the landscape and its scale (a form of non-human, or biophysical agency - see Whatmore 2006; 2002; Lorimer, 2012; Bingham and Hinchliffe, 2008). Through working in a conservation capacity within the study region and building relationships with the farming community, I became aware that people who live or work within the region for a period of time, become embodied in space (reiterating sentiments of Dominy (2001) and Ingold (2005; 1993)). An aspect of this is how properties have ordinarily been farmed on a vast scale. Particularly, if high country framers have experience with different landscapes (for example, in overseas rural landscapes or low country New Zealand farming experience) they are able to contrast this to the broad spatial scale that has traditionally constituted high country subjectivity and social-spatial praxis (Morris, 2009; Haggerty et al., 2009; Jay, 2007).

It is not until one visits properties like Mt White in the middle of the Arthur’s Pass, Mt Algidus or Glenfalloch in the distant reaches of the Rakaia Valley that the scale some high country farmers have operated within can be truly comprehended. Land expands out from a vantage point and is at times uninterrupted by prominent human use. However, the vast tracts of land are not necessarily highly productive in terms of farm production. Such stations were classed as “real high country” (Male Landholder 12) – large interior properties that are steep, high altitude and dry with limited flat country. However, the Pastoral Lease encapsulated a range of properties, some large, others relatively small for a particular environmental gradient. As a general rule, 10,000 hectares in the Canterbury high country will carry roughly the same stock units as 1000 hectares on the Canterbury lowlands. Historically landholders relied on scale to provide a production advantage. As the scale of landholdings has shrunk, land use has increasingly intensified on remaining land (Smith and Dawson, 1977; Clarke, Lambert and Chapman, 1982).

In the Canterbury high country there has been an increasing concentration of use on lowlands, initially resulting from soil management under the Land and Soil Conservation Board, motivated by the fear of wide spread erosion.\footnote{A knowledge transition that expands from Cumberland (1944; 1943; 1941) associated with fear of a similar occurrence to the 1930s ‘American Dustbowl’ in the high country leading to severe public concern and political lobbying to McCaskill (1973) where high country erosion was understood as anthropocentric and due to grazing. McSaveney and Whitehouse (1989) then revolutionised thinking on high country erosion, where they illustrated scree to be a natural process of ‘oro-degenesis’ – with freeze thaw action – as opposed to anthropogenic in its cause.} The period of
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retirement involved sought to control erosion and return structure to the land. The most prominent idea that emerged from this soil conservation movement however, was to allow farmers to manage more ‘effectively’ and therefore, intensively, on land below the higher altitude zones. These lands were understood as less fragile and erosion prone (Grant, Rumball and Suckling, 1973). A brittle geology, steep topography leading down to large braided rivers and wet climate compared to Central Otago has meant large, moving greywacke screes and historically there has not been a lot of productive advantage associated with the top country (unlike the basin and valley country of the Mackenzie and Otago regions). The ‘flats’ in the Rakaia and Rangitata valleys are generally high quality and nutrient rich soils. Therefore, a lot of the cultivated development had been undertaken prior to tenure review and had become perceived as an accepted part of the local landscape. The Ashburton Basin has retained a more uniform tussock and mountainscape aesthetic. DOC, as a now dominant landholder in this region following tenure review and NHF purchases, seeks to retain and improve wetland complexes and grasslands.

On land categorised ‘farmland’, tenure review illustrates the ongoing reshuffling of the relationship between agricultural practices and the land, in some examples concentrating intensive farming on lower altitude areas (see: Weeks et al., 2013a, 2013b; Walker and Overton, 2012; Walker et al., 2006). Under pastoral lease there were implicit limits set on what biodiversity loses were ‘acceptable’. The number of stock units and the duration of time that the stock units could be on the lease were regulated through the leasehold agreement. A leaseholder may have held 4000 hectares of higher altitude country as summer runoff and 3000 hectares of lower altitude and winter safe – ‘sweet’ country. The influence of pastoral use was spread over an expansive area and was seasonally changing, leading to an overall reduction of intensive use impacts. For example, concentrated over-grazing and effluent problems were managed in an integrated way at a broad spatial scale.

Reflecting on the impact of boundaries, several participants within the ‘conservation grouping’ discussed changed perspectives regarding tenure review. Initially, they believed the process would achieve positive outcomes for access and conservation. As mentioned in Chapter 5, in some cases review has provided opportunities, for example

---

135 In the process there were also extensive tree plantings and forestry research, which in some high country regions, like the Arthur’s Pass, has resulted in wilding tree issues. A central focus was also river management, where flooding ‘stop banks’ were successively erected along rivers.

136 As well as this, being ‘off the beaten track’ meant that the region, and developments within the region, were subjected to less public scrutiny than other areas of the high country, like the Mackenzie-Omarama Basin and the Southern Lakes district around Wanaka and Queenstown.
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leading to increased recreational access to some places and public interaction with conservation and pastoral heritage with Ō Tū Wharekai. However, such outcomes could likely have been achieved without the neoliberal overhaul of tenure structures. The way division has facilitated transformation on freehold land, was perceived in some cases to undermine the net conservation benefit achieved by tenure review. For example, in the Mackenzie and Southern Lakes, tenure review has contributed in part to transforming the low intensity pastoral mode that was distinctive, and to some extent protective of an existing cultural landscape (Landscape Ecologist 3, DOC manager 1, DOC employees 1 and 2, and a number of landholders). The privatisation of public land by leaseholders was a particular issue in many conservation interviews, where the control of expanses of land allowed profit to be gained from tourism and amenity ventures increasingly allowed on pastoral leases. Examples, of this include Minarets Station (at Wanaka), as well as Glenfalloch and Lake Heron Stations in the study region. For example, one landholder participant stated, “I find it ridiculous that the Reischek Glacier is included in the exclusive occupation on the Heron Lease [Upper Lake Heron Station] with all that public recreation value … it [the glacier] shouldn’t be privately controlled … that’s a historical anomaly … they divided all the land up in huge parcels, that doesn’t work so well now” (Female Landholder 8). Leasehold control of these amenities, which hold no grazing potential, had allowed the opportunity for the lessee to capture benefits from privatised use of this resource for a heli-skiing and tourism venture. A common view of undertaking such activities was that “if it’s ok for DOC to charge on their land, it’s good for us” (Male Landholder 2). However, many landholder participants understood such transformation as “all positive” (Female Landholder 4), making landholdings more productive and improving profitability. The case study shows that transformations are complex, and not entirely focused upon intensification and improving the value of real estate, contrary to the dominant focus of media and academic discourse (Brower, 2006a, 2006b; Forest and Bird, n.d.; Horton, n.d.).

Complex transformations
Rather than the integration of values and distinctive landscape form that low intensity farming overlaid, tenure review was understood by various participants to be modifying the landscape; becoming a “piecemeal mish-mash of intensive farmland desert interspersed with unsustainable pockets of conservation land … with hardly any connectivity” (Grasslands Ecologist 1). This conservation advocate was beginning to recognise the high
country landscape as fluid. The pastoral lease had integrated multi-uses and regulated interactions between local, regional, national and globalised actors, maintaining a particular social-ecological assemblage (Tsouvalis, 2000; Holmes, 2002, 2006). As a region of connected local spaces, of different negotiations and contests, which are inflected in changing habitus, a ‘hybrid’ social-nature, as a complex, differentiated rurality is beginning to emerge in the high country.

Numerous landholder participants reflected upon how dividing their properties “didn’t make sense” (Male Landholder 12), “was illogical” (Liaison 2), “hard to deal with” (Male landholder 10) and a source of “frustration” (Male landholder 4). An older participant voiced consternation at how he felt division between conservation and farming disregarded the stewardship that he and his family had provided, and on which they continued to pride themselves. His justification for this came with stating that “even DOC” (Male Landholder 7) understood their property to be in “very good knick” (ibid.). Poor outcomes with difficulties of reaching agreement on the “split of land values” (Male landholder 18) left conservation employees and farmers agitated. Also, because the process was undertaken on a compartmentalised and voluntary property-by-property basis rather than at a holistic landscape focus, outcomes were perceived in a number of cases to be “absurd” (DOC manager 1). A participant explained that tenure review had been fraught as values were diffuse throughout. The proposal to divide the property with a 15 metre by 700-metre native reserve was described “bizarre” (Male Landholder 10). The premise of retaining a viable production unit while separating biodiversity values was an “impossible task because the land was not naturally lined up to be broken up in this way” (ibid.). The participant’s family had withdrawn from tenure review on the basis they would have to pay the Crown for subdividing production values. He argued that the “conservation outcomes were nonsense” (ibid.) and overall, review would drastically reduce the properties scale and change the model of farming, which would destroy their personal enjoyment of the property.

In terms of applying Bourdieu’s concepts to the current study, how do such concepts of custodianship associated with the traditional pastoral mode and contesting of the logic of division infer changes to habitus and productive attitudes? The chapter now moves to examine an even narrower focus of analysis, highlighting transformations that are occurring at an individual farm level.

---

137 See Norton and Miller (2000) for a useful expansion of this point and the need to retain strategic connectivity between ecosystem remnants in agricultural spaces.
ii) Individual Properties – breaking connections with land

Although not necessarily shared by his colleagues or higher DOC authority, DOC Manager 4 argued,

"Tenure review is very emotional … especially on properties where there are generations of connection, it is a difficult process, it took a long time in some tenure reviews to break down relations with the property, there were a lot of emotions that needed to be overcome. (DOC Manager 4)."

The quotation is thought provoking where alienation of relationships with land is at odds with the contemporary paradigm of conservation that emphasises collaboration and the national shift encouraging local buy-in to with conservation efforts, grounded in the knowledge structures and capacities of local communities. Why would a policy like tenure review, which seeks to optimise conservation (rather than preservation) outcomes endeavour to ‘break down’ connections to land couched on arguments of ‘passions for a place’, family identities and an established, productivist ‘ethic of custodianship’?

Reflecting on the ethical stance of Cronon (1995), the attitude in the quotation signifies breaking down connections on the basis that conservation should be the extrinsic responsibility of a centralised agency with the specific expertise and mandate to ‘conserve properly’, on the basis of ‘restoration’ and preserving nature. Such a policy approach is peculiar when understood in relation to a sustainability discourse that encourages a social ethic of environmental responsibility, prioritises more sensitive land uses, as well as biodiversity conservation (Robinson, 2011).

Analysis revealed that farmers and conservationists had struggled with poor outcomes and tenure review was understood to have operated separately from day-to-day conservation relationships. The administration of tenure review involved higher-levels within DOC working with LINZ at a centralised level, separate from local conservancies who were only consulted. For this reason, relationships between local actors became fractious, associated with an upper-level directive, administered by LINZ. This was labelled as “the monster of DOC’s ideology” by one participant (Male Landholder 22). The traditional ethos of pastoral custodianship is being undermined by tenure review’s narrow

---

138 Upholding a level of generosity to the productivist custodianship provided by landholders, some may argue further affirms the hegemony of the southern-landed gentry (Eldred-Grigg, 1981), and supports the alleged disproportionate social benefit from the provisions and outcomes of tenure review (Brower, 2006; 2008). However, in Chapter 8, while attending to both the concept of custodianship’s complexity and contested nature, I suggest the notion’s potential to become a middle ground of commonality on which to progress shared objectives for conservation on the basis of accounting for plural values and an ethos of conviviality towards non-human nature (Bingham and Hinchliffe, 2008; Hinchliffe and Whatmore, 2006; Lorimer, 2012). This is rather than constant justification and argumentation about where specific points of view on social space and ideologies of conservation differ (Boltanski and Thevenot, 2006).
appreciation of the high country’s intrinsic biodiversity and production values – rather than understanding the landscape as a complex, integrated ‘socialised resource’ (Robinson, 2011).

Spatial transformation

The policy approach to tenure review abandoned concepts of integration and multiple use, which had established with integrated land management in the 1960s and continued throughout the early 1990s (Star and Brooking, 2007; Espie, 1994; Floate et al., 1994; Bosche et al., 1996). Previously, farming was seen as providing ‘live on’ custodianship in the high country, and maintaining a balanced pastoralism was understood to prevent the land slipping further beyond the point of degradation that was evident in the 1930s and led to the instigation of the Catchment Boards. In this way pastoral productivism was justified and legitimated as a mode of farmer oriented land stewardship.

Many participants’ highlighted and contested the claims of Brower (2006a, 2008) (refer Chapters 2 and 3) as a macro-level approach that did not focus on the interpersonal subjectivities of local people, which are insightful for understanding rural transformation (Wilson, 2004; Murdoch et al., 2000). As a political commentator and economist, Brower was argued to have fuelled public animosity towards the high country community on the basis of an approach that many participants conceived to be a “completely misguided perspective” (Legal Representative 2). Brower’s (2006a) argument was seen in various accounts to be superficial in its understanding of historical connections to properties and the socio-political context that surrounded establishing the pastoral lease, where the Crown granted rights on the basis of the potential for farmers to maintain and make land productive. She was also understood to have ignored the pastoral ethos of custodianship that was an intrinsic aspect of many high country people’s subjectivity (Morris, 2009). Brower was perceived to have focused on generalisations to construct a political and publically volatile depiction of what has been a highly complex process, transformative of social identities and spatial concepts. Box 1, 2 and 3 within Appendix 4a provide a detailed

---

139 Catalysed by severe issues with erosion and rabbit invasion – rabbit management boards, increasing national concern regarding the degraded condition of high country land, consequent with the emergent environmental lobby. This growing consciousness aligned with an increasingly adversarial dynamic between farming and environmental lobbies. Contemporary management issues associated with wilding pines in the Arthur’s Pass, Porter’s Pass are Torlesse regions and especially surrounding Flock Hill Station originate from the period of time when focus was on managing high country erosion. These sites, located in the northern part of the study region, were established as a forestry research areas, with various conifer species being introduced for research into potential methods of improving rangeland soil stability. A similar site at Mid Dome in Southland is also the centre of management concern associated with poorly managed wildling trees.
range of participant insight and background context, which in particular highlight the perceived benefits of low intensity pastoralism, differences in values and ideas of custodianship, which lead to tensions, and ideas of identity and nationalism. In part, much of the insight provided questions the partial perspectives of high country land ownership and pastoral management offered by previous scholarship (Brower, 2008a; 2008b), which was considered by many participants to have stimulated defensiveness and the further entrenchment of oppositional positions between farming and conservation others, as an issue examined in Chapter 7.

The level of defensiveness is palpable in attitudes displayed in Appendix 4a, where participants often defend traditional ideals of pastoralism as ‘protecting the landscape’. However, the quotes are also suggestive of the transforming social representations of productivist farming in the high country. The notion in the final quotation explains that the land did not ‘look good’ prior to the Land Act 1948, where prior to instituting the pastoral lease it is widely recognised that the lands were degraded (Mark, Rowley and Holdsworth, 1980; Meurk, Norton and Lord, 1989; O’Connor, 1981; 1982; O’Connor and Harris, 1991; Brooking and Star, 2011; Armstrong et al., 2008). This was associated with the lack of security provided by non-perpetually renewable pastoral licences. Insecure tenure did not encourage investment in the land and underpinned a system of ‘strip and burn’ agriculture (Pedofsky and Douglas, 1987; Peden, 2011; Pawson and Brooking, 2013). The idea that farmers became the custodians of this land and “protectors of the existing landscape” (Male Landholder 4) was consistently conveyed by farmers and evidently remains laden with cultural and symbolic capital (Morris, 2009; Dominy, 2003). In this way, the pastoral lease negotiated a middle ground between low security tenure, encouraging exploitation, and freehold, which generates the current intensification and production incentives, which are leading the modification of landscapes.

In a number of cases, properties where there were obvious development potentials volunteered and completed tenure review early (as mentioned in Chapter 5). However, in the case study, numerous landholder participants were ardently opposed to tenure review. The political and social inflammation that surrounded Brower’s coverage was a watershed point, with a number of farmers noting that there was considered to be a need to assert

---

140 Farmer habitus from this time onwards became increasingly mobilised around ideas of landholder’s protectors the high country landscape. While the Crown retained a stake in the higher-level management oversight and control of land use, divesting control of the land with the Land Act 1948 both encouraged investment with improved security. The Land Act 1948 recognised that high country families had an ongoing vested interest in the land because their livelihoods were dependent on sustaining it.
power over space and to affirm boundaries in order to establish “what is ours [farmland] and what is theirs [conservation land]” (Male Landholder 1) due to the perceived threat of protectionist lobby groups. Freehold land represented the ability to insulate oneself from exposure to public scrutiny and political flux. I engage with this issue in Chapter 7, in relation to how it has given rise to a modified habitus with the demarcation of boundaries and intensified ‘othering’ between high country interest groups. However, first I examine the changes occurring on individual properties.

**Modified practices**

Several interview questions queried how practices and knowledge had changed over the generations of high country farming through tenure review. This was because of the understanding that all agricultural land was at some point in time a ‘pre-human ecosystem’, and within 160 years, around 70 per cent of New Zealand’s land area has been transformed into various dynamic agricultural and urban spaces (Norton and Miller, 2000); modified to an extent that there are few areas of original ‘pre-habitation’ values (Holland, 2013; Pawson and Brooking, 2013; Brooking and Pawson, 2010; Molloy, 1987). For example, early in colonisation, the Canterbury Plains and other now intensive areas of rural New Zealand, were held in large, unfenced pastoral holdings. As the demand for land increased and technology improved, so too did the capacity for landscape transformation and a rich history of breaking up the landscape.  

Tenure review has progressed this transformation in the high country, stimulated by the demand for conservation land. As properties have decreased in size there has been a transformation in the way the landscape is spatially understood as comprised of smaller, compartmentalised units of land. This is recognised by participants quoted below who explain the changes that have occurred on properties in the region and the increase of intensive production. The three quotations echo insights made by Morris (2009) regarding spatial change. In each insight there is a clear understanding of what high country farming has traditionally represented in terms of a mode of production at a large spatial scale.

> With tenure review there are a lot of farmers who aren’t high country farmers anymore (Female landholder 7 – italics added).

---

141 Productivist ideologies became more established in the cognitive frames and habitus of farmers and social concepts of ‘farmland’ engulfed the transformation of New Zealand’s landscape under the productivist paradigm (Pawson and Brooking, 2013; 2008).
There is a definite psychological change with going from thinking in a big expansive high country way, to having a smaller, plains sized property in the harsh conditions of the Rangitata Gorge. (Male landholder 1 – italics added)

Tenure review has forced a change … the landscape is divided and the properties are smaller. (Male landholder 11)

Furthermore, elaborating on the second quotation, the participant explained how past Act MP Jerry Eckhoff, described as a “flammable” (Male Landholder 1) member of the high country community from Roxburgh, challenged the then Minister for Conservation, the Hon. Chris Carter, some 15 years ago. He argued that by dividing protection from production, more pressure would be put on the land that was going into freehold. The participant believed that because it was politically unsavoury to acknowledge the pitfalls of tenure review when the then Labour government was “rampantly supporting tenure review and against farming” (ibid.), and also due to the personality of Eckhoff, this challenge was disregarded. However, if taken seriously, such a local concern would have acknowledged how changing the spatial scale of high country properties with tenure review would transform the habitus of landholders. An early response to tenure review’s scale transformation, would have potentially avoided the trend of intensification of lowland ecologies, where Walker et al., (2006) identified the loss of low land biodiversity in the decade prior to 2006.142

As an impetus to change, landholders generally wanted to be productive and were striving for similar or better production outcomes on a restricted land area following tenure review. This is a result of the competitive neoliberal economic framework under which farmers now operate. The symbolic capital of farming and the historical habitus of farmers meant that many wanted to carry the same stock units that have been carried on 8,000 hectares (as stock numbers equate directly to income and scale provided productive advantage with the pastoral mode). So for example, when 5000 hectares is returned to the Crown, the way a property is conceptualised spatially is transformed. This is illustrated by the Rangitata landholder above (quotation 3), who asserts the psychological change from farming in a “big expansive high country way” and the inapplicability of that to a farm only

---

142 Walker et al., (2006; 2008a; 2008b) have made a marked contribution to understanding the continuing depletion of lowland ecosystems. As a result of analysis using a classification of land environments, “derived from soil and climate data layers (LENZ) as a surrogate for biodiversity pattern, spatial data bases and land cover and legal protection” (Walker, et al., 2006: 169), the authors brought scrutiny on the outcomes of tenure review. Walker et al., (2006) illustrated extreme (>70%) loss of indigenous cover in 57% of land environments, and poor protection (<20% land area protected) in more than two thirds. Loss of indigenous cover was shown to have continued, where 49% of environments had lost indigenous cover between 1996/97 and 2001/02. Furthermore, the rate of highest decline to indigenous cover was highest in ecosystems that were already the most depleted.
slightly larger than a Canterbury Plains property. Such a perspective highlights how the restructuring of the landscape may markedly influence the subjectivities / habitus of ‘farmers’ and ‘conservationists’ in their cognitive understandings of the high country landscape, where practices of scaling and bounding modify attitudes and habitus (Zimmerer, 2000; 2010; Morris, 2009). As a result, the practices associated with each bounded land parcel emerge into a new developmental path – a point that was signified by the analysis of subjective ideologies/values dimensions in the previous chapter. Using the completed tenure review of Mesopotamia Station as a contextual case study exemplifies a range of issues associated with changes to spatial scale and modified habitus. The case study provides an in-depth understanding of a particular property.

Transformational praxis - the tenure review of Mesopotamia Station
Mesopotamia Station provides a useful lens into the consequences of the division principles of tenure review, due to the publicity which arose when the tenure review of this high profile property became acrimonious. Tension is highlighted by the speech of the lessee Laurie Prouting at the passing over of conservation values to DOC on the 22 of June 2009, following tenure review of from what Laurie described as “our patch” (See Appendix 7a). Many participants drew on Mesopotamia as a local example, which highlighted the political issues emerging from the process. Using the property as a case study exemplifies how reduced scale has the latent potential to transform three aspects of landholder subjectivity:

- Transforming the way a property is spatially demarcated and conceptualised, as an outcome that influences ‘everyday’ repetitive relations with the land as a modified habitus of socio-spatial praxis.
- Psychological and emotional change associated with the changing frame of how the landholders understand the property.

The first two issues are addressed in detail in the following section. The final issue of transformation is then addressed in chapter 7, emphasising how, with the erection of boundaries:

- The potential exists to erode good will between the State, the public conservation interests and landholders, and also potentially cements a more intensified and productivist landholder praxis.

In Chapter 7, I emphasise this third issue to be a destructive outcome from tenure review by examining interview themes of control, threat and power. However, below in Applications Box 6.4, issues regarding how tenure review has impacted on the spatial composition of Mesopotamia are outlined.
Applications Box 6.4: The tenure review of of Mesopotamia Station
The tenure review of the furthest inland property in the Rangitata river catchment, Mesopotamia Station, was completed on March 3, 2008. The property was reduced from approximately 26,000 hectares as a pastoral lease to 5,252 hectares of freehold, under Section 36 (1) (a) of the CPLA 1998, and subject to a series of provisions (see LINZ, April 2008). The property is notable as an example of an original run that has been conservatively farmed for three generations of the same family (The Proutings) two other families and Samuel Butler. The properties connection to Butler highlights the property's pastoral heritage and cultural mystique (Ansley and Bush, 2012).

Traditional Farming habitus
As an expansive pastoral unit, Mesopotamia was managed in a particular way. A third of the property was valley country (the high tops was land only used for summer grazing and overflow). A third was the down slopes and flats lands along the Rangitata river terrace, and a third was gorge country (see Figure 6.2 below). How the property operated as a pastoral lease was that the gorge and valley country complemented each other. The 5000 strong whether flock spent most of their time on unimproved ground in the summer valley country. Come autumn the flock would be mustered, crutched and put up onto the warm faces, or ‘sweet’ country, in the Gorge for winter. In spring the sheep would be mustered, shorn and put back into the summer country. Farming this way allowed a six-month rotation that rested the land and the scale meant that stock were at low density. Tenure review has stopped this cyclical mode of farming. The downs and flats are now entirely freehold, the valley country has been retired back to public land and hunters have released pigs that are now rutting a latticework up what were intact tussock faces.

Modification of Traditional farming habitus
Participants who referred to Mesopotamia as an example suggested that tenure review would entirely change the way the property is understood spatially and how it functions as a farm. There is a psychological change from farming in an extensive, low intensity way in the harsh conditions of the upper Rangitata, to a smaller property. To retain viability the mode of production would likely change. To retain the same stock numbers it was believed that the lowlands would be farmed far more intensively with the loss of existing ecological values across the pastoral flats (certainly analogous with the views of Walker et al., (2006) and (2008a)). As a neighbouring runholder argued, “…something’s got to give, I expect there to be two or three central pivots on the flats of Messy in the next 5 years with the way it’s decreased in size”(Male Landholder 8).

Tenure review has influenced the way the landholder conceptualises the property following the completion of the tenure review. The original runholders have received a grazing. DOC does not believe that grazing threatens the ecological values of the gorge country if grazed at a low enough stock density, which raises complexity.

To conclude, what the Mesopotamia tenure review highlights is that while approximately 21,000 hectares of extrinsic conservation land has been gained, overall, the re-spatialisation of the properties scale could have dramatic influence on the way the property is managed in the future. The pastoral heritage that has been established on the property since before Samuel Butler arrived is emerging in a transformed trajectory of social-spatial becoming.
In the cognitive frame of the landholder, division may justify reduced interest in the protection of the land retained as freehold. Participants expressed feeling publicly responsible for allowing access and retaining the property in good condition, while the land was retained under pastoral lease. For example, several participants, including four conservation employees, commended Laurie Prouting, the recently retired lessee of Mesopotamia Station, for his “helpful open-minded attitude towards DOC and access” (DOC employee 3) and for welcoming people onto the property. Laurie was described as having a “wonderful attitude” towards the public (Male landholder 10), and as “biddable” and “publicly motivated” (DOC manager 2). Another conservation manager reflected on the “excellent job” the Proutings have done maintaining the Station, described as “hard arid country”, and noted their continued efforts to remove pests (DOC Manager 2). DOC Manager 2 recalled attending river-care meetings at Mesopotamia and within the Rangitata Valley with Laurie, describing him as a “real man of the land” on the grounds that “he always had Prills [pelletised form of herbicide] in the back of his truck or a spade”. A wildling pine, a broom or gorse seedling did not survive long, he noted.

Mesopotamia provides a useful example that highlights how management philosophy and attitudes towards conservation could change following tenure review. A local DOC employee who worked closely with the Prouting family, but was not involved in the tenure review, which was administered from Christchurch, stated:

I spoke with Malcolm [Laurie’s son] just after Mesopotamia came out [of the tenure review process] and he was traumatised, maybe traumatised is not the right word, but he wasn’t happy. I can understand why he hated DOC for a while, you know, it was a really emotional thing for him. I get that, I do, he’s spent his whole life there and now it is not the same. His lifestyle is different, the land he controlled, the way he farms Messie, it’s all different and that takes adjustment. (DOC employee 1)

The participant expanded on this, explaining that:

For Malcolm’s father Laurie, it must have been a bit easier. He was at the end of his road on Messie, whereas Malcolm was just taking over when it started heating up, he would remember how it was and would have established ideas about how he wanted to farm the property and then his whole operation and mind frame had to change. (ibid.)

Personal identity, custodianship and connections to a specific property are interwoven with understandings of Mesopotamia. A landholder participant stated that, “it must have been a real slap in the face, Laurie prided himself on protecting Mesopotamia and looking after it well” (Male landholder 10). Such quotes are suggestive of the direct influence on habitus and attitude, but also on the subjectivity of farmer custodianship.
Chapter Six: Spatial Changes - Division, concepts of custodianship and scale

Referring to Figure 6.2 below, as the vast percentage of Mesopotamia has been returned to extrinsic conservation, the rest is therefore held under the entitlement of the freehold landowner to develop, retain and improve economic prospects under the restraints of the RMA, which is administered by Environment Canterbury and the Timaru District Council. No longer is the property a high country pastoral lease. Now, at only 5272 hectares the property is a large farm sited in the harsh conditions of the upper Rangitata Valley. The Prouting family are also open about receiving considerable Crown remuneration for the return to the Crown of land holding Significant Inherent Values, considered worthy of extrinsic conservation management. Consequently, the tenure review has freed up capital for development. If a grazing easement had not subsequently been granted, the family would understandably have looked towards other methods of income production, an obvious potential outcome being irrigation of the newly freehold flats. The allocation of a grazing easement subsequent to tenure review brings under scrutiny the objectives of tenure review as a matter of control and not ‘protection’ of intrinsic ecological values (see Chapter 7). Granting grazing back to previous landholders, because grazing is understood to be low intensity and subjectively considered ‘appropriate management’ by DOC, gives weight to participant arguments that overall tenure review was plagued by political expediency and poorly defined strategy, becoming the focus of social struggle over the allocation of values (Redford et al., 2003; Redford and Sanderson, 2000).
Taking insight from complex understandings of tenure review, ecological succession and proposed interventions to direct the landscape’s trajectory (see Chapter 5), the reallocation of control provides insight into the deeper operation of the State within tenure review, which is examined to conclude the chapter. Many participants considered that the consequences of reducing spatial scale / property size on the habitus of landholders was underestimated by policy makers when tenure review was instigated in 1991, and continued under the Crown Pastoral Land Act 1998. Some questioned whether it was a means of furthering the Crown interest by incentivising economic development with continued productivism, stemming from a narrow socio-cultural conceptualisation of the potentials that high country lands offer. Such a dynamic is often framed in media as a struggle between the objectives and public good of environmental protection, and the cultural and economic ‘common goods’ associated with high country farming. In tenure review, this tension seemingly represented the clash between narrow parameters retained in a dualistic imagination of social-space. Debate about custodianship and “better
management” (Male landholder 4) of land by farmers, compared to resource constrained
DOC arose, leading to media stories highlighting a frustrated depreciation of the ‘other’,
and poor land management on either side of the social political divide between nature
preservation and agricultural production (for example, with coverage of weeds and fire risk
associated with what is perceived as poor DOC management of tenure reviewed land –
see: Littlewood, 2009; Maturin, 2007; Bruce, 2007, refer Appendix 1C).

Reiterating the position of a number of sympathetic landholders in the region, the
perspective below, however, reinforces the potential for locally negotiated empathetic
positionings through exposure and knowledge sharing (see Chapter 8). In terms of ‘DOC
as a neighbour’, a landholder and liaison affirmed this, stating:

I refuse to buy into this farmer rhetoric that DOC are not doing a good job.
They do an excellent job with the resources they have and I think landholders
are coming to realise that, they just manage the land from a different point of
view (Male landholder 12)

Common accord existed to some extent, where participants, both DOC and landholders,
acknowledged each other as good land managers.

Locally, a number of landholders were perceived by conservation participants as
focused on sound environmental practice, and similarly, conservation interests were
acknowledged to be pragmatic and sensitive to landholder objectives for obtaining
livelihoods. A level of common ground existed within the case study region, as well as
established empathies and effective relationships between conservation groups and
landholders (especially around land-care groups). However, at a policy level and within
representations of high country relationships, a duality between conservation and
production objectives is retained. Higher-level polarisation associated with tenure review
and people who were perceived as “destructive personalities” (DOC Manager 1) within
the politics surrounding the process, as the “squeaky wheels who are always heard” (Male
landholder 9), were argued to distract away from focusing on localised shared ground. The
fear of wide spread intensification is a focus of public unease. However this generalised
idea of development was challenged by local perspectives, which I briefly examine in the
following section. This highlights the importance of focusing locally to inform macro-level
representations and to provide a more nuanced understanding of the development
transition occurring with tenure review in the local region.
6.4 Broader transitions occurring in the study context

Generalised depictions

There is an intensifying fear amongst the national public and conservation lobby that the high country will continue to experience a developmental overhaul, similar to that which is seen in the Mackenzie-Omarama Basin, which has involved irrigation, land subdivision and amenity development in the Southern Lakes region. Mounting pressure is placed upon farmers, who are perceived as holding the active potential to “wreak havoc on the precious ecologies of the high country” (DOC Manager 5). This corresponds with trends examined by the scholarship of Walker et al., (2006; 2008a; 2008b), Weeks et al., (2013a, 2013b). The mode of production is suggested to be transforming from ‘low intensity pastoralism’ to ‘farming’ involving intensive inputs and cultivation of smaller blocks. Images evoked in media coverage provide potent political representations latched onto by the conservation lobby that rejects industrial farming and the movement of the industrial frontier towards the treasured wild-lands of inland New Zealand (Potton, 2013, Abbot and Reeve, 2011).

Many farmer’s disagreed with intensive development, but vocalised feeling alienated and attacked as dissidents in opposition to the public good of conserving biodiversity; the supposed ‘nationalisation of conservation estate’; and the associated political power garnered by ‘guaranteed’ public access. “[A]ll farmer’s get labelled the same way” (Male landholder 9) asserted an older participant on a historical run, even though many landholders continued to hold strongly to the ideas of low intensity pastoralism and farmed custodianship. For example, some landholders perceived intensive development in the high country to be “a disgrace” (Male landholder 10); “short sighted” (Female landholder 1); and “not within the charter of the pastoral lease” (Male landholder 7). However, several landholders explained that the economic incentives generating into such modes of production were undeniable, especially now that space is divided between production and conservation land, and properties are significantly smaller as a result of tenure review.

Generalised depictions alienate people and overlook previous conservation achievements of farmers and the local community (often in conjunction with the Department of Conservation, Forest and Bird and Conservation Boards, such as local initiatives in the Rangitata Gorge and Whitcombe River alongside Land Care Groups and independent efforts such as vegetative monitoring at Mt Peel). Removing polarisation, I suggest will allow for refocusing on shared strategy which acknowledges plural values and recognises the complexity of transformations within local contexts. This would move
discussion beyond the antagonism that arose in the southern lakes region and in relation to intensification in the McKenzie Country, which were issues highlighted by Woods, (2007, 2009) and Brower, (2006; 2008a). It is suggested by scholars, including Memon and Kirk (2012), Robinson (2011), Brechin et al., (2002), Wondolleck and Yaffe (2000), that by removing antagonism (which in tenure review stems from binary constructs between protection and production) and focusing on shared ground, a space is opened to customise conservation processes that are supportive of a community and enables partnership.\footnote{143}

Complexities of local development

Returning to Figure 6.1 above, boundaries between production and protection land have changed dramatically with tenure review and NHF purchases in the study region. Many interviewees considered that the mode of production in some cases will change, modifying the cultural story of the region’s pastoral heritage, adding new aspects to the cultural landscape (Foster, 2012; Manning et al., 2009; Tscharntke et al., 2005; ; Olwig, 2005; Swaffield and Foster, 2000). However, one cannot overstate the weaknesses of generalisation. Development has occurred on some freehold land, following tenure review, but also on historical freehold land (for example, returned servicemen’s freehold and University Lease). However, with the broader influence of the State, the regulations of the pastoral lease under the CPLA 1998 have become increasingly flexible, as the demand to move towards different modes of production has increased.

Table 6.1 in Appendix 7b examines the transformations that have occurred to the 43 original leaseholds in the case study region. The evolving histories and micro-scale transformations on each of the individual properties are evident. Each sketch highlights complex responses to political-economic (macro-level) fluctuations, but also the micro-level productivist attitudes of landholders and the unique development options for individual properties. Table 6.1 examines the influences of tenure review, ongoing changes to land use and ownership structures, including the nationality of current landholders, and other significant dynamics of change. The high country was a location of social flux and tenure review was understood to have modified social structures (Appendix 7b). Significantly, all properties are complex in the breakdown of their natural and landscape amenity, productive and historical assets, giving rise to disparate development potentials.

\footnote{143 This assertion is in line with Robinson (2011) and Zimmerer (2000) and other conservation geographers in the developing contexts (including Brockington and Ingoe, 2014; Brockington and Duffy, 2010; West, Ingoe and Brockington, 2006; Proctor, 1995), who see the need for conservation planning and practice to fit within and be customised to the conservation ideologies operating within local contexts. Similar principles should apply within the high country context, where there is ongoing recognition of landscapes as hybrid and relied upon for livelihoods.}
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As mentioned previously, not all high country properties are ‘premium’ in terms of capacity to intensify and diversify around amenity values. Referring to Table 6.1, Appendix 7b, a varied range of uniquely geographical factors are influencing the complexity of transition within the study and the specific developmental trajectories that are arising.

Several properties are interlinked between established families (for example, there is a joint partnership between Upper Lake Heron Station in the Ashburton Basin and Glenfalloch between two lines of the Todhunter family, whose forebears settled the original Double Hill and Blackford runs. Glenrock and Cleardale in the Rakaia also remain Todhunter properties. The Ensor and the Hutchinson properties in the upper Rakaia have also been leased for several generations and different branches of the Acland family continue to farm Mt Peel, Waikari Hills and Mt Somers stations). The Todhunter properties are particularly interesting in the way they are oriented towards retaining cultural heritage on Lake Heron and Glenfalloch, targeting tourism with heli-skiing and lodgings. In contrast, on Cleardale and Glenrock, the different locations and potentials means that the properties are more intensive and productivist than the previously mentioned inland properties (see Appendix 7b). It is interesting how each are developing in entirely different ways, related to geographical factors such as scale or diverse landscape and amenity features and habitus of landholders.

Millions of dollars are spent on huge high country properties like Mt White or Glenfalloch to obtain productive advantage. Advantage is increasingly reduced within neoliberal markets, but other intensive modes offer potential. With the return of land under tenure review through the ceding back of areas that provided productive advantage, viability is further reduced and modes of production transformed (as analysis in Appendix 7b suggests, this occurs in complex ways). Therefore, division and condensing spatial scale would clearly reduce the viability of pastoral productivism, which aligns with theoretical arguments advancing transition to post-productivist or multifunctional models (see:

---

144 Limiting factors included location and proximity to tourism and general amenities; scenic and economic values associated with properties like Mt Cook and Minaret Stations and their closeness to tourism ‘hotspots’; access to water and ability to irrigate; climatic and altitudinal gradient, and geology; as well as historical issues such as wilding pines, gorse, hieracium and rabbit incursion.

145 Analysis in Appendix 7b illustrates the changing composition of the runs within the four basins of the study region. Some properties now cease to exist, for example Clent Hills, Barossa Stations. Tenure review has reduced the carrying capacity of a number, but obtaining capital from Crown remuneration for ceded land, in some cases has reduced debt burden that has encumbered several of the properties for decades. The process has in cases provided capital for new modes of production, diversifying away from, and intensifying, pastoral use. However, it is not a deterministic cause and effect relationship between tenure review, retaining freehold and intensification. Development autonomy was associated to the subjectivities of landholders, their personal and family aspirations, commitments and financial situation, as well as asset (environmental, tourism, agricultural) base of a property.
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Shucksmith, 1993; Burton and Wilson, 2006; Campbell et al., 2009; Rosin, 2012 Hendy and Callaghan, 2013). Neoliberal orthodoxy would suggest this to incentivise innovative business structures and strategies to emphasise other economic activities (Robbins, 2008; Harvey, 2007; 2005). It may have been hoped at the outset of tenure review that such innovation would have restored grasslands and provided for sustainable options. However, such transformation relies on viable alternatives and many participants disagreed that these were obvious for their properties. In some cases, like at Cleardale Station (or many Mackenzie Basin examples), the incentive to follow post-productivism and multifunctionality was less viable than intensification.\(^{146}\)

In terms of drawing broad inferences on the transformations occurring in the region, Table 6.1 in Appendix 7b provides a clear indication that the farming is changing and has changed previously. It is clear that political economic pressures are influencing a strong dual trajectory of landscape evolution. Properties that are not maintained as pastoral runs (properties that have not volunteered for or completed tenure review) appear either to be developing more intensively or are diversifying post-productive and multifunction strategies. However, the compression of scale is not the only influence on landholders towards post-production, multi-use and diversified productivism. Properties like Upper Lake Heron Station and Glenfalloch have retained pastoral leases, but have obtained commissioner approval for diversifications. This transformed business model highlights how the pastoral lease regulation has become more flexible with time.\(^{147}\) It also suggests how the pastoral lease tenure could have been used as a basis to encourage sensitive, low impact modes of economic return, which could have accounted for the complexity of properties.

Landholders are focusing on a range of development potentials; which if related back to values typologies explained in Chapter 5 (traditional pastoral, developmental, aesthetic, ecological values) appears to broadly correspond with the particular values for space individuals hold and the specific characteristics of a property. For example, the balance of cultural and environmental assets a property holds was a strong influence on

\(^{146}\) To several participants, intensification was understood as being the only option, for example, in the Mackenzie were the grasslands were perceived as “destroyed” by a combination of rabbits, hieracium, pastoralism and climate; “a dustbowl” and “so far from natural” in the versions of reality offered by two participants. Therefore, such flat lands were understood as a dead-weight cost to farmers who were transforming them into profitable and productive. The case study region was more complex, and many participants defended the pastoral heritage of the region, and also, that the landscape was already more developed than many regions.

\(^{147}\) The flexibility of the lease was argued by several conservation participants’ to amount to a lack of political foresight and overall, the continued support of farming, in varied forms in the high country.
the ability to transition towards post-productivism and multi-functionality, such as with tourism ventures. At a landscape scale, land set aside for extrinsic conservation and ecological succession – ‘restoration’ – is becoming interspersed with a mix of different uses. A diversified and in some examples an ‘intensified productivism’ that is reducing the previous homogeneity of the landscape is emerging. The analysis highlights the potential for productivist transformation that is opposed by those of a ‘green ideology’, who appeal to values of homogeneity, uniformity and aesthetic values – and contests the movement inland of intensified agriculture (forming a back drop to polarising contest as examined in Chapter 2 and extended in Chapter 5).

**Changing habitus – generational complexities emerging from research**

The three participant worldviews examined in Appendix 6a provide insightful perspectives on transforming habitus, but one participant in particular stands out. As a grassland ecologist who had grown up on a Rangitata station, he provided a sensitive appraisal of changes happening in the local basins. Raising ideas of generational complexities, he states, “I don’t like what is happening to the farming scene in New Zealand but I don’t think we can generalise, in these valleys some are focused on production and development but to be fair nowhere near that of my father’s generation” (Grasslands ecologist 3). The participant argued that countrywide, farming is “getting bigger” becoming more “factory oriented and about pushing stump to the hilt” (ibid.), but that within the valleys of the case study region, connections to properties reduced the level of development. It was perceived that previous generations were more development oriented and transformative of the land. A landholder affirmed similar understandings, stating:

… my father ploughed swamps that I cringe at now. All I see is drained and ploughed wetlands and imagine the lost diversity, the plants and critters. He called them swamps, to him they were valueless, unpalatable grasses covering sinkholes where stock disappeared and machinery got stuck, there was no sort of value for them. (Male Landholder 10)

This example offers insight into the generational complexities of changing knowledge and habitus. The participant expresses exposure to a wider range of values, which are considerably different to the other understandings signified by the pejorative term ‘swamp’ and the understanding of these as uncivilised, and therefore in need of modernist/productivist concepts of ‘improvement’, such as with ploughing and infill for pasture development (Brooking, 1996). Such a perspective begins thinking around the discussion in Chapter 8, which stems from the analytical position expressed in Chapter 5.
which highlights that the community is a spectrum of people from some who highly motivated environmentally to “some bloody shockers” (Male landholder 10).

Reflecting on the participant spectrum (Figure 5.4, Chapter 5), along with insights into the generational changes to habitus highlights the capacity for knowledge to expand and embrace different epistemologies with opened dialogue (Vance-Borland and Holley, 2011; Prell, et al., 2009; Carlsson and Sandström, 2008). The statements by Grasslands Ecologist 3 and Male landholder 10 are only two examples of participants who illustrated evolving knowledge and habitus, reflective of exposure to and negotiation of a range of contextual and extra-contextual knowledge sources and an understanding of values existing in in place. Each suggest micro-scale land valuations that challenge simplistic nature-economy dichotomies and views that productivist ideologies are assumed to entail (Rosin, 2012; Jay, 2007; Walford, 2003, Marsden et al., 1999; 1998).

Such complications relate to the complexity of individual subjectivities and the negotiation of one’s viewpoint on social space and position within and between social orders (see Chapter 5, Section 5.4 and Bourdieu, 2000; 1996). These examples emphasise the complexities that make the dichotomy between ‘farmers that farm’ and ‘conservators that conserve’ problematic and potentially alienating between social groups. The statements of Male landholder 10 suggesting changes to the way he values wetlands, compared to his father’s views on ‘swamps’ emphasises again how perceptions of landscape and socio-ecological assemblages are fluid (Olwig, 2007; Garkovich and Greider, 1994; Lorimer, 2012). Valuations for swamps, associated riparians and diversity in the excerpt from the participant’s interview highlighted how habitus and values had changed within a single generation. Such a perceptual transition reflects an example of changing understandings of a landscape characteristic and what is deemed appropriate use of high country space. It also signifies the potential for gradual change to habitus of thought, attitude and practice, which can be destabilised through the process of tenure review.

6.5 Ingrained productivism

Reflecting on the argument that productivist practices will continue regardless of tenure review is a significant point that contributes to analysis in Chapter 7. Critically, participants suggested that the continuation of productivism is the most socially and economically viable basis for the communities within the case study region (Appendix 7c). Diversification provides security, dual income streams and cash flow, traditionally a major limiting factor in the high country’s development and the longevity of family connections.
to properties, however, incomes primarily remain pastoralism based. Also, postproduction and multifunctionality has not been approached strategically as a mode of local community development, because tenure review focused on delineating between narrow parameters of ecological values and maintaining production values.

More concerningly, due to the problematic division between protection and production objectives, farmers looked towards other areas they could exploit to diversify and provide business security and resilience in an unstable political-economic situation. One participant specifically argued that his family’s decision to go through tenure review and diversify amounted from the previous Labour government’s “gun to the head approach” (Male Landholder 4). The participant’s statement expresses the manifestation of deeper political divisions and allegiances that motivate oppositional State politics and higher-level institutional and strategic shortcomings.

Several conservation participants argued a perceived need to move towards a less economic and productive emphasis. However, there was little clarity of the form this strategy might take. There was also scarce acknowledgement of the social and symbolic capital associated with farming from these participants, and the cultural legacy the pastoral mode has retained, suggestive of different relational visions for space. For this reason, landholders in several instances explained how high country conservation policy lacked foresight and understanding of the economic value for the high country ‘landscape’, in which case conservation was perceived as vague and ideological. However, research by Carr, (2008), Thompson et al., (2008), Riza and Lovelock (2006) acknowledge that the economic benefit from preservation and parks is indirect and sometimes vaguely defined. However, for the small communities like Omarama and Twizel, conservation park tourism is important for ongoing economic sustainability where it is stated by Thompson et al., (2008) that tourism contributes between $1.5 to 2 million annually to the local economy. Preeminent political focus was seen to remain narrowly defined around ‘production’ and ‘preservation’ uses of high country space. Several landholders also perceived that the high country’s diversification into a multifunctional rural space was contested by eco-centrists.

There was a feeling amongst landholder participants that all ‘other’ uses, farming or otherwise are rejected by the green lobby; unless new models conform to a strict ‘nativism’.

\[148\] Various informants explained that post-productivist and multifunctional uses were not approached strategically at a higher political level as a planned model for high country development. There are homestays, various recreational and tourism based ventures, but primarily these have been undertaken in an isolated and opportunistic way rather than as a strategic, sustainable direction for social sustainability and economic development.
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It was felt that indigenous biodiversity and use for recreation are the aspirations deeply held within the institutional ideology that impacts upon the management of conservation land (of DOC, Forest and Bird, the EDS and so on). For example, female landholder 10 perceived the green lobby as “hell bent on getting rid of us from the properties” and the removal farming from the high country. The division method within tenure review has operated to undercut the emergence of ‘new values’ and less productivist emphasis (most significantly by reducing the flexibility of the pastoral lease). Applying a framework of mutual exclusivity between ecological protection and farming values fails to embrace more moderate attitudes towards nature and underpins an over focus on the polarised and stereotyped land ideologies.

Arguably production and conservation did not operate mutually exclusively under the pastoral lease model, which was perceived to rely on protecting the land to sustain production. This is an important theoretical point, where reflecting on Chapter 5, high country space is a rich and evolving socio-nature. Diversification, partly associated with tenure review, has brought with it new values for high country space, focused around tourism and new emerging neoliberal ‘nature values’ (Bakker and Bridge, 2008; 2006; Bakker, 2010; Castree, 2008a; 2008b). This opens a new range of habitus, which are divergent from the colonial definition of the high country as a singularly productivist space.

6.6 The broad message from the chapter

Analysis suggests that from the low intensity mode of pastoralism regulated by the pastoral lease, a ‘diversified productivism’ is emerging as a mix of multifunctionality and productivism. This equates to different dimensions of an evolving political economy and changing social / cultural / economic demands from high country space, which has become increasingly ‘freed up’ from regulative constraints. If the political heat is removed by moving away from values claims and toward a focus on an ethic of custodianship, the debate becomes a matter of negotiating future steps. The preceding analysis has highlighted the tensions associated with the modernist conservation ideology within tenure review. Informing the chapters that follow, I wish to question where the post-modern, pluralist view for a negotiated landscape vision in the high country exists.

The modernist productivist focus supports secured profits, the market imperative and economic logic of continuous growth from the resource base of First Nature (Smith, 1984). The guise of ‘balance’ has progressed this in the high country through tenure review as a neoliberal project, but similarly, is an ideology deeply connected with separatist
conservation ideology. Hence, the dynamic within tenure review presented as a Faustian pact between deep green and neoliberal logics, which lead to social justifications of the mechanism of separation being appropriate and beneficial for conservation and production (Jackson and Dixon, 2007; Schwartzman, 2011; Dorward, 2009; Memon, 1993; Bührs and Bartlett, 1993). As the policy has unfolded the inequities within the process and net conservation benefits from the project have been uncovered and questioned.

Critique of neoliberalism asserts that the current paradigm most subscribe to is the pursuit of capital accumulation. Such a pursuit relies on individuation, which is synonymous with fracturing social unity, encouraging advantage, disadvantage and alliance (Robbins, 2008). The post-modern view supports moderation and strategic sensitive understandings and approaches to ‘the local’ and the complexities of spatial becoming. In Chapter 7 I explain how politics embedded in conservation ideology is in many ways blind to the value of ‘the pastoral mode’ and the potency of the once resilient but subjective ethic of custodianship attached to the high country heritage and leaseholder identity. Being generically anti-production / anti-farmer and vice versa fails to recognise ‘better’ and ‘worse’ or more moderate attitudes towards nature and the landscape by those resiliently ‘othered’ in the national discourse.
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Contesting Production and Protection Objectives

7.0 Introduction

The clash between productivist and protectionist objectives was evident in representations of high country space and relationships depicted in Chapter 1. However, analysis in Chapter 5 highlighted how social groups are internally complex; localised values and attitudes complicated broader exemplifications and macro-discursive distinctions between production and protection. Contrary to this local complexity however, I argue tenure review operated in a manner that perpetuated division between generalised protectionist and productivist orders. In Chapter 6 I illustrated how the re-categorisation and the dualistic policy imagining manifest in tenure review, was complexly influencing the emergence of social-space within the case study context.

The process of tenure review also illustrated a complex articulation of power between productive and protection objectives that becomes the focus of the current chapter. In Chapter 5 by examining the social-spatial concepts communicated by interview participants I highlighted interconnections with broader social-political discourses. The constructionist lens informed politics surrounding high country space by positing the emergence of social-space, and therefore, its ontological instability.149 Challenging notions of fixity attached to representations of the high country acknowledges epistemological pluralism. However, Braun (2008) asserts that it is insufficient to proclaim the instability and vitalism of social space alone. Accepting instability must be taken further politically to understand how social organisation occurs.

In light of Braun’s claim, the current chapter broadens analysis of participant narratives in a way that provides a theoretical conceptualisation of grouped dynamics and power relations. I extend the application of Bourdieu’s theory of practice to examine how political positions emerge and what positing ontological instability does to trouble conventional concepts of power to inform eco-politics over high country space. Acknowledging that space is not external or apolitical highlights that erecting boundaries (physical, cognitive, social and political) between production and protection categories is inextricably linked to the assertion of power (Bryan, 2012; Blomley, 2010; Massey, 2005).

149 Questioning objectivity and positivistic assumptions of space and nature, with little emphasis on the dialectical interactions between humans and material nature, ecology, biophysical space in meaning formation, and material co-production of hybrid socio-natures.
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In Section 7.1 I explore the complex role of the State in tenure review. In such circumstances Bourdieu (2000; 1998) suggests neoliberalisation is a government removing itself as the referee between forces of capitalism. Therefore, it can be understood that the neoliberal State institutes policies that open spaces to transformation (Robbins, 2008). Situating the State in this way is influential in how the rest of the chapter unfolds, where I examine how tenure review, advancing a neoliberal ideology of privatisation and removing state regulation impacts on the micro-level habitus of relations between conservation and farming actors.

Interview material is analysed and presented in a way that conceptualises grouped politics in section 7.2. I examine how, by allocating freehold absolute title, tenure review was a re-territorialisation that affirms a resilient boundary between privatised ‘farm land’ and State controlled, public ‘conservation land’. As DOC Manager 3 argued, tenure review intended to “define what’s for conservation and what’s for farming” under explicit provision. I suggest this argument, which was shared by many other participants, makes apparent the potential for a more divided social-spatial habitus to emerge from tenure review’s bounding process. Tenure review conveys the potential to root oppositional relationships between powerful social groups, often conceived in conventional representations as holding divergent visions and values. The overall fit of the chapter within the thesis is illustrated in Applications Box 7.1. The focus of the chapter is on the power relations and concepts of threat and control as clear interview themes. I examine how Bourdieu’s idea of asexual social groups informs discussion on the re-emergence of social space following reform. This contributes to the parameters of a rearranged politics, where working with epistemological pluralism within landscape management (rather than division) may forge a more workable framework for achieving outcomes for ecological and landscape protection (Bryan, 2012).

Applications Box 7.1: The assertion of capital, antagonism, threat and control.

The current chapter focuses on how the State’s intervention of dividing high country social space between nature and production values has impacted on the habitus of relations between conservation and production interests.

Second, I seek to shed light on how power is articulated between productivist and protectionist orders, which referring back to Chapter 1 and the normative framework in Chapter 2, are conceived of as contesting. This analysis highlights the impact tenure review had in facilitating social struggle and the assertion of power, in various species of capital at the disposal of protection and production orders.
7.1 Situating the State

To recap on Chapter 6, acknowledging the subjective local understandings of custodianship associated with the pastoral lease brings under question the operation of the State within the neoliberal policy of tenure review. Bourdieu (2000) contends that the State provides the basis for consensus in regard to common-sense social practices (the habitus) and therefore, the categories that provide meaning for social space. The State has fundamental influence on the primary experience of the social world and its order. For Bourdieu, such self-evidence suggests the extraordinary acceptability that an order (such as a productivist order) obtains when successful justification embeds a habitus based categorisation of social space as legitimate. The relative stability of an order, which is understood as a hegemonic doxa, relies on the assertion of symbolic power (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2007; Ingold, 1993). Doxa is retained because those who are marginalised by an order, accept and internalise hegemony as being common sense (Bourdieu, 2000; Grenfell, 2008a).

To help us further conceptualise the State’s role within tenure review, Bourdieu asserts that symbolic power is exercised through the institutions of the State “as the central bank of symbolic capital” (Bourdieu, 2000: 240). People know how to behave in social spaces and society because they judge their actions and attitudes in relation to what they perceive to be orthodox or heterodox. Dominant points of view become tacitly imposed on the ordering of social space as normalised (Bourdieu, 2000: 174). With this, Bourdieu therefore recognises the perpetuation and reinforcement of dominant habitus, and therefore, hegemonic orderings of social space. However, the way I examined the theory of Bourdieu in Chapter 2 sought to provide a framework for conceptualising social rift, where tenure review, as a State administered reform, has brought the productivist stability across high country space up for renegotiation. Bringing attention to the operation of the State highlights its marked influence on this process, where tenure review allowed an opening for competing social orders to challenge or affirm the hegemony of the previous productivist order. Consequently in the current chapter, Bourdieu’s thinking lends to a deep examination of the conflicting politics that operate between productivist and protectionist orders at different levels of New Zealand’s society.

---

150 Orthodoxy is defined as an assumed appropriate point of view on social space, encompassed within personal habitus, which allows or disallows enrolment into a social group (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2007; Bourdieu, 2000). It is noted that participants within particular groups, networks and affiliations (social, political, practice bases and ideological), to at least some extent have a shared sense of what is orthodox and heterodox regarding the fluid order of social space; even though in Chapter 5, I highlighted how groups are internally complex locally.
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An ambiguous mediator

[The State] can be described and treated simultaneously as a relay, no doubt a relatively autonomous one, of economic and political powers which have little interest in universal interests, and as a neutral body which because it conserves, within its structure, the traces of previous struggles, the gains of which it records and guarantees, is capable of acting as a kind of umpire, no doubt always somewhat biased, but ultimately less unfavourable to the interests of the dominated to what can be called justice, and what is exalted under the false colours of liberty and liberalism, by advocates of ‘laissez faire’, in other words the brutal and tyrannical exercise of economic force … All that can be said here applies first and foremost to the state … marked by profound ambiguity.

Neoliberalism is characterised by the ‘withdrawal of the State’, but this phrase is itself ambiguous (Harvey, 2005; Robbins, 2008; Bakker and Bridge, 2008; 2006).151 Many contemporary geographers, critical of issues underpinned by capitalist processes, hold that the current role of most States is primarily “[as] the enabling regulator of neoliberal capitalism” (Martin and Pierce, 2012: 63). As Robbins (2008) explains, the neoliberal State is simultaneously everywhere and nowhere, as a complex and contradictory actor. Many scholars take issue with the fractured and multimodal influence and power structures of the neoliberal State (Bakker and Bridge, 2008; Bakker, 2010; Castree, 2008a). Interactions between the State and differently positioned and unevenly empowered social groups within resource disputes vary with differing aspirations for the constitution of social spaces.

Such insight suggests that while the State is rhetorically withdrawn from the policy of tenure review that operates with free-market logic, as an ambiguous actor, the State is intrinsic to complex power relations. Therefore, I question whether the State within tenure review, operated as a neutral umpire in the face of tyrannical economic forces, as Bourdieu (2000) suggests above. Potentially, such an argument of neutrality, depicted by tenure review objectives seeking to balance between conservation and agriculture with

151 The scholarship of Harvey (2007; 2005; 1996; 1989; 1984) and that literature surrounding the neoliberalisation of nature and market based environmental regulation (Bakker and Bridge, 2008; Bakker, 2010; Castree, 2008a), examines the relations between the state, civil society and changing formulations of nature as a resource, its ‘social production’ and political regulation.
separation,\textsuperscript{152} may belie the furtive violence of such a ‘state of neutrality’ in the face of laissez faire economic restructuring. In the operation of the neoliberal market lies the potential to undermine the meanings and resilient cultural landscape forms of the high country – leading to a reimagined spatial geography (Massey, 2005; Castree, 2008a). As was examined in the previous chapter, the case study region is emerging in a complex trajectory reflecting political-economic and social-semiotic changes, where traditional pastoral use was couched within a subjective social understanding of land husbandry and custodianship in participant discourse.\textsuperscript{153}

Following tenure review, the regulation of land management is devolved from State centric oversight to the regional and local level, managed on an effects-based approach under the RMA 1991 (Memon, 1993). DOC controls conservation as a State centralised agency that is increasingly under-resourced and politicised, and operates in a national conservation context of autonomous and fragmented NGO’s and lobby groups (Wright, 2013; McFarlane, 2011). However, as Bakker and Bridge (2008) argue, undertaking resource regulation, and therefore conservation, as a State-centred activity, undermines the potential for regulation as a matter of personal habitus, often by facilitating alienation (see also, Adams, 2004). In the case of the high country, the pastoral lease was argued by many participants to embody a sense of responsibility for custodianship of the environment and for public access.

\textbf{The State, political flux and resistance}

Tenure review solidified the freehold rights of landholders as a neoliberal objective. However, this objective was surrounded by a discourse of public benefit associated with centralising conservation and guaranteed public access, illustrating how the State operated as an ambiguous player within the field of tenure review. The split premise was understood by several participants to be “playing conservation and production off [against] each other and [where] economics always win out” (DOC Manager 3). This DOC manager depicted how when protection is set as something done mutually exclusively or extrinsic to local aspirations, it may become a focus of social struggle and the assertion of power between social groups. The current section examines how this power contest unfolded in tenure

\textsuperscript{152}This idea of balance was a theme that clearly emerged in the cabinet (Hansard) discussions and media debates in referred too Chapters 1 and 2.

\textsuperscript{153}The RMA 1991 is recognised by authors such as Memon and Wilson (2007) in relation to stakeholder management in forestry governance, and also, Memon and Kirk (2008) with inclusion of indigenous Maori into water governance, as weak at for addressing cumulative and net effects and managing cultural ‘landscapes’ strategically and in an integrated manner.
review through the voices of participants. This connects back to Chapter 6, where I explained how the ‘net conservation benefit’ (Wright, 2013; Salmon, 2013; Woolastong, 2012) from the split methodology of tenure review, is questioned on the basis that: 1) relations with the landscape are grounded on traditional ideals of custodianship are transforming (examined in Chapter 6); and 2) the split methodology approach is changing relations between landholders and conservation interests, creating alienation between asexual social groups, depicted as holding irreconcilable logics.

A manager at Environment Canterbury critical of tenure review stated “all negotiations are difficult unless parties have equal power, but who had power in tenure review fluctuated with politics” (ECan informant 1). He argued that the power between whether farming or conservation values received priority fluctuated within the negotiation-based split between protection and production in tenure review. An opinion shared by many participants, the ECan representative also argued that “power was messed with too many times” (ibid.) with political expediency. Therefore he stated, the strategy of tenure review “was always moving, where you’ve had a situation where under one political regime it has gone one way, and then, whoops, we’ve gone too far and it goes the other” (ibid.).

A liaison officer between DOC, LINZ and landholders within the process held views that aligned with the perspective of the Environment Canterbury manager. He explained his perspective of the position of lessees within tenure review, which he experienced negotiating the split of property rights on various properties. He argued, with regard to the relationship between Crown agencies and lessees, that:

Walking into tenure review was like walking into a room with many doors… and the whole time there were bright lights flashing in your eyes and threat of getting a bad deal… losing the bits that made a place work productively. You always knew you were on the back foot with LINZ and the LINZ guys knew they had the power… the political cards were never all laid out in the negotiation. (Tenure review liaison 1)

The participant highlighted that the tenure review process was threatening to landholders. Several other participants described the process as a “tussle for control” (Tenure Review Liaison 2) over the allocation of values to protection or production categories.

Institutionally, the way that DOC operated within tenure review was perceived as “a completely different organisation” (DOC manager 1), detached from the conservancies that are then required to manage land reserved by the process. LINZ in conjunction with “centralised DOC” (DOC employee 2), was responsible for tenure review and was located in Wellington and Christchurch. In this way, several participants understood tenure review to have been progressed as a policy detached from local relationships, knowledge and
values. Therefore, the potential for politicisation existed at the outset; due to tenure review being perceived as an imposition, and also arising from the illogical premise of dividing between protection and production in a landscape characterised by the greyness between such categories (explained previously in Chapter 5). Many participants understood the detachment of the policy of tenure review from lived realities as undermining the reputation of DOC locally, impacting on well-established relationships with landholders (such as around the initiative of Ō Tū Wharekai), where tenure reviews became a “festery mess” (ECan Manager 2). Such a point of informant critique provides a glimpse into the way tenure review may be modifying the habitus of relationships between conservation and farming stakeholders operating in the local context.

Importantly, the quotations selected in the three paragraphs above emerged in the narratives of conservation employees and non-landholder participants, who explained issues with power relations in tenure review. However, power was a recurrent theme in landholder participant dialogue also. Many informants highlighted how defensiveness towards tenure review emerged from feeling pressured into an “ideological” (Female landholder 3) and “politically volatile divide” (Male landholder 13), that “didn’t make sense” (Male landholder 10). Many participants struggled to reconcile the separation on particular properties and noted how: 1) proposed outcomes were illogical, which often provided the rationale behind why landholders withdrew from tenure review; and 2) outcomes fluctuated dramatically with changing political rationale over the prolonged reform. It is evident in empirical analysis that the State has tended to champion production versus protection to a greater or lesser extent depending on fluctuating politics and facilitating spatial segregation accordingly. The dynamic of flux suggests how the relative power of each social field was disproportionately prioritised over the other at different junctures throughout the now, nearly four-decade process of reform.

For example one participant (DOC Manager 1), in order to explain issues with outcomes of division discussed the tenure review outcomes from Blue Mountain Station, a property adjacent to the study region. He also discussed the Māori Lakes, a complex of high endemic value wetlands located on the freehold section of Barossa Station, and therefore, exempt from being negotiated into conservation protection under the tenure review process. High value areas, such as terrain and outcrops with populations of endemic bluff weta and bats, were exempt from tenure review because they existed on previously

---

154 A property that now no longer exists, with land being divided between Castleridge Station, Arrowsmith Station and the Department of Conservation with tenure review.
freehold land. The participant surmised that these values were understood by successive governments as politically untouchable, and therefore, too difficult to negotiate. This was even though lessees usually agreed that the areas on freehold were highly valuable for ecological reasons and were often prepared to exchange them. However, the inherent values noted in both cases remained under private freehold control. Tenure review was employed to negotiate and divide only the leasehold property, which was a parcel of land understood as only “low value grazed land” with “diffuse ecological values” (ibid.). Such a dynamic emphasises the issues with how freehold is perceived as politically exempt from external influence as the realm of the landholder, except within the parameters of resource management law as a polarising mechanism of conflict resolution (Daniels and Walker, 2001; Wondolleck and Yaffee, 2000; Blomley, 2010). It also illustrates the issues with contest that transpired from the split ideology of tenure review.

In the view of the DOC manager, the outcomes from reviewing Blue Mountain (and other examples of recent poor outcomes) illustrated an aversion to conflict (like that stimulated under the last Labour Government and with Brower (2006; 2008)), which he argued to exhibit an agenda of “keeping farmers happy and weakening DOC” (Conservation Advocate 1). Furthermore, nine other participants, including conservation advocates and several lessees, claimed that contrary to Labour pushing for conservation land, the National government has been “writing off” (Landscape Architect 3) values and land to freehold and production, illustrating a political impetus for economic development.

Several other participants explained particular anomalies within the study region, where boundaries did not make sense. In one instance, the boundary was battled over, and not renegotiated as the Department had lost favour with the leaseholder because the process tenure review of the property had been arduous and had extended over a 9 year duration. The previous research of McFarlane (2011) into tenure review supports the analysis above. Highlighting similar issues, the primacy placed on the economic values of landholders was argued to have undermined the goal to ensure sustainable ecological management. Such a political dynamic highlights the criticism of many participants, regarding; first, a perceived lack of long term strategic vision for the high country landscape; and second, a lack of regard to how the high country had functioned in an integrated way under the pastoral lease. It is evident that embarking on a ‘negotiation based’ split methodology, may be intensifying oppositional politics between conservation and agricultural groupings (see: Cabinet Business Committee, 2003; Wright, 2009).
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The threat of conservation and tenure review as a tussle for control

Related to research objective two, each interview included the question “what are the issues in terms of the relationship between conservation and farming in the valley?” (See interview schedule, Appendix 3d). Detailed responses emerged and in particular, many landholder participants voiced issues with how tenure review manifested locally as a struggle for control, where conservation as an external undertaking, threatened the loss of land and production. In Chapter 6, such a process was examined as a complex exercise of scaling and bounding (Zimmerer, 2000). However, many landholder participants (with regard to the question above), outlined how tenure review, with the process of dualistic re-categorisation on pastoral lease land set ecological protection, public access and agricultural production objectives in opposition. This frustrated participants who felt such an intervention was a backwards step from the pastoral lease mode. The two following perspectives illustrate the situation of threat observed by many landholders, and empathised with by several local conservationists.

I have a tendency to think that tenure review was all about control and these agencies having the ability to control us, and the land, it’s been a struggle between the different agencies, [the] government and us. (Male landholder 1)

I had to counsel my son [during tenure review], he was going on about, you know, granddad gave back land and now you have given up most of it, there won’t be anything left for me to farm. I said, yes, we have forfeited a huge scalp of land, 21,000 hectares went back, huge, incredible, but just look at the facts we didn’t outright own it. It was in perpetuity, it was an incredibly strong lease … [but] it was open to politics. At least now we have a stake in the ground, we hold the fee simple to a large area, and we have a cheque for 5 million to do what we want to do to maximise our production from it [the property] … looking back, knowing now that the underlying reason for tenure review according to the last Labour [Rt. Hon. Helen Clarke] government was solely about control, what have we lost? Absolutely nothing. (Male landholder 14)

Numerous other landholders reiterated similar concerns related to the struggle to control land resources with the process tenure review seeking to separate productive assets from intrinsic values. In particular, like in the second quotation, many lessees intimated how the transition of high country policy under the last Labour government was threatening and influenced landholders into tenure review. The participant explains a relatively common understanding that freehold title solidifies rights, to become independent from the State. Some lessees perceived there to be dwindling political support of farming in the high country under Labour, which illustrated that the pastoral lease was becoming an increasingly risky mode of tenure. This coupled with the impetus for freehold to optimise
business potential, family succession and future security were the primary motivators into tenure review referred to by participants (indicated in the analysis of values in Chapter 5 associated with wariness about security in the face of State indecision).

There exists a deeper historically linked context to issues of control and threat, and in particular issues of trust in the State, that were provoked around the process of tenure review. These are now unpacked around the matter of amenity valuation, which was repeatedly referred to within interviews to exemplify concerns with political uncertainty and defensiveness from landholders towards the conservation lobby, the State and the public. In the subsequent section, the tenure review of Mount Peel Station is used to ground analysis of the power dynamic between the State, landholders, the conservation lobby and the public. The Mount Peel case study can then be considered through the lens of Bourdieu’s theory of social practice. Applying Bourdieu’s thinking to this specific example will help us to more accurately understand the articulation of capital between contesting social orders. Importantly, there has been a historical claim from landholders to ensure a fair and secure basis for pastoral farming, where a lack of rent security incentivised little investment in the maintenance of the land in early pastoral history. Such elements of local subjectivity highlight how over the history of high country development there has been on-going stimulus by landholders to secure freehold rights. This historicity connects with contemporary attitudes of uncertainty towards the State and continued bids for security.

Case Study 1: State Intervention and Rental Instability

The pastoral lease legislated for a fair rental to be charged on leasehold properties. This clause is stipulated in Section 4(a) of the Crown Pastoral Lease Act 1998, which was carried through from the Land Act 1948. Both Acts require the parties under the provisions of Part 8 of the Land Act, Section 131 (1) (ii) to establish the rental value on an equitable basis, having regard to the relationship between the lessor and the lessee. The rental review provisions of the Crown Pastoral Lease Act 1998 presume that there is a good correlation between the right to pasturage, the Land Exclusive of Improvements value and an annual rental fixed at 2.25 per cent of that value for an 11 year rental review period (Armstrong et

---

155 Early in the establishment of high country pastoralism political, economic and environmental insecurity made pastoralism a difficult proposition. At review of what were only pastoral occupation licences with no perpetual right of renewal, people with more funds or a neighbouring landholder could outbid an existing landholder to assume control of the lease. Such insecurity of tenure underpinned a degrading mode of pastoral agriculture, from which stemmed wide spread biodiversity loss in the high country region (Peden, 2011; Brooking, 2013; Holland et al., 2011).
al., 2008). This recognises fairness on the side of the lessor – that the Crown receives a fair dividend on their share in the lease; and that the lessee pays an affordable rent that takes into account the limited productive capacity of properties previously constrained to pastoralism, unless with Crown consent.

From 2003, however, public and political attention was increasingly placed on pastoral lease rentals, and in particular the imbalance between what high country properties are worth as pastoral lease units and what they are worth on the open market as lease or freehold.\textsuperscript{156} In some examples it was evident that there was a disproportionate benefit to the landholder when a pastoral lease was sold, or subdivided and sold as freehold title subsequent to tenure review.\textsuperscript{157} Consequently, the political argument emerged within media, institutional rhetoric and academic discourse (such as Brower, 2006a; 2006b), that the Crown was not receiving a ‘fair rental’ return from pastoral leases. Such arguments inferred that leaseholders held pastoral usage rights, but that the bulk of the market value of high country properties is the relative capital held in amenity values – a fair argument for some ‘premium’ properties. However, the issue became a major policy dilemma in the mid-2000s. Political pressure surrounded the argument that some of the value attributed to the amenity of such assets, should be reflected in the Land Exclusive of Improvements value, or the capital value of a property as the basis for rental.\textsuperscript{158}

On December 17 2003, the Labour Government’s delivery of the \textit{Objectives for the South Island High Country} document (Cabinet Business Committee, 2003; 2004) was a watershed moment that inflamed the situation between landholders and the Crown. Antecedent to the release of these objectives, the Labour government rejected the findings of the report colloquially known as the ‘Armstrong Report’ (Armstrong \textit{et al.}, 2008) and subsequently issued a revised valuation protocol of Amenity Valuation. Concerns raised in the findings of the Armstrong Report also resulted in the Crown instituting the Lakeside Exclusion Policy, when public unease caused upheaval over the application to subdivide

\textsuperscript{156} Especially in optimal amenity areas, where an influx of amenity and international capital was inflating the value of pastoral leases in desirable locations with lucrative amenity features (for example, features such as those examined in Woods, 2007). Amenity features include lakeside, alpine position, and proximity to tourism hotspots (Woods, 2007), iconic features and lifestyle elements that properties offer (Armstrong \textit{et al.}, 2008; Cabinet Business Committee, 2003; Cabinet Policy Committee, 2003; Cabinet Policy Committee, 2005).

\textsuperscript{157} For example, media controversy surrounded the purchase of Motutapu Station on the edge of Lake Wanaka and Mt Soho station further inland by Mutt Lange and Shania Twain for $21.5 million in 2004 (Sunday Star Times, 2012; Horton, 2004).

\textsuperscript{158} This fuelled the critical coverage by Brower (2006, 2008) and rebuttals by Quigley (2008) among others scholarship generally perceived by landholders as covering an issue in a region, that is on the basis of an ‘anomaly situation’.
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freehold land obtained from the tenure review of Richmond Station on the shores of Lake Tekapo (Cabinet Business Committee, 2007a; 2007b; Wallace, 2006; Littlewood, 2006).

Many landholders agreed that rentals were too low prior to amenity valuation being proposed, however, many indicated that the revised valuation and rental approach was highly threatening. Leaseholders were initially slow to volunteer for tenure review in the years immediately following its formal commencement in 1991 (Armstrong et al., 2008). However, the previous Labour government was, according to several landholders, putting considerable pressure on lessees to progress tenure review. Fulfilling aspirations of a connected grasslands national park and improved public access, which were keystone ambitions of the later period of “Clarke’s Labour administration” (Male Landholder 15), and amenity valuation was represented evocatively as a method of “Clarke and Carter’s mission of conservation grabbing” (Male landholder 4). These two landholders used Clarke and Carter, the surnames of Rt. Hon. Helen Clarke and Hon. David Carter, derisively to illustrate a perceived political agenda of alienating leaseholders from properties. Such derision provides an impression of the politics that surrounded the issue of amenity valuation.

It is not difficult to establish why lessees understood the Crown’s objectives to exemplify a threatening exercise of State power. The objectives document (Cabinet Business Committee, 2004) outlines barriers to achieving economic and conservation objectives with tenure review, affirming division and therefore the politicised dualism between protection and production. The document is very explicit and for many of the lessees interviewed, such objectives were perceived as an active threat by the State and explicit in undermining of the rights associated with the pastoral lease. The participants who referred to Amenity Valuation quoted paragraphs 29 and 30 as the most threatening. Paragraph 29 states that “if non participation and withdrawal from tenure review proves to be a barrier to the government achieving its objectives then ministers may wish to consider other measures in the future” (Cabinet Business Committee, 2004: 3). Subsequently, provision 30 outlines the measures. I have detailed these below and in italics

---

As a side issue, for a number of landholders lakeside exemption signified the lack of political foresight with the instigation of tenure review, where once freehold, lakeside land could be developed under the RMA. The state acted in a reactionary way, excluding development within 5 km of all water bodies (regardless of location), and removed all lakeside land from being eligible for tenure review, even though landholders who completed the process earlier, with obvious lakeside development potential around Lake Wakatipu had already embarked on subdivision development (Jack’s Point, Blanket Bay). This dilemma is suggestive of how development reaches a critical limit where public attention mounts and then is vetoed, rather than managing the land resources strategically from the outset, where frequently, due to this obvious development potential, development had been able to occur under the planning protocols of regional plans and RMA administration.
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provided a brief synopsis of what various participants took the three most problematic provisions to indicate. Measures referred to in paragraph 29 included that if lessees proved unwilling to enter into tenure review ministers might look at:

30.1 Introducing market rents
   This is the clause from where amenity valuation arises. To landholders it indicated making rents unaffordable or unfair with regard to the flux of a ‘normal’ pastoral based property and encouraged landholders to enter tenure review.

30.2 Review the recreational permit regime
   To lessees this clause suggested making changes to the discretionary consent process, making it harder to diversify (into tourism and post-production – because intensification could have been regulated under the Crown Pastoral Land Act 1998), therefore making the Pastoral Lease less desirable.

30.3 Initiate compulsory land acquisition for conservation purposes
   This clause represented the potential confiscation of land under the previous Land Act 1948 and CPLA 1998 provisions.

30.4 Look at more active management of Significant Inherent Values (SIVs) by the landlord [the Crown, under the Pastoral Lease].
   This clause suggests the Crown intervening in the management of ecological and landscape values on pastoral lease properties, which is within the rights of the lease tenure. Some participants considered that allowing for this would have been a better approach to tenure review, which split values apart and alienated interests rather than facilitating shared will in the management of values.

The situation that was occurring with amenity valuation was that rentals were being set on inflated values on the basis of no more than twenty per cent of pastoral leases with ‘premium’ development potential. Extraordinarily high prices were being paid for high amenity properties, including pastoral leases and freehold stations, in places like Wanaka, Hawea and Queenstown. For example, Brower draws attention to Dingleburn, Hill End, Alphaburn Stations, amongst various other properties. However, the high prices being paid in these regions was inflating the rental thinking for every pastoral lease. The policy conundrum that arose emphasised the difficulty of including the dramatic geographical and economic variables encompassed by the pastoral lease legislation into a coherent and
fair rental. A legal interest stated in reference to a particularly dramatic increase on a property between Queenstown and Glenorchy:

...amenity valuation imposed by the Labour government really unsettled high country lessees. The new rent set at Mt Creighton Station was going to rise from about 35,000 to around 300,000 dollars annually... you have got to make enormous profits annually to cover a fixed rental of 300 thousand a year (Legal Representative 1).

Other examples of proposed rental increases within and beyond the study region were severe, and the two valuation experts interviewed considered many of the proposed rental increases to be well above the productive potential for individual properties if retained as pastoral units.\(^{160}\)

The amenity value is based on the subjective values and economic capacity of the purchaser, not the current leaseholder. On a simple economic logic, if the rental is leveraged on the basis of an aesthetic and amenity value that does not provide income on an annual cash-flow basis, but provides a capital gain with eventual sale, then it does not pay for an increased rental. Amenity valuation therefore introduced a level of subjectivity to the rental system that was difficult to apply across the range of high country leasehold properties. The policy made for a difficult situation for the owners of marginal properties.

Highlighting this subjectivity, a participant who farmed a small Arthur’s Pass property, which remained reliant on merino pastoralism argued evocatively that “the whole ridiculous system was based on the idea that your sheep viewing the Torlesse Range will increase wool growth by 10 centimetres a year” (Recent landholder 5). A rental that is based on amenity was argued to “not pay the bills, feed the stock and it certainly doesn’t mean that you will look after the asset” (ibid.). The participant’s second sentiment identifies how concepts of custodianship were at times interwoven with production.

It was understood by several participants that provided the landlord (Crown) was not extracting an unfair rental the farmer would ensure the property was maintained. For example, landholders would ensure management of gorse and wilding trees. Also, the participant and several others, held the understanding that if a property is relatively prosperous and

\(^{160}\) Armstrong et al., (2008) explained that prior to the commencement of amenity valuation rents in most cases (except in the most extreme examples of production advantage and amenity demand) were at an appropriate level for the majority of leasehold properties as per their pastoral productive capacity. High country pastoralism is also a high risk farming system that requires good margins of profitability in order to sustain adversity. Some landholders felt that the profitability and viability of pastoralism was increasingly reduced, except for a few properties with a particular story to pastoral products. Examples given were Cluden and Omarama Station and other properties supplying wool clip to Icebreaker (merino wool products). In particular, many landholders referred to Bendigo Station near Tarras (Central Otago), where ‘Shrek the Sheep’ had given an identity to the property, which has diversified into wine growing connecting historical ideas to contemporary practices.
secure, landholders will be more likely to conserve. However, such an example highlights the complexities of custodianship and protection. Managing wildling pines and the landscape as a low growing mixed indigenous / introduced grassland form advocated by some local landholders, was understood in a different frame to native preservation. Advocates of the latter at times asserted the ethical need to maintain the integrity of fully functioning and indigenous flora dominated ecosystems (see Chapter 5). Such a position is suggestive of plural concepts of conservation and the defence of custodianship by lessees often exemplified what Robinson (2011) identifies as utilitarian and economistic visions for conservation.

Animosity from farmers towards conservation interests and the State emerged frequently where amenity rentals and conservation objectives were perceived to arise from a detached ‘urban’ frame. Some believed that landscape values were mobilised by the public and politicians on the basis of aesthetic concepts of amenity and urban notions of lifestyle and a longing to get back to nature (the complexity of lifestyle in a landholder frame was examined previously in Chapter 5, Figure 5.2). Compared to the Queenstown Lakes region, most landholder interviewees believed there to be considerably less capacity to capitalise on amenity potential in the case study context (especially in terms of residential subdivision and development). Most properties remained predominantly pastoral / agricultural with some diversification and intensification. Therefore, most local lessees looked upon amenity valuation negatively. Many were seeking more profitable models and freehold-provided political security for privatised development; an issue explained by examining the Mt Peel Station tenure review below. Although many landholders contested division with tenure review for undermining a culturally significant mode of production and landscape character, pastoralism was less profitable and there existed strong impetus for political security in terms of tenure, rental and economic security in all landholder narratives.

All except four (of 53) landholder participants, as well as valuation experts and liaisons spoke of issues of threat associated with amenity valuation. As tenure review was initiated on a supposedly ‘voluntary’ and flexible basis, resentment of amenity valuation was frequently used to highlight how the process became politicised. By adapting the rental system with amenity valuation the Labour government was understood by many participants to have created uncertainly around the lease, and therefore, “made tenure review involuntary” (Male Landholder 15), as a “threatening tactic of persuasion” (Male landholder 21). In doing so, uncertainty and clash characterised the interim period between the year 2000 and 2009, a time in which relationships between the State, conservation
lobby and landholders became increasingly strained (see: fed.farm.org.nz/Relations-Intensify, 2013). Four DOC employees, two DOC managers, a Fish and Game employee and both Tenure Review Liaisons I interviewed sympathised with high country landholders. All explained elements of political coercion of landholders into tenure review. Several quotations from these non-landholder participants are included in Applications Box 7.2 along with several landholder perspectives. The quotations highlight how political pressure coupled with a transformative political-economic situation and low commodity prices represented a period of considerable uncertainty.\footnote{Interestingly this was simultaneously a period of significant government surplus, with considerable expenditure on conservation objectives. This illustrated an influx of economic capital that backed the conservation lobby through the agenda of tenure review and imperative of division. It was also a time of prosperity and growth of wealth in the major urban centers. In lowland rural areas, it was also a period of time where the dairy boom had begun to gain momentum, the high country was reputed for the way its developmental trajectory lags behind lowlands by 10 to 15 years, but tends to follow similar trends.}

The situation with amenity valuation exemplifies a complex example of State intervention. The policy culminated in the Minaret Land ruling in 2009, where the Wallis Family (Wanaka) challenged the Crown in the Otago District Land Valuation Tribunal over the legality of including amenity within the capital value of a market-based rental \textit{(Commissioner for Crown Lands v Minaret Station Ltd, 2009)}. The Tribunal decided in favour of the lessees, ruling that the amenity rental was beyond the purview of the fair rental provisions of the CPLA 1998. Referring to the proceedings of the Minaret Ruling, the first expert witness for the Crown made it obvious that amenity valuation was a political intervention into areas of law and valuation. Through adapting the rental system, the Labour government was contended to have created uncertainty around the lease, which was acknowledged to be a distinct pressure into tenure review recognised by landholders.

The litigation associated with the Minarets Land Ruling and the Fish and Game Case in the High Court, mentioned previously in Chapter 2, illustrated a method of restabilising equilibrium between the Crown, leaseholders and other public stakeholders. The period suggests a legalistic approach to progressing forward the inflamed situation between protective and productive objectives, as is represented diagrammatically in Figure 8.2 in Chapter 8. Such a dynamic suggests a power struggle, which becomes the focus of discussion in sections that follow. However, first I examine a second case study.
Applications Box 7.2: Issues with political coercion into tenure review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation participants sensitivities to leaseholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... early in tenure review was a period of time where high country sheep farming was on the bones of its arse, and amenity valuation with Labour made it a very threatening time for landholders and many saw no alternatives than to go into tenure review [DOC employee 1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots of them [lessees] went into tenure review for security and to provide for economic options for the next generations... it’s not very often that the Crown offers you a deal like winning lotto” (DOC employee 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... they [lessees] were being pushed and squeezed by the Labour government (DOC manager 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour made a lot of threats to landholders, I can understand why they got pissed off (Tenure Review Liaison 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Several landholders shared insights with personal experience into how tenure review became ‘involuntary’ due to State intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Cuddihy [Regional conservator for DOC Canterbury] would come down from Christchurch, he’d talk about tenure review as a voluntary process and would look across the room at me and I would make every effort to remain composed, I didn’t even flutter an eyelid. He is right, it was voluntary, but I am right also when I say that when the government has got a gun at your head, and are threatening to rent you out of existence you enter tenure review, you take the freehold and you run away (Male landholder 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For us, tenure review was all about security ... the future of our families in the high country relied on the security of our asset and our constant investment (Female Landholder 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... government lost sight of the Land Act and the Pastoral Lease and the security that it had early on ... government got greedy with the land it wanted for DOC ... Aunty Helen really started throwing her weight round to push us through to gobble up all the farmland into the conservation parks ... it was ridiculous [the outcomes] ... it burned a lot of people off ... they couldn’t make sense of what it [government] wanted ... what the end goal was and now you have DOC slogging its guts out to do a bad job to what we were doing (Male landholder 9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was voluntary, but there were pressures that led us into going harder for the process ... it wasn’t just about farmers going for a deal and on the take from Labour’s open chequebook ... I’m pretty sure that was that governments objective ... they wanted us gone, or at least the area we [lessees] hold decreased a lot (Male landholder 13).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Study 2: The tenure review of Mt Peel Station

The tenure review of Mt Peel Station, an overview of which is provided in Applications Box 7.3 below, exemplifies concerns many participants described with the politicisation of tenure review and uncertainty associated with the State’s intervention in the pastoral lease. Tenure review destabilised a long established social-spatial order, under the benevolent guise of balance between production and protection interests. Dividing previously large leases, like Mt Peel, has led to social-spatial transformation and enabled privatisation, benefiting some leaseholders (constructed in some accounts as an economic hegemony (Brower, 2006a; Eldred-Grigg, 1981)). Two questions emerge to reflect on in subsequent sections, regarding: 1) whether the outcomes of tenure review were actually in the public interest; and 2) consequently whether the pastoral lease was a more equitable and balanced mode of tenure that implied landscape management?

The prominent colonial run holder Charlie Tripp arrived in Lyttleton with his friend and business partner John Acland in 1855. John Acland is the forebear of the Acland families who remain at Mt Peel and Mt Somers Stations. Following exploration of the Mid Canterbury Hill Country the pair took up land including Mount Somers, Mount Possession, Mount Peel, Orari Gorge and also parts of Hakatere and Mesopotamia Stations. Tripp and Acland’s partnership dissolved in October 1862 and Tripp retained Orari Gorge and Mt Somers Stations. Tripp was quoted to not develop or ‘improve’ any land unless freehold, which suggests why, although originally leasehold, Orari Gorge is now entirely freehold.

Tripp’s attitude was a local proverb within the Rangitata region quoted by several participants. In one example, a landholder stated, “Charlie Tripp would always say that you’ve got to get that land and freehold it because you never know when the government will change their mind ... you have got to be in a secure economic position” (Male landholder 1). Such a perspective reveals the historical linkage to contemporary State-lessee tensions. The participant’s attitude was that the instability of the rental system and the last Labour government’s ambition to accumulate land represented the potential for lessees to lose control. Issues like amenity valuation “encouraged landholders to push harder for tenure review” (Male Landholder 10) because the policy presented the opportunity to secure properties into the future as freehold title. The added security that freehold rights imparted, as an exclusive land title free from undue interference from others of different social-spatial visions, was buttressed by a concept of individualised land title, as
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compartmentalised and bounded (Blomley, 2010; 2008; Wallace, 2014; McClean, 2007). The owner of a large freehold run exemplified such an argument by stating,

“[W]e are freehold so [conservation organisations] leave us alone pretty much. We try to do a good job, but if you weren’t they would still leave us alone, being freehold means they don’t really get a say in the matter” (Male landholder 2).

The holder of fee simple freehold has priority in decision making over land use and management. There is no direct accountability to a State agency, such as the Commissioner for Crown Lands, and therefore landholders are in a stronger position of power. Freehold ownership limits the capacity of outside interests (proliferating in the field of high country land management) having influence on ‘owned’ freehold, rather than ‘leased’ property.

Tenure review provides the opportunity to freehold land, insulating from political intervention to secure development by firming ownership title and asserting power over space (Blomley, 2008). However, a grasslands ecologist who was closely linked to the tenure review of Mt Peel, argued, “from a national perspective a huge amount has been lost in terms of people caring for that property”. There is considerable risk of land being farmed in more intensive and diversified ways, which may further erode ecological values that were to some extent retained when land was farmed in a low intensity manner under the pastoral lease. For example, the Mt Peel case study connects to an interesting reading from within context, where macro-level policy struggles transform conservation values into liabilities and alienates people from the land; a debate examined in subsequent discussion.
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Applications Box 7.3: The Tenure Review of Mt Peel Station

The tenure review of Mt Peel Station was gazetted in April 2008, after a prolonged negotiation over ‘who got what’. Several landholders and a liaison involved with the tenure review believed it was a “lousy deal for the New Zealand taxpayer” (Male landholder 1). The pastoral lease was argued by the landholder to be the most appropriate mode of tenure for the property.

This argument was on the basis that Mt Peel Station originally ran up to 1730 metres and the LINZ employees involved in the tenure review “drew a line at 3000 feet [900 metres]”. The approximately 2800 hectares above were reallocated back to Crown conservation and the other 2800 hectares below were retained as freehold, some of which had been obtained historically. The land below 900 metres on Mt Peel, a predominantly foothills property, holds high quality soils and high rainfall relative to the runs further up the Rangitata Valley. Consequently, land above 900 metres feet had not been grazed for 80 years. Historically it had always made sense to only farm the lower lands, and potential cultivation had largely already been completed prior to tenure review. Good relations existed between the family who farmed the property and DOC, there was buy-in with regard to protecting Significant Inherent Values collaboratively.

The family received a payment for the land that was ceded back to the Crown. A line was bulldozed and a fence worth around $750,000 dollars has been erected between the freehold farm and conservation land (Fig. 1). This boundary was contested where land that had historically been retired from grazing under the run plans, for example erosion prone gullies and brittle land, was returned to freehold. It is a recognition that gives weight to the recurring landholder argument that run plans offered a more sensitive approach to managing landscape values and the friability of high country land. Erecting the boundary fence was argued “a pointless exercise” (Female Landholder 1), when Lochaber Station, onto which the top boundary of Mt Peel backs has not been volunteered for tenure review. Until this occurs (which as tenure review is a voluntary process, may not happen) the sheep from the neighbouring property can graze the conservation estate right up to the new DOC fence. Hypothetically, the process has extended the paddock size of the backblocks of Lochaber Station, including gazetted conservation land.

Subsequent to tenure review, the 1200 hectares of Waikari Station is combined with the 2800 hectares of freehold from Mt Peel. A ‘re-spatialised’, aggregate landholding of approximately 4000 hectares of territory, predominantly on easily developed terrain is classified as “production land” (Male landholder 1). There has been a zero sum loss to production, however, as a key conservation informant involved in the tenure review questioned, “you really must ask the question what taxpayer’s gained from the tenure review?” (DOC Manager 3).

The division between newly acquired freehold land and the conservation estate is marked by bulldozed boundaries. The bush on the left remains reserve, controlled by the Department of Conservation, while the cleared land on the right is farmed under freehold title (Te Ara, 2014).
7.2 Understanding the relationship between division, power and local habitus

Bourdieu (2000) asserts that while individuated, the habitus is simultaneously supra individual, whereby dispositions of thought extend beyond the subjectivities and contingency of individual worldviews to function collectively and structure social praxis (See also, Grenfell; 2008a; 2008b; Werjen and Bergen, 2006; Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2007; Haggerty et al., 2009; Campbell et al., 2012; Rosin, 2012; Buller and Morris, 2003; Thoms, 2008). Bourdieu posits that different groups have specific logics of habitus and order that unite and empower shared visions for social orderings. The habitus therefore attaches value to specific socio-spatial relations (between humans, non-humans that are both material and semiotic (Whatmore, 2006; 2002; Lorimer, 2012; 2005)), which are performative and power-laden in the way they draw upon ‘capital’ to represent and symbolise political concepts that ascribe order (Robinson, 2011; Tsouvalis, 2000).

Examining the habitus of participants therefore provides insight into how they understood power to operate within tenure review and how power relations continue to influence the relationships between conservation and farming interests.

The problems with division are clearly identified within the Mt Peel case study above, and also by analysing the tenure review and boundary processes of Mesopotamia Station in Chapter 6. As previously mentioned, the narrow focus of bounding between economic and indigenous biodiversity values was a root of discord for many participants from various positions. For example, a Fish and Game employee perceived that an over focus on “DOC values and farmer values” (Fish and Game employee 1) dominated the objectives of other interests within the tenure review process, which was perceived to be “too black and white to be creative” (ibid.). It was perceived by other Fish and Game participants that the narrow vision within tenure review focused on ‘indigenous’ and ‘farming’ values externalised their objectives from the process; even though DOC has a

---

162 This is where convention theory, such as the work of Boltonski and Thevenot (2006) expands on the scholarship of Bourdieu, and also where Actor Network Theory (ANT) diverges, emphasising the networks of connections between actors and actants (Law, 1994; Serres and Latour; 1995; Latour, 1999a; 1999b; Bingham and Thrift, 2000; Latour, 2004a; 2004b; see also Murdoch 1997a, 1997b and Whatmore 1999 for a detailed discussion.). Both convention theory and ANT give weight to the agency of the non-human in in the constitution of multi-natural assemblages of social nature (Lorimer, 2013; Braun, 2008a; 2008b, 2006; Whatmore. 2006). While I illustrated the influence of non-human nature on the constitution of farmer habitus associated with the established pastoral mode, this line of inquiry is not the focus of argument, and instead I am more interested on the changing relations between social groups.

163 This is an expansive theoretical issue in terms of Fish and Game’s position within the ‘conservation category’ in New Zealand’s national discourse, whereby the NGO seeks to protect a non-indigenous but socially valued resource (Emerson, 2011a; 2011b). By prioritising indigenous values and refusing to look at the bigger picture of water quality and quantity beneficial to exotic and indigenous fisheries, DOC were understood by the three Fish and Game employees to have reneged on legislative requirements (Fish and Game Employee 1). One staff member had written 180 submissions on tenure reviews, which she described
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statutory responsibility to make a place for Fish and Game values under the provisions of the Conservation Act 1987.

As addressed in Chapter 2 and expanded with analysis in Chapter 5, the high country landscape is dynamic and hybrid. Analysis of participants’ narrative emphasised how the multiplicity of values that comprised the cultural landscape come from various phase changes in the local region’s ‘landscape development’. Geological and glacial formations and natural ecologies signified values for material history, historical and contemporary social valuations. The ‘grasslands’, which comprise an aspect of the biophysical landscape, were acknowledged as highly modified. There are areas of special endemics and high value biodiversity (NZ Herald, 2015; Ralston, 2014a; 2014b; Sullivan, 2009). Habitats, landscape formations and vistas hold special significance for diverse people. The environment, however, is not natural, pre-human or unused, but is a multivalued terrain of economic, social and ecological significance. What this chapter has begun to illustrate is that focusing on ‘naturalness’ and a philosophy of division is riddled with political and strategic omissions. This is to challenge the politics over the defence of ‘a singular nature’ that is politically moribund but remains entrenched in media and institutional conservation discourse and some localised, social understandings. Asserting the concept of hybridity, and a relational ontology that highlights how landscapes (as social and physical entities) are always under construction is not to infer that the high country ‘landscape’ should be opened up to development. This is a relativism that social constructionist critique disputes (Latour, 2014; Bryan, 2012; Kruks, 2014; Bingham and Hinchliffe, 2008; Forsyth, 2008; Pedynowsky, 2003). However, it does begin to open up the politically laden schism between nature and society to an agonistic and pluralist spatial understanding. This is where the following chapter turns.

Perspectives outlined in Chapter 5, Section 5.3.4 emphasised how to some individuals grazing has represented exploitation and damage, and the removal of use under the DOC conservation was understood as environmentally sound. DOC and other agents became entrusted as those ‘doing conservation’ as a State centric task external to private landholder commitments. Such an ideology perpetuates a particular, western cognitive limitation, connected historically to preservation discourse, that promulgates nature protection as an extrinsic, expert based, scientific undertaking (Bryan, 2012; Adams, 2004; to have been routinely ignored (ibid.). Therefore, Fish and Game were often forced to go beyond tenure review, utilising historical relations with landholders to obtain outcomes.
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Cronon, 1995; Cronon, 1992 Whatmore, 2009; Brockington, 2004; Neumann, 1998; Katz, 1998; Turnbull, 1997). Many informants challenged such a divisive approach. Participants attitudes linked with concepts of tenure review as a green empowered land grab and imposition based upon ‘locking up nature’, as themes prominent media and interview coverage (see: Loe, 2008 and Chapter 2). Such a stance is pertinent where a farmer argued that his “uppy” (Male Landholder 14) defensive attitude towards “greenies” (ibid.) transpires from the attacking attitude of some employees. As well as the “insulting premise that values cannot and have not been protected on high country properties” (ibid.). On this reading, conservation is an activity done by DOC, where 18 landholders referred to feelings of alienation from conservation in their interviews.164

The way participants spoke of alienation suggests how institutional structures may reduce buy-in. This issue was affirmed by DOC Manager 5 who stated that getting landholders involved openly and non-defensively in “DOC’s conservation” (DOC Manager 5) is a “constant battle against wills and aspirations” (ibid.). ‘Against’ is the term in contention within the statement. It suggests a situation where conservation and the protection of biodiversity are the responsibilities of a ‘conservation other’, namely DOC, charged with protecting nature on public land. As a result, previous histories of use are removed to ‘re-naturalise’ conservation land, which was a primary theme of landholder critique in Chapter 5.

The risk with such a dichotomous cognitive ideology, manifested as a re-categorisation of space, is that holding ecological protection within the realm of State regulation may externalise nature as a fetishized ‘thing’ (Smith, 1984). Protecting ecology may thereby cease to be a responsibility of private landholders actively involved in the transformation of the landscape and use of natural resources. However, there exists relative consensus within the contemporary collaborative paradigm that optimal biodiversity conservation outcomes will be best achieved by focusing on biodiversity conservation on private land, rather than preservation on State controlled land (see for example, Brechin et al, 2002; Robinson, 2011; Bryan, 2012; West and Brockington, 2006; Zimmerer, 2007, Cronon, 2005). Erecting boundaries between nature and society may facilitate the writing-off of values to particular categories of productive and protective social use and separated values. In the high country such conservation and production categories have previously

164 Even though documents such as the Canterbury Conservation Management Strategy (CCMS) (DOC, 2002) and the management objectives of Ō Tū Wharekai (Sullivan, 2012) state explicitly that landholders are primary stakeholders in the nine Canterbury conservation units.
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not been delineated so explicitly. This argument speaks to the political stance of Adams (2004), where in Australian rural spaces boundaries between nature conservation and production alienated local landholders from protection. Bryan (2012) suggests also classifying land as either for production or protection, thus stabilising traditional uses, may stifle innovative approaches to managing the landscape as an integrated system.

What such a dialogue indicates is how tenure review has had a significant impact on the habitus of relations between landholders and conservation agents. I turn now to examine this power construct in terms of grouped politics and the power play between production and protection aspirations.

Contest between protectionist and productivist orders

The particular cultural symbols that the protectionist and productivist fields attach to emergent social space to some extent compete. With tenure review, the separation of production and protection values and objectives has operated as a nexus of power play, mediated by the State and has stimulated conflicting social messages between competing interests. Numerous participants suggested that the exercise of State power conflicted with the support of agricultural development, and the simultaneous economic support of tenure review was understood as a conservation motivated land grab. The issue of conflicted State support for production values and ecological preservation ideology are clear in the following extracts of participant discourse, each of which depict clash between orders:

We [Fish and Game] would write a resources report and state the need to protect game bird habitat, fisheries and water quality ... that gets sent off, then we get back the preliminary proposal once the whole shebang’s been decided ... that's basically the end of the process we never got what we needed … it was frustrating as hell the way the process worked … it was crap … there seemed to be this unspoken pact in DOC or wherever … [a] high up decision to exclude anything Fish and Game requested… it was all about DOC and Farmers [values]. Instead of trying to follow it through the tenure review process, the way the [State led] process worked just led to grabbing and marking territories … it became a stakeout between farmers and DOC and everything else was lost. (Fish and Game Rep. 1).

It’s all contradictory … this line between preserved values and production was on the basis that private landholders, you can’t trust them to protect … but the outcome of tenure review … it’s created a distinct line between intensive development and locked up protection land salvaged by DOC. … my reading is that [tenure review] has worked to bring land out of production and into [State] management, but then the government encourages farmers to develop whatever they can elsewhere …. There is no sensitive balance … room for
integrated landuse and planning is left behind, because, you can't rely on the private landowner to do it. Some might be very good at it and have great intentions and they do an extremely good job, others don't that's pretty clear. (Landscape Architect 4)

Evidently, tenure review along with Nature Heritage Fund purchases operated as a twofold strategy of conservation accumulation. As one participant argued, “on the lobby front it has historically been just more, more, more” (Male Landholder 8). He perceived what he termed an “Oliver syndrome” (ibid.) of conservation expansion based on a divisive model advocating the establishment of parks and reserves, free from human use. Green politics and the ways that land is accumulated for conservation were perceived by various participants as being backed by a nationally potent politic of “saving New Zealand’s environment” (Landscape architect 3). Discursive representations like this are power laden and garner political backing from the conservation lobby. In the media, and infused within the relationships between productivist and productionist interests are power relations that relate to the clash over prioritising particular ‘spatial definitions’. Such definitions of social-nature comprise assemblages of meaning that are linked to socially justified values and systems of knowledge formation (Tsouvalis, 2000; Seymour, Watkins and Tsouvalis, 2000).

In line with Bourdieu (2000; 1996), each social-spatial order, or shared habitus of knowing and doing, is vested with various species of capital (economic, social and cultural). Capitals are held and exerted as a composite of symbolic capital accorded to a particular order on the basis of social justification and enrolment of agents into collectives that hold more power.

Reflecting back to Figure 3.2 in the theoretical framework, a clash between the social fields of conservation and agriculture at different levels of New Zealand society was posited. Situating analysis of spatial production locally emphasised the disjunction between micro (lived/experienced habitus) and macro (represented, public and policy) levels of debate over tenure review; similarly, acknowledging the inherently partial and emergent ways that space and nature are made meaningful (Braun, 2006a, Wallace, 2014; Stephenson, 2008; 2010). However, I suggested that protectionist and productivist orders correspond with relative power from varied allocations of symbolic capital. Some elements to these vestments of symbolic capital were outlined in Chapter 3 and highlighted further in Chapter 5, with focus on the local negotiations and social values. The relative symbolic capital, and therefore, power, associated with the productivist and protectionist orders is derived from complex sources.
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Importantly, I conceptualise these orders as composites / collectives that are both associated with broader ideologies and visions for the order of social space. Each order, from its unique historicity of development, articulates a set of values that are consistent with a habitus and general ‘knowledge culture’ couched in ‘protectionist’ and ‘productivist’ values and concepts (Tsouvalis, 2000; Tsouvalis, Seymour and Watkins, 2000). These visions are often objectified as competing in the national media (see Chapter 1), as well as political and policy discourses (Parry, 2009; Wright, 2013; MfE, 2012). At the macro-level, tenure review divided between protection and affiliated public access values and production. However, as was highlighted in Chapter 5, each order is complex at the micro-level and analysis has revealed contradictions and overlaps within and between groupings often perceived uniform. Therefore, the process set in motion a polarised politics based on a dichotomy perpetuated between nature and society, which was not necessarily how space and landscape has been or continues to be conceptualised locally. This claim extends back to the dual emergence and historical roots of productivism and later the growth of conservation awareness in New Zealand’s cultural psyche, which was examined in Chapter 3 (Moon, 2013; Ginn, 2008, Rainbow, 1993). A dualised farming and conservation discourse at a national level that Morris (2009) began to examine, but did not go deep enough to problematise the overly reductionist policy dichotomy on which the tenure review process rests and the contest was stimulated.

As expressed in the following sections, each knowledge culture articulates a set of values and is influenced by global and national discourses and social demands that amalgamate into a coherent and justified habitus of social-spatial praxis and social affiliation. For this reason, the ‘social group’ provides a useful analytical conceptualisation of social structures and political collectives. However, as a structuring to social praxis, I emphasise due care so as not to overemphasise structuration and underemphasise the pluralism and internal complexity existing within the concepts of social ‘field’ and ‘group’ (examined in the latter sections of Chapter 5). To do this would be to reinstate the generalisations about and distinctions between ‘productivist’ and ‘protectionist’ orders, which with a lens of social constructionism and by focusing on the contingent experiences and values of individuals, I have carefully sought to avoid. This is an intricacy to the research approach, where I have shown the need to unravel complexities and understand relational concepts of space before seeking to understand power structurings and social contest to negotiate between macro and micro level of analytic and understand complex influences on social ideologies.
The ‘productivist’ order

The productivist order exists as a complex composite of political power that amounts from attributes of habitus and social spatial relations. The order, and justification of productivism, derives political potency from a range of capitals, borrowing from systems of values that comprise social meanings and therefore symbolic power (Wacquant and Bourdieu, 2007). For example throughout this analysis, productivism in the mind spaces of landholders was argued for on the basis of national economic security, negotiating a discourse of production as socially beneficial. The modes of production are transforming with tenure review, and visions for production in high country space often remained constrained around the modernist productive basis of improving agricultural output (Walford, 2003; Burton, 2004b). By affirming freehold as a category ‘for production’, the conventions of productivism, the productivist knowledge culture and its alignment with social praxis will likely be perpetuated (an argument that corresponds with the broader arguments of Rosin, 2012; Jay, 2007; Burton, 2004b and Shucksmith, 1993).

Participants attributed the value of pastoralism to cultural identity and social sustainability. The traditional mode is understood as ‘in keeping’ and less likely to undermine the biophysical, ecological and social values that comprise the high country as a resilient cultural landscape. Such understandings interlinked civic social goods and economic worths with an argument for a traditional ethos of ‘custodianship’ in Chapter 6 (Rosin, 2008, Boltanski and Thevenot, 2006). Various social and productive values and aspirations were unravelled within participant discussion of custodianship. For example, the resilience of the cultural and historical significance attached to high country production was imbricated with agriculture for nation building and colonial independence (elements of this are examined in Appendix 2a). Each signification lends allocations of capital in the justification of a farmed social-spatial order (of which there were various typologies and interventions that emerged from discourse analysis of interviews presented in Chapter 5, from sensitive and in keeping with the existing high country landscape character, through to highly developmental, as the example in Box 5.4 depicted).

High country agriculture, for its position within New Zealand’s cultural psyche and continued emphasis on the social and economic importance of the agricultural economy, is a social field of considerable symbolic capital. Consequently, the productivist order holds political influence within national imaginations of high country space. The symbolic capital associated with what a high country farmer has traditionally represented, and the ideals of pastoral custodianship, are challenged. Participants of eco-centric dispositions often
emphasised the need to reduce priority placed on economic values and development. However, the unforeseen effect of division has been the transformation of farming habitus, in ways that many participants understood to be a “back-turn” (Female landholder 7) in the trajectory of the high country’s social-spatial emergence; to more intensive uses and as a divided and more antagonistic social space as presented in the participant quotations above.

The ‘protectionist’ order

As mentioned in Chapter 3, tenure review wielded significant economic capital to advance obtaining conservation territory, with substantial State funding backing the process. This recognition develops the understanding that conservation / the protectionist order was not disempowered economically within the process of tenure review. It also exists as a similarly potent field of social aspiration, and within landholder discourse there was also considerable resistance to the public backing the protectionist order garners (examined below).

The symbolic capital attributed to the protectionist order came predominantly from social expectations of nationalising land (associated with public access) and ecological values in many participant interviews. Concepts of New Zealand’s egalitarianism are entangled with New Zealand’s unique environmentalism with the emergence of the Values Party and Green movement (Rainbow, 1993; Wallace, 2012; Ginn, 2008; Abbott, 2009; Moon, 2013). Such representations extend into rhetoric of benevolence associated with public access and protecting nature in media and institutional discourse (Sage, 1995a; Sage, Graeme and Maturin, 2005; Blogisthmus, 2012; Rural News, 2010; The Timaru Herald, 2010b).

At a generalised level, agriculturalists are often depicted as focused on economic profit and individual gain. Such representations were the focus of eco-centred participants who rejected the over prioritisation of economic development and industrialism in the high country, as an element of deeper eco-centric epistemology. This assertion is supported by Rainbow (1993), who examined the emergence of the national Values Party and the Green Party movement in New Zealand. The ‘Greens’ as a social-political entity in the composition of New Zealand’s society, advanced on egalitarian ideals of social and environmental justice, participatory democracy and proposed alternative modes of economic structuring and ecological economics. These values were counter to the
industrial aspirations and ‘Think Big’ policies of the Muldoon era of government, whom many of the farming community were strongly in support of at that time (see Chapter 2).  

As examined in Chapter 5, participants defended and hence imbued with value (capital or power) ideas of indigeneity, unique biodiversity, charismatic flora and fauna. As exemplary concepts, “use free” (Landscape architect 2), “ecological restoration” (Forest and Bird Advocate 2) and “park reservation of flourishing… special species” (Landscape Architect 3), were frequent signifiers of eco-centric worth in participant interviews. Each is imbricated with power through the practices, representations and social values they entail. Such concepts therefore become intrinsic to political agency within the knowledge culture of environmentalism (Ginn, 2013; Bryan, 2012; Lorimer 2012; 2005; Brockington and Duffy, 2010). The discursive and politically convincing basis of protecting nature extrinsically from human influence emerged from a brief overview of politically loaded language regularly occurring in media, institutional, academic and also interview coverage. “Saving”, “significant”, “rare”, “endemic”, “fast declining” and “at risk” exemplify but a few conceptual examples that participants’ attached to biodiversity. Significantly, each term illustrates social backing, and capital that supports the protectionist order, related to knowledge stemming from technical ecological terms and conservation ecology. 

The political potency and public support of concepts attached to a protectionist order is derived from political junctures and a historicity of global and national emergence. Biodiversity conservation as a political concept reflects Agenda 21 and the Rio Earth Summit inter alia at a global level. Authors like Ingoe (2006) and Ingoe and Brockington (2014) explain how biodiversity, discourses around ecosystem services and intrinsic values have become examples of powerful political concepts, unifying political collectives within the global environmental agenda. In New Zealand, the concept of biodiversity’s influence is encapsulated in the National Biodiversity Strategy, the Reserves Act 1977, the National Parks Act 1980 and Conservation Act 1987. Each mandates extrinsic protection and segregation between ecological conservation (or preservation) and cultural use (Norton and Miller, 2000). Revisiting an argument made previously in Chapter 5, the principle of sustainable management in the Resource Management Act (1991) to some extent conflicts with this body of legislation, which is situated in a particular temporal context of modernist conservation thought. The imperative of sustainable management and collaborative
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165 Such a politics of emergence suggests the deep context of affiliation conservation has with leftist governance and its challenge to right wing governance in New Zealand’s political environment (Rainbow, 1993; Dunlap, 1997).
approaches to resource regulation challenges reserves and national parks and their constitution as externalised ‘First nature’ (Smith, 1984; 2008)

For example, emphasis in conservation management literature (including, Zimmerer, 2000; 2010; Marris, 2009; Hobbs, Higgs and Harris, 2009; Manning et al., 2009) is increasingly placed on shifting the paradigm away from ‘preserving nature’ towards sensitive social praxis towards ‘used nature[s]’. In New Zealand, there is increasing recognition of cultural landscapes novel ecosystems in landscape and ecological conservation philosophy and practice (see: Norton and Miller, 2000; Wallace, 2012; Trapeznik, 2000; Stephenson, Abbott and Ruru, 2011, Walliss, 2013). However, tenure review operated as a strategy of park formation, suggesting a still deep-rooted divisive ideology in national biodiversity protection orthodoxy. It is a logic that potentially relegates the most precious values in the conservation estate into the realm of centralised management by DOC. The issue however, is that such a protection strategy may disengage local communities, who are alienated from management, but are at the coalface of land transformation. The flow-on impact of disengaging communities from alternative values and objectives (for example, biodiversity values and protection) is that production impetus may narrow to an individualistic mode influenced by the neoliberal imperative of the economisation of everything. Boundaries therefore reduce cross-pollination between groupings – an issue explained in the following chapter. Importantly, the discussion above links intricately to ideas of public backing of the protectionist order, and therefore, the power that confronts productivism, as the order which in Chapter 3 I suggested is often represented as dominating / hegemonic over others in the high country context (and tenure review).

Public backing of the protectionist order
An increasingly urban-dominant conservation lobby backs the power dynamic emerging between productivist and protectionist orders, and landholder participant’s often implied this to be threatening. This was an important theme that emerged from interview analysis. In particular, threat was perceived to emanate from claims of altruism attached to nationalisation of the conservation resource and a selection of participant insight is provided below in Box 7.4. Quotations are organised into subthemes of farmer and conservationist perspectives of altruism attached to protectionism, and also the subtheme that emerged in eco-centric perspective’s emphasising the need to scrutinise the ‘actual economic worth’ of agriculture. Each participant quotation in subtheme one highlights
different aspects of public backing behind the altruistic politics of the green lobby. Also a sense of defensiveness and threat associated with the public backing and perceived benevolence of the conservation lobby is made clear. Such insight suggests how ‘saving’ or protecting nature and safeguarding public access in contemporary New Zealand society are associated with considerable symbolic capital. For example, within the political stance of Forest and Bird and Grahame Sydney in Chapter 2, representations of saving the existing landscape in the Mackenzie Basin, as an assumed static entity is clear.

Quotations in Applications Box 7.4 illustrate how some farmers felt perceived in the public sphere as opposed to the altruistic good of conservation as “pariahs in opposition to the national benefit of saving nature” (Male landholder 10) (see quotations 1 – 7). This position exemplifies an exertion and clash between capitals associated with protectionist and productivist aspirations, in a way that is alienating, rather than integrating. Within the landholder quotations there are clear ideas of detachment and a sense of ambivalence that many landholder participants felt the high country community is faced with from the urban population and conservationists. Many perceived themselves vulnerable to a degraded public image, but perceived that the government still incentivised and supported agriculture in the high country, as a contribution to the economic security and resilience of New Zealand (the political economy of which is now more intensively production focused). It was distinct in some accounts that conservation / the protectionist order further threatened the stability of productivist interests, which have begun to regain doxa within high country space following conflict over tenure review.

In light of gauging landholder wariness towards the altruistic stance of protectionism it is noted that some eco-centric participants acknowledged that their work was altruistic and for the public good. Several in particular felt that conservation and preservation of the high country landscape should be the only use option. Preservation was constructed in some examples as the most environmentally friendly and in the national interests. The removal of use allowing DOC control, access and recreational options, compared to the productivist order, which has “long captured” (quotation 6, Applications Box 7.4) the structures of power that have operated in the high country. There was recognition of the economic and social values that stem from preservation and firm ideas of what was and was not considered sustainable practice (quotations 10, 11, 12). Aligned with protectionist ideology, there was a strong participant theme that the economic worth of high country agriculture should be re-evaluated. Participants aligned with such ideology (particularly those of an eco-centric disposition) argued the need to deprioritise
conventional productivist economic structures. For example, several participants, like Landscape Architect 1 (quotation 11), contended the need to put value on collective resources such as ecosystem services and water quality.

### Applications Box 7.4: Ideas of Altruism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landholder perspectives of altruistic protectionism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: The recreation and conservation lobby always have the vote of altruism behind what they are doing. It is always in this big can of worms called public interest. They [conservationists] don’t stand to gain anything from conservation and from putting pressure on us to retire land with tenure review because they are working in the public good, whereas farmer’s aren't seen as doing that (Male landholder 10).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: If conservation is a fine thing to be doing, then by definition we are doing a fine thing, then these other people who are resisting us are not doing a fine thing (ibid.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: I don’t think that we can underestimate how influential some of those individuals can be, it’s a pretty nice moralised position to be firing ammo at the local farming community from isn’t it ... you set yourself of a pedestal as a greenie and hurl offensives at the rest (Male Landholder 15).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: It’s not easy always being the villain, you know I have been farming for 40 years and to always be seen as the villain in the piece is taxing (Male Landholder 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: I used to be proud to be a farmer’s wife, now I certainly don’t advertise it, people in town see you as a raping and pillaging the land (Female landholder 9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: ... lobby groups have so much influence, often I don’t think it's DOC or Fish and Game or whatever thing generally, I think they respect farmers, they might not agree with everything we do but they respect us and try to work with us rather than against us, but behind that the lobby groups and the public, they are saying this land is too special, too high value and our position is that we don't trust farmers to look after it after it so it has to come out of farmers control (Female landholder 4) (emphasis added).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: I just can’t agree that everything that is being done on the conservation estate is always in the public interest and is of high social benefit … more so than what’s happening on farms… it’s not like that really, farming’s not opposed to conservation, they [farmers] just have a different idea of what is good (ECan Manager 1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation perspectives of altruistic protectionism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8: I think that farming is a sad inditement on the land, it is really destructive you know, and the land that is kept by DOC it is maintained in the national interest (Forest and Bird Advocate 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: Farmers have long captured that government power and have been able to do what they want, well I guess the pastoral lease put limits, but it was still about production ... more so anyway... and that was about individual families, not New Zealand... the whole... what the public values about the high country (DoC employee 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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10: … it takes long term view, DOC and tenure review was thought up with this in mind … I think that the public will see the benefits, there is so much doubt about what the landscape will be in a few years, but it has to be better than it all being farmed … grazed, you know … it’s not a sustainable practice. (Local Conservation Board Rep. 2)

11: You’ve gotta question it [current political logic]… everyone knows that tourism and the conservation estate is worth more to the economy than the small benefit that high country farming makes. The land is better put to better uses than farms … [and] without the conservation, if we degrade that resource, the whole high country basis will go, we need to value the ecosystems services that tussocks provide, the water, the air (Landscape Architect 1).

12: I remember Muldoon too well … you can’t have farm development at all costs … preservation should be prioritised as a base to New Zealand’s economy, it is the most sustainable way of maintaining landscapes and ecosystems that we have damaged so much but there is also some value to the ordinary way of farming [pastoral farming] (Landscape Architect 3).

The protectionist order is affiliated with people undertaking important jobs for the prioritisation of an environmental ethos and conservation is attached to arguments and goals in the public interest. However, because of its oppositional framing, many landholders and farming participants understood conservation to remain external to the normal social praxis and habitus of economic production, as the objective of DOC and which may impose “un-necessary boundaries” (Male Landholder 8) in the way of business objectives and capital accumulation.

However, avoiding a one-sided portrayal, there was deep context spoken to by several conservation participants regarding why farmers are not trusted as environmental managers. Predominantly this was associated with the “long history of degrading practices and biodiversity decline” (Forest and Bird Advocate 1). However, at different times practices implied as degrading, have been understood as landscape improvement, where agriculture was used to tame feral nature (Moon, 2013; Brooking and Pawson, 2010, Ginn, 2008). Furthermore, broad-brush rejection of custodianship offered by landholders on the basis of its production-centric ideology fails to account for better practices. By focusing on historical practices and poor examples of contemporary land management, the venerability of all claims to custodianship (currently and under the pastoral lease) are
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106 This was a core reason behind the rejection of landholder custodianship by some eco-centric participants in Chapter 6.
potentially disregarded. Consequently, the justification for taking control of values and the use of fixed boundaries to protect ecological values emerges.

As mentioned previously, controlling values suggests a root of social struggle between productivist and protectionist objectives. In each example, notions of altruism are evidently a matter of symbolic capital associated with the protectionist order that evokes social and political backing from New Zealand’s public with the way it is mobilised in opposition to the privatised interests of farming. However, what understanding dialogue around altruism and non-economic values does is show values beyond economic capital, a reading of social benefit upon which justification for productivism is often reconciled. Complexity arises here however, where some local conservation participants and many farming participants perceived the pastoral lease as in the public’s interest. Recreational access was available in many cases and the mode of production was regulated as a low intensity landscape. Tenure review however, has advanced a more distinctly bounded and neoliberal land tenure arrangement, overhauling the traditional model, and isolating nature into parks. Conservation values under the terms of the ‘tussle for control’ within tenure review, are transformed into liabilities in the habitus of leaseholders, due to the mutually exclusive way that production and protection are set in opposition.

**Conservation ‘Values’ – Assets or Liabilities?**

The holder of an expansive Arthur’s Pass pastoral lease, which includes a large area of historical freehold, explained: “if we went into tenure review, because our property has high ecological and landscape values on both high altitude and the flats, we would have all those values taken off us” (Male landholder 23). Referring to a map, he described the area that would be ceded back in exchange for freehold on flats and a condensed area of gridironed land around the homestead and curtilage areas. Such an argument reiterates the scalar issues examined in Chapter 6. However, the existence of ecological values offered the potential for an external other to take control of values and therefore presented as risks in landholder attitudes towards tenure review.⁶⁶ For farmer’s to secure production advantage, the more values extant on a property are devalued, the less likely they will be identified as of value for extrinsic protection and returned to the Crown. Therefore, as a
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⁶⁶ Mentioned above, there was disgruntlement from many landholder participants regarding the way conservation has traditionally worked through a methodology of attempting to control conservation ‘resources’ – land and biodiversity values – in a state centric ‘extrinsic way’. Such examination aligns with thinking of Robinson (2011), Bryan, (2012) and Adams (2004), who assert the need for balance in the management of ‘used natures’, to encourage local buy in.
split methodology, tenure review counterproductively encourages farmers to erase values before rules are put in place. Landholders become busy hiding values rather than enhancing them. This structural impasse is illustrated in the sample of quotations in Applications Box 7.5 below. The landholders and conservation participants each discuss aspects of the destructive issue of how control and threat manifests as ecological values being understood as threats. Each example illustrates an understanding of how conservation values were understood to be liabilities within the habitus of landholders, both in terms of economic expense and psychological liability. This is especially the case where a rigid conservation ethos of ‘unworkably’ use free nature is posed in opposition to production values.¹⁶⁸

The participant who offered the final quotation was apologetic for using Laurie Prouting (the previous lessee at Mesopotamia Station) as an example. She explained how he holds a “genuine conservation ethic” (Female Landholder 1), illustrating sensitivity to the complexities of individual perspectives. However, due to the higher-level ideological demand to isolate ecological values from social use in conservation orthodoxy, landholders were understood to portray ignorance of values existing in place. This is because, admitting the existence of values may mean that a previously humanised ecology is understood to need purification, to allow space for ecology. Seeking the nostalgic return to ‘higher indigenous species abundance’, or a return to an imagined pre-human state, becomes a matter of exerting control, as an assertion of symbolic violence towards the productivist order (Bourdieu, 2000).

The critical message from analysis is that when production is socially constructed as opposed to ecological protection, people generalised within the ‘production category’ are potentially alienated. They are perceived unable to conserve as a scientific task, undertaken separately to local values and resource dependencies (Brechin et al., 2002; White, 1995). Relations are oriented in opposition to a constructed ‘other’ within social space, overlooking commonalities and the blurry complexities that delineate and connect between interests for conservation and farming locally (see Chapter 5). While some landholders were sympathetic to ‘local DOC’, as an organisation, the Department of Conservation (the distinction between conservation and preservation is important) was understood to remain philosophically opposed to productive use. For example, the way

¹⁶⁸ Even though ‘conservation values’ may broadly be understood as ‘produced’ but differently acculturated social-spatial meanings for material things within nature, grounded upon different frameworks of knowledge construction (Turnbull, 1997; Agrawal, 1995; Tsouvalis et al., 2000), and material-semiotic assemblages (Lorimer, 2012; Braun, 2008a).
tenure review operates as a policy seeks to control values with a view to returning ‘third nature’ to a dehumanised state as a restored form of ‘first nature’ (Smith, 1984). A clash stems from division and a failure to negotiate a more sensitive place for humanity within a historically used landscape, whereby conservation was discursively constructed as an ‘overly ideological other’. Defensiveness and opposition arise from a perceived weakness in conservation practices, which are purported as based on an “anti-humanist” (Int. landholder 2) or “preservationist” ideology (ibid.), rather than practicality and ethics towards occupants in space. Subsequently, ‘common sense’ associated with conservation ideals were questioned.

Applications Box 7.5 – Assets or Liabilities

Conservation participants
You see people racing to develop stuff and really pushing the CPLA or ignoring the CPLA as far as they are allowed to and the legislation pretty toothless now. (DOC Manager 1)

The current legislation, the CPLA, local government, the district plans, the RMA and tenure review put farmers in a terrible position in that they are faced with doing things they don’t really want to be doing but if they want to secure the production potential of their property they have to pretend they haven’t got these values or go hell for leather with development so they get rid of them, it’s totally screwed up. (ECan. Employee 2)

You see it time and time again with SNA surveys and things like that, they [farmers] want to be able to plead ignorance. They don’t want to know because they are afraid of what it means if things get identified .. it’s better to ignore them. (DOC Manager 3)

Landholders
The trouble is that high country people have wanted to hide values because if there was anything special about the place it was more of a risk … you lose more of the place because conservation wants all the values in conservation land. (Male landholder 12)

We know the value of some of these things [of ecology and landscape] but if you saw a Jewelled Gecko, a Scree Skink, a Grebe nest, you wouldn’t say a word about it. Those things have never been seen as opportunities, always risks, anything special is even more of an excuse for your land to be taken off you. (Male landholder 10)

There is a fear that identifying native values will lead to them being taken away. Look at tenure review, if we have been good stewards and looked after values, they are seen as too valuable to be left in or stewardship and they’re taken away. (Male landholder 14)

I was flying over the Rangitata and I said, you’ve got Black Stilts down there, and Laurie [Prouting] said, where, where? If there is I need to shoot them all, when we got back he apologised, he said, ‘I don’t really feel like that, but you know, it is not worth my while finding Black Stilts and Blue Ducks up there. (Female landholder 1)
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Below, three landholder participants, each from different valleys in the case study region all speak to issues with threat and control. Many others expressed similar concerns and several DOC employees who worked closely with landholders were sympathetic to such issues. Overall, the insight from the three participants suggests how higher-level conservation ideology, expanding beyond tenure review, may undermine local relationships. Overall, defensiveness in participant narrative stemmed from perceived misrepresentation, which manifests itself in a closing down of dialogue due to the ‘attacking stance’ of higher-level conservation policy.

… there is resistance to a perceived threat. Where will the next challenge come from? Conservationists? Recreationalists and the access lobby? The Crown? We always feel on the back foot and none of them want to work with you. (Male Landholder 10)

There is a culture of defensiveness and protectiveness that is evidenced by people sometimes being angry and resentful or uncommunicative … I think high country farmers feel misunderstood and misrepresented. (Male Landholder 15)

There is defensiveness from a group of people who have been used as a political football for years and years. Some react by firing up, others react by going inward and saying we are never going to win we’ve just got to keep our heads down and keep farming. (Male landholder 8)

Acknowledging such insight into oppositions, within a Bourdieusian frame, conceiving ideologically of opposition may lead to the advancement and reinforcement of difference between competing habitus and groups (Bourdieu, 1991; 1998). The latter perspective on the ‘atmosphere of defensiveness’ in the exemplary quotations above extends this argument emphasising the potential for the retrenchment into a forms of ‘stubborn productivism’ and reinforcement of social differences between increasingly asexual social groups. Related to transforming habitus, several participants stated how tenure review has established a more “pig headed” (Male landholder 10) attitude towards the conservation ‘other’ and the State from farmers. Emerging was a perspective of “up yours to the government ... no longer in support of the farming cause” (ibid.). The impression I gained from interviewing landholders was that stubbornness at times underlay farmers negotiating hard for freehold through tenure review, to “develop how they like for the cash” (Male landholder 15). Subsequently, less responsibility for land management and obligations for allowing public access was associated with freehold title. Therefore, division is erosive of sharing space and negatively transforming of interpersonal habitus, potentially undermining collective sustainability outcomes.
By taking an extreme protectionist view that focuses on the re-naturalisation of a hybrid nature, potential allies in the progression of a more sustainable, integrated social space are alienated. Division and categorisation as conservation land ideologically separated from human use, scales and bounds territory as ‘DOC land’. As one Rangitata lessee asserted, “Conservation is done by DOC on DOC land... which irritates me because it is public land administered by DOC”. Such as assertion illustrates how in the ideological frames of high country actors and the public, conservation is understood as the responsibility of DOC, who manage a territory of landscape categorised for ‘use-free protection’, as a refuge for venerated nature. It is justified as DOC’s responsibility to preserve land and values, beyond the habitus requirements of landholders.

7.3 The broad message from the chapter
Over the preceding three chapters, critique has drawn attention to the complex knowledge frames, the social relations and habitus that allow the ability for social praxis to conform and support the order of a particular field. This has given insight into the doxa and mutual contestation associated with two dominant ‘orders’ (protectionist and productivist) negotiating high country space.

This chapter has asserted that there has been flux between the relative power held by conservation and farming visions for social space through State orchestrated and politically volatile division. Therefore, tenure review operated as a fulcrum of discord and fragmentation of social groups, as an inroads for neoliberal processes. By theorising the articulation of power in this way, I suggest that neither field is subjugated, but challenge one another which justifies approaches that seek to open a more agonistic/pluralist politics. In contemporary New Zealand society, the relative social backing of the economic imperative of farm production and ecological conservation underpin social and symbolic clash. The high country landscape, as a focus of divisive politics, has illuminated the tensions between productivism and protectionism as core objectives within New Zealand society.

Recognising the relative parity between conservation and agricultural orders opens the playing field for social negotiation between them in terms of exploring future, strategic
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169 Rather than public conservation land or even ‘our land, which is administered by DOC’, which has been an argument reiterated regularly by landscape ecologist Brian Molloy in many public forums, such as the Environmental Defence Society symposium on the Mackenzie Basin (pers. Comm., Brian Molloy, 28 November, 2011).
direction for the continued emergence of the high country landscape. The debate, rather than impasse, becomes about considering ‘where to from here’, and I argue, negotiating a space of becoming from the foundation of a plural ontology. The following chapter looks explicitly at this, seeking to forge the parameters to a pluralist politics, emphasising the potential benefits of dialogue and integration of spatial visions and social groups.
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Chapter 8

Connecting Research Threads: Potentials for a Negotiatory Politics

8.0 Introduction

Bringing together the threads of thinking that have woven through this thesis, the following chapter is guided by two dimensions. In section 8.1 the broader argument of the thesis is concisely summed up, integrating theoretical ideas that were previously developed. I avoid reengaging with detail on how the prior analysis has deconstructed tenure review and instead seek to conceptualise the thesis as a whole, enabling you to more fully appreciate the key interventions posed and where this discussion chapter is moving in terms of practical politics and theoretical implications.

The remainder of the chapter (sections 8.2 and 8.3) takes a transformative stance, which relates to my commitment to an approach that seeks to highlight potentials for reconstruction following critique, and thus, a more inclusive, less antagonistic ‘exercise of futuring’ (Braun, 2008; Bingham and Hinchliffe, 2008). It is this stance that speaks to the third research objective, which questions the ethics of challenging dualisms constructed between nature and society to create a platform for enabling collaborative politics and social learning. I use this objective to frame the discussion to offer creative thinking that challenges accepted assumptions and suggests implications for theory formulation, but also practical politics in the local case study context and future conservation approaches, rather than providing much further empirical detail.

To approach the debate in an alternative manner, the current political impetus for encouraging conservation partnerships is examined and I conclude on the position of the neoliberal State within the facilitation of collaborative politics. The current national-level political shift inspires questioning around local and institutional capacity when tenure review has demonstrated the State actively removing itself from high country land management. In section 8.3 I offer a concluding commentary on integrating pluralism and engage with the concept of hybridity in a way that negotiates a different political future focused on an ethics of engagement and respect, where a relational ontology:

- Suggests establishing a different social-spatial politics to move away from dualistic frames, and which takes account of and works with plural claims, thus empowering complex epistemology, rather than closed, static notions of landscape and nature.
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- Inspires a locally grounded politics, emphasising interpersonal connections between individuals, communities and the environments in which they live and work. Importance is placed on forging respectful relations with hybrid natures and other social stakeholders. However, not one social order or definition of space should be assumed hegemonic over others, because within a pluralist framework direction and approach is a matter of local negotiation.

8.1 The thesis this far – complicating macro with micro-politics

My positionality provided a unique lens of inquiry to interrogate the complex experiences and attitudes of a selection of people involved with environmental management and production activities in the case study context. Productivist and protectionist ‘groups’ are often polarised in environmental debates and are portrayed as conflicting interests within mainstream discourse covering tenure review and are also viewed as internally homogenous. However, due to my connections to the study region and with conservation and farming interests working there, I perceived that local complexities might complicate assumptions and challenge less informed representations of where ‘farmers’ and ‘conservationists’ fit within the hotly contested tenure review debate.

The extent to which my initial supposition was revealed astounded me. As is represented in Figure 8.1, the messy overlaps and complex and multiple positionings of individual participants within the debate and between production and protection ideologies challenged assumptions of polarisation. In this way the research findings highlighted:

- the complex multiple-subjectivities that exist within individual ‘knowledge spaces’, attitudes towards nature and other high country stakeholders, and how these micro-level complexities often challenged typified ‘norms’ of attitude for a particular social group; and,

- how individual participants held multiple and complex relationships with the land, and these relationships are evolving with the intervention of tenure review, and are complex, contested and fluid across time and within space.

It was clear that tenure arrangements, legislative change and economic imperatives guided by capitalistic logics influence the transformation of social spaces, and complex but often superficial discourse circulates within this macro-level space. However, people belong to and engage with environments in diverse ways that inform attitudes towards nature and ‘their place within it’, as a contextualised micro-level discourse.
Figure 8.1: The interplay between micro and macro levels of spatial co-production associated with localised analysis of tenure review.
What analysis illustrated in terms of broader learnings from the study is that the logic of tenure review and consequently, prevalent attitudes in the national and regional media, political lobbyist coverage and some legal and academic critiques, reflect unnuanced understandings of nature-society relationships. These interpretations are too simplistic to show peoples’ complex engagements with local environments. As a result, a polarising macro-level discourse constructs the debate over tenure review in binarised terms that provides a backdrop for unbalanced representations and social conflict. Making distinct the macro and micro levels of the debate has provided alternative critical lenses offering different vantages points from which to commentate on the inner workings of tenure review. The integration of these lenses has delivered a more comprehensive picture of the pressures and complexities influencing high country landscape change. Clearly, tenure review represents the rupture between contesting spatial orders and inherently political social logic systems.

**Dual emergence and ruptured landscape politics**

Spatial politics in the high country show a legacy of colonial productivism, which over-time has evolved and moulded space into a utilitarian but valued cultural landscape. However, the establishment of Tongariro National Park in 1886, and later, when Premier Richard Seddon began steering the Scenery Preservation Bill through Parliament in 1903, a different frame of national imaginary regarding landscapes and nature was introduced. An ideology of protecting “nature for nature’s sake” (Schwarz, 2014: 32), but also for the enjoyment of nature by people became an ideology deeply embedded in cultural politics, which challenged the colonial productivist orthodoxy of land as a functional resource base for agrarian nation building (Wallace, 2014; McAloon, 2013; 2011; Moon, 2013; Brooking and Pawson, 2010; Ginn, 2008, McGlone, 2000). The early legacy of protectionism has similarly evolved and been manipulated into various iterations of environmentalism, which have negotiated relative space within New Zealand’s macro-level politics.

The high country became the centrepiece of the most recent episode of national park creation as part of this social-political trajectory. As is illustrated in Figure 8.2, tenure review, which has variably been celebrated for enabling the extrinsic protection of ecological values, but also criticised for flawed logic, represents a rupture that has forced people to come to terms with:
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1) their positions within the debate, based on complex inter-subjectivities and differently embodied relationships with space, as was examined in detail in Chapter 5; and,

2) how structural changes are impacting on highly valued cultural landscapes in complex localised ways, many examples of which were presented and analysed in Chapter 6.

In this way, the dual timeline represented below (Figure 8.2), illustrates the evolving productivist and protectionist trajectories. Key events, such as amenity valuation and the exclusion of lakeside property from tenure review, discussed previously in the thesis, are positioned to show contestation and the re-setting of directions over several decades after the rupture that followed the inception of tenure review in 1991.

The transformative stance developed within this chapter comes through clearly in Figure 8.2, which recognises the constructionist ideology that space and society are always under processes of change, being made, broken down and remade in constant dialectic. Bourdieu identifies similar characteristics associated with the change and perpetuation of the specific habitus of a social group within time.

The schematic provided in Figure 8.2 depicts the simplified dynamic of productivist and protectionist orders re-establishing doxa following clash stimulated by tenure review as a polarising mechanism of conservation accumulation and freehold land disposal. Scenarios A and B identify two simplistic potential trajectories for the future emergence of ‘the field’ following rupture. These two scenarios emerge from theoretical engagement with the potential of approaching landscape management from the position of good will, as an agonistic or negotiatory politics that encourages a more facilitative approach to local conservation (examined in section 8.2.); or in a way that maintains a status quo of contest and antagonism with protection and production interests maintaining divergent trajectories on alienated landholdings. Re-equilibration as divergent trajectories, however, suggests defensiveness of land title. The affirmation of distinction and the defense of boundaries between conservation and farming territory represents an assertion of power. Following tenure review a binary logic is erected between mutually exclusive land categories (Blomley, 2010; Strack, 2011), leading to the assertion of difference between social fields and the social conflict that ensues as alternative orders of habitus compete for symbolic hegemony, which is where Chapter 7 concluded.
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Figure 8.2: The impact of opposition, from dual emergence to clash and then re-equilibration as divergent trajectories and separated orders.
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The dynamic evident in contest over high country space suggests that neither protectionist nor productivist visions exercise sufficient symbolic capital to secure hegemony and establish doxic conditions in which all other orders are repressed. As similarly matched orders, imbued with symbolic capital and backed by politically supportive networks, neither has sufficient power to overhaul or more firmly entrench the pre-existing productivist order, which underpins social-political rupture. Instead of replacing the definitions of the productivist order, the spatial territory of ‘farmland’ has been modified with the transfer and accumulation of land for Crown conservation purposes. Consequently, attitudes towards ‘othered’ interests within the case study revealed deeper undertones of defensiveness and resistance, even though environmental protection in various forms was a shared aspiration between communities within interpersonal discourses.

The summary above re-engages with how the debates were laid out in the thesis, and inspires me to question how we can think differently about tenure review and the conservation orthodoxy in New Zealand, which continues to often inscribe various manifestations of separation logic. A constructed partition between conservation and production has the distinct potential of alienating the local community, and was a root cause behind why landholders were frequently wary and resistant to support ‘DOC conservation on DOC land’. There is significant symbolic capital associated with the politicised position that ecological conservation and providing public access is the responsibility of DOC, with some involvement of other NGO’s, as an extrinsic land use. However, under this social framing, conservation becomes relegated as an external job undertaken by people with the particular social identity of ‘conservationists’, who undertake the protection of nature separate from those living and working in high country spaces. This is a relatively entrenched social-political logic when it has come to interrogating how conservation / tenure review has operated in the high country in a way that is alienating people from landscapes that have long been social ecologies. In particular, it is a problematic ideology when attempting to foster more holistic, integrated and sensitive approaches to managing land use across landscapes that are comprised of diverse, competing and changing values. Consequently, this foundation of critique

---

170 This is a position that reiterates the ethical issues with the nature culture dichotomy interrogated by scholars including Cronon, (1995, 2002), White, (1995), Demeritt (2001) and Castree (2001) with particular interest in urban-rural distance and the veneration of pre-human natures and wilderness.

171 Such a narrow binary logic constrains the potential of spatial becoming. For example, looking at multiuse or economic use of the conservation estate is impossible when this puritan, divisive conservation logic remains.
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presents potentials in terms of practical politics and the way conservation is thought of in New Zealand. In this regard, the chapter now turns to question how the current and coming phases of social-spatial emergence can be influenced (Braun, 2006a). As important aspects of reflection on key learnings from this study, conservation policy and planning approaches require tools that:

- enable integrated approaches to land management, in ways that acknowledge varied resource needs and valuations and incorporate pluralism in creative ways, as opposed to separation, which can alienate people associated with defensive land rights.
- encourage existing populations to live within ecologically significant spaces sensitively, by directing strategies that do not alienate people from engaging in the management of environments surrounding their home spaces.

Therefore, whilst diverse understandings of nature and landscape exist and contest within local spaces, a pluralist approach seeks to engage with and adjudicate between multiple views. Bourdieusian thinking is applied in the remainder of this chapter as a tool for suggesting how habitus may change ‘positively’ when opened up to other ways of knowing high country nature and space, if the potentials associated with engaging epistemological pluralism are acted on.

8.2 An alternative approach

Concluding on the State’s potential in landscape governance

Conservation and biodiversity protection requires constraint on resource users. It is argued by authors like Robinson (2011), Ambus and Hoburg 2011, Bakker (2010), Robbins (2008), that there are two approaches to achieving this; that is through regulative or behavioural constraint. On the one hand, regulative constraint relies on State administration and laws, which are nested within local institutions. On the other hand, behavioural constraint focuses on inspiring human agency – local people, institutions, cultural practices and attitudes that influence and guide behaviour (Jay, 2007; Falconer, 2000). Acknowledging the linkages between macro and micro levels of resource regulation illustrates that the State plays a marked role in how politics unfold locally. Therefore, the State can also play a significant role in how local productive and conservation practices may transform in the future, to become more mutually supportive or continue to be factious and conflict inducing (Morris, 2009). It is noted by Robbins (2008) that social control and motivation towards particular objectives tends to occur through striking balance between externally imposed, regulative controls and behavioural constraints. As identified in Chapter 6, many
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participants believed when making arguments in support of lessee custodianship that behavioural constraint was intrinsic to the pastoral lease farming model (the pastoral lease being the regulative control), which implies balance sought between State regulative and behavioural functions. This argument suggests that the State’s regulative institutions, when in synchrony with local aspirations provide social signals that influence individual agency, values and attitudes (Robinson, 2011; Wilhusen, 2010; Burton and Paragahawewa, 2011). Such critique aligns intricately with Bourdieu’s (1998) criticism of the neoliberal State, and also critique of current governance of ‘neoliberal natures’ globally within the scholarship of Harvey (2005; 2003; 2001; 2000; 1986), Bakker and Bridge (2008), Castree, (2008a; 2008b) and earlier work by Castree (2001) and Braun and Wainwright (2001).

In a Bourdieusian frame, the State exerts influence on the formation and durability of social dispositions – ‘the habitus’ – through which constraints and disciplines are imposed. It is therefore considered that in tenure review, the State held the capacity of monopoly over social control, imposing structuring on practices, forms of thought and social attitudes, perception and the classification of social space and landscapes. As the authority regulating practice under the pastoral lease, the State arguably maintained the capacity to encourage collaborative politics and shared attitudes towards custodial ownership. Within tenure review however, such ideas were undercut by hegemonic neoliberal tenets of privatisation and removing State administration (Harvey, 2005; Robbins, 2008). As a result, social space is increasingly carved up (see: Chapter 6 and McFarlane, 2011); where previously the habitus of production and relations with the landscape was oriented on sharing a vision with the government, which was legitimised under the lease system and through collaboration with Crown Lands Advisors. Relaxing discipline with liberalisation has allowed social groups, driven by different market and non-market logics and alternative schemes of values, to re-negotiate the order of compartmentalised spaces based of alienated land rights. Evidently, the State has actively removed itself as the ‘referee’ between forces of laissez faire capitalism, as was argued in Chapter 7.

A flow of mixed messages and support that reflect the ambitions of differently situated but politically powerful social groups, were drawn upon in order to legitimise division with tenure review. This suggests a dynamic of fragmentation characteristic of ‘the neoliberal project’, destabilising established social and spatial orthodoxies to allow for the expansion of privatisation and capital accumulation (Bakker, 2010; Robbins, 2008; Bakker and Bridge, 2008; Castree, 2009; 2008a; 2008b; McCarthy, 2006; Harvey, 2005). It is
suggested by Bourdieu (1998) and others who apply his thinking (including, Haggerty, Campbell and Morris, 2009; Wilhusen, 2010; Rosin, 2012; Burton and Wilson, 2006; Sobels, Curtis and Lockie, 2001), that such fragmentation of social unity often allows the reestablishment of previous economic hegemonies and the surreptitious advance of individualism under the neoliberal order. In the case of tenure review, this manifested as land privatisation, which several landholders perceived the farming community to have been maligned over in Dr Brower’s (2006a; 2006b; 2008) critique.

What acknowledging the dynamic of constant justification between orders (above and in chapter 7) achieves is to provide an alternative understanding to conventional readings of tenure review. Authors like Brower (2006a; 2006b; 2008), Quigley (2008) and Round (2009) amongst others, have focused on justifications for and against political-economic inequities stemming from tenure review. In particular, these authors highlight aspects of legal rights and intricate links with social and political-economic powers under an agrarian order. Similarly, Blomley (2010) acknowledges that litigation and the law often operates in a way that re-equilibrates a status quo of political-economic hegemony, as one particular dimension indicated in Figure 8.2. In so doing, discourse like the contest between Brower (2008) and Quigley (2008), tends to focus on justifying the dual sides of a clash between farmer and conservation gains from tenure review on the basis of points of law and orthodox economic considerations. This sustains defensiveness between social and political factions, but the dichotomy between nature and society, as the fundamental philosophical grounding to tenure review, remains under thought and assumed common sense.

8.2.1 The State’s Encouragement of a Less Divided Politics

Reflecting on the consequences of tenure review has sought to re-evaluate the reliance that is placed on boundaries in conservation policy (aligned with the work of Bryan (2012) and Adams (2004)). Tenure review erected boundaries that has directed the protection of hybrid nature in a particular way and according to a specific logic. As the high country is a

---

172 My argument here relates to deducing the similar conclusions of various other Bourdieusian scholars (including: Burton and Paragahawewa (2011); Burton, Kuczera and Schwarz (2008) Rosin (2012; 2008)) who emphasise from their case studies the perpetuation habitus under various structural conditions and the reconstitution of a pre-existing doxa of order and power relations following rupture. However, authors like Morris (2009), Haggerty, Campbell and Morris (2009), and Sobels, Curtis, and Lockie (2001) emphasise the potential for habitus to change in some situations.

173 This dichotomy was challenged in Chapter 5 by examining the complexity of values and the relational contingency of social experiences and attitudes, and was taken further in Chapter 6 and 7 to understand how tenure review unfolded in a way that advanced the modernist separation between nature and society.

space that comprises a number of outstanding landscapes and varied overlays of cultural values, the division approach which prioritised a narrow field of values set in motion a contest that has expanded to a protracted duration of nearly three decades. However, as mentioned in Chapter 3, the conservation paradigm has begun to shift to adopt more collaborative ‘humans in ecosystems’ approaches to conservation. This ongoing shift recognises that most contemporary natures are ‘hybrid’ – or humanised, novel ecosystems – and should be managed in creative and inclusive ways accordingly (Folke, 2006; Gallopín, 2006; Dietz, Ostrom and Stern, 2003; Meurk et al., 2002; Berkes, Colding and Folke, 2000; Berkes and Folke, 1994). Regardless of neoliberal rhetoric assuming the State’s ‘withdrawal’ from the administration of some but not all pastoral leases with tenure review, the Crown remains an integral part of the boundary-spanning policy process in the high country. As the ‘actor’ with the most power/influence on facilitating relations between social institutions (Robbins, 2008; Woods, 2004), if the State and macro-political context operates in a contradictory manner, social processes occurring locally will likely continue to be conflicting.

The State operates as the ultimate decision maker as the “central bank of symbolic capital” (Bourdieu, 1994: 12), and therefore, retains significant influence on social practices normalised as common-sense within particular spaces. As many pastoral leases have not been volunteered for and completed tenure review, the State continues to hold influence on the justified dispositions of thought and practice within high country space, and therefore the potential to influence habitus collaboratively or divisively. Herein lies the political challenge associated with building capacity, with the State affecting governance processes and demonstrating leadership within landscape management. As the pastoral lease retained a centralised mechanism of control, custodial outcomes may have been achieved more easily under the pastoral lease legislation. However, policy cannot be retrofitted to the moving process of landscape construction. The debate becomes a matter of questioning ‘where to from here?’ establishing a political platform where negotiation rather than alienation, occurs.

The Current Political Impetus

Recent political rhetoric has referred to a “new era” of collaborative conservation management in the high country, associated with public critique of tenure review (Rae, 2014: np; Morrison, 2013) (see Chapter 3). Farmer participants interviewed were generally appeased by the Department of Conservation’s increasing willingness to involve the wider
community in its decisions and work. This political shift culminated from the previous Director General of DOC, Alastair Morrison revealing a restructuring of DOC in March 2013, focused on establishing local and corporate partnerships. The release of the conservation strategy under the National Government disclosed an emphasis on DOC’s focus becoming more conciliatory towards landholders. However, this vow of partnership and the decentralisation of conservation came with the announcement that 140 DOC employees would be made redundant; with Morrison stating in the Dominion Post that “DOC must adapt if it is going to meet the conservation challenges that New Zealand faces” (Morrison, 2013: np). He claimed that the new structure would retain DOC’s conservation delivery work of scientific monitoring, biodiversity conservation and managing visitor assets centrally, but sets the Department up to work more effectively with external partners. To him, the creation of the Conservation Partnerships Group prioritises working with community groups, iwi, local authorities and private landowners and external businesses to attract more resources for conservation. However, to date the new approach has led to public volunteers becoming a conservation workforce, supporting DOC as an increasingly constrained, but still State-centric agency (Benny, 2016: n.p.; Littlewood, 2013: 3). As well as this, big businesses like the dairy company Fonterra and electricity producers Contact Energy and Meridian Energy have become more prominent in assisting conservation projects financially. However, in some media articles and institutional discourse, conservation advocates understood such neoliberal conservation approaches as ‘corporate green wash’ and unethical offsetting (see Rudman, 2014; Taranaki Daily News, 2013).

As tenure review has firmed boundaries between Crown conservation land and freehold farmland, talk of integration and partnership suggests rhetorical gloss over a more divided, neoliberal landscape. Following tenure review, with the Crown’s evident interests in removing itself from lease administration, the stability of political commitment for forging partnerships is questioned. The form the espoused ‘collaborative approach’ will take amounts to conjecture, especially when tenure review has operated as apartheid between protective and productive land uses. Furthermore, because restructuring has resulted in redundancy of important people connecting DOC with the local landholder

---

174 Focused on ecosystem and habitat protection as an offset for damage upon other habitats associated with windfarm for development or water decline from dairy development, Project River Recovery in the Upper Waitaki catchment; Contact Energy backing of the Rangitata Gorge River and Land Care Group; and the ‘Living Water’ partnership between DOC and Fonterra, illustrate recent neoliberal conservation objectives.
community (associated with Ō Tū Wharekai for example), capacity for facilitating relationships and effective DOC initiatives is undermined.

Rhetoric of building partnership between stakeholders has remained prominent. For example, in the Management Objectives for Ō Tū Wharekai (Sullivan, 2009), leaseholders are explained as being the primary stakeholders within the Ashburton Basin. However, with tenure review, this report recognised that building partnerships with neighbours and obtaining conservation outcomes on private land is ever more difficult. Furthermore, sentiments around ‘partnership’ extended into Federated Farmer’s High Country conferences in 2013 and 2014. The concept was prominent in the agenda, encouraging the theme of ‘neighbourliness’ between individuals, groups and outside organisations. Beyond rhetoric, forging ahead with collaborative approaches to conservation requires capacity being built up within local communities (Woodhouse, 2006; Larie and Hibbard, 2008; Selfa and Endter-Wada, 2008); whereas tenure review has operated as a mechanism that on the most part has broken connections down and in so doing has alienated communities, whom initially shared some goals and values. This suggests a dynamic of centripetal pull of conservation values into the control of an increasingly resource constrained, but State centralised Department of Conservation. However, on freehold land released from tenure review, management control is relinquished centrifugally from the State’s oversight to the control of regional and local council bodies and the RMA planning framework that assessing the effects of developments on an individual project basis. Subsequently, the function of broader integration across the region that the pastoral lease tenure provided is removed. As a result, I consider that New Zealand’s conservation governance, much of which remains couched in a modernist ideology advocating the separation of ‘nature’ from ‘society’, needs rethinking.

Throughout this study it has been challenging to reconcile competing ideologies within macro-level governance structures. For example, the Resource Management Act (1991) seeks to encourage an ethos of sustainable management in the control of adverse effects on the environment (Norton and Millar, 2000; Wallace, 2014). This aligns with the

---

175 The ‘partnership’ concept has been introduced. However, in cases it has been construed in a way that seeks to encourage outside organisations and individuals to support DoC in “[the organisation]s more important conservation projects” (Vice Chairman of Federated Farmers, Simon Williamson, 2014). The focus on high profile conservation involvement may distract from more significant issues of needing to focus on better and less alienating and divisive practices across all land uses (Adams, 2004; Bryan, 2012).

176 Analogous with other studies, but in particular Bryan (2012).
current political impetus of the National led government to encourage conservation partnerships. However, the Crown Pastoral Land Act (1998) is more aligned with the Conservation Act (1987) and Reserves Act (1977), which as a result support separation between protection and production values. Inconsistencies and structural contradictions at different levels of policy administration are identified. In turn reorienting conservation thinking locally will require a change in the identity of DOC, and also ‘conservation’ at a higher perceptual level, currently understood as a centralised responsibility. Tenure review was implemented as a divisive imposition and became a catalyst to resistance and contest (identified in the data analysed in Chapter 7, and discussed above), which undermines biodiversity conservation outcomes at a landscape scale and on private landholdings (Walker, Price and Rutledge, 2005; Walker, Price and Stephens, 2008; Walker et al., 2009; Norton and Millar, 2000). Consequently, along with other authors from various vantage points, I have become highly critical of the wisdom of tenure review and the weaknesses of such a separatist approach with achieving sustainability outcomes (see Chapter 6 and 7).

The State continues to hold an important function in high country conservation politics. However, the analysis of the macro-level tensions exemplifies issues with how tenure review and the current paradigm of thinking in high country conservation, focused on establishing conservation partnerships, pull in contradictory directions. For this reason, the remainder of the chapter focuses on sketching an outline to a potential way forward, as an approach that is adaptive and embraces the pluralism of values and epistemology that exists within local spaces.

8.2.2 Advancing a pluralist framework

The fundamental intervention from the pluralist stance is that there is no singular way of knowing nature, or conceiving of social spaces like the high country (Robinson, 2011; Braun, 2004). Instead, an alternative understanding is implanted, where space and nature are always multiple, unstable and accepted as always under processes of relational becoming (Foster, 2010; Ingold, 2009; Wood, 2008; Massey, 2005; 1999). Therefore, social and political conflict over a perceived ontological stasis of the high country landscape is politically moribund, because it is a constantly fluid, hybrid space and cannot be kept stable.

Closure and the defence of perceived static versions of nature equate to the assertion of power relating to how people affiliated with a particular social order seek to defend or assert hegemony within social space (Bourdieu, 2001; 1979). There are always
outsiders and alternative claims marginalised in the defence and advocacy of a particular stability or closure of space and the assertion of a singular, partial vision as hegemonic. So while I have focused on ‘farm production’ and ‘ecological protection’ as the values and social aspirations prioritised most explicitly in tenure review, the assumptions behind this research approach have to some extent left out the voices of sub-alternate ‘others’ overlooked within the tenure review process. For example, I acknowledged in Chapter 2 that Māori valuations and claims have not been engaged with deeply within the current project, for I did not see myself able to provide adequate nuance. Likewise, it is beyond the scope of the current project to account for meanings and values of future generations. Each of these insights suggests that potentially creative, adaptive and more integrated visions for spatial becoming may be offered in the future. However, closing down the tenure review process to an overly narrowed policy dichotomy failed to acknowledge the wisdom of other viewpoints. So while Māori were included in the process, outcomes for iwi were limited, and due to the binary approach, policy makers failed to engage with the worldview of Tangata Whenua and the principle of Ki Uta Ki Tai (from Mountains to Sea landscape ideology), which emphasised holistic ideas of custodianship and the maintenance of cultural connections at a wider spatial scale. Similarly, amenity claims, hunting and fishing, cultural heritage and historical values were under recognised by the process, and the silent claim of non-humans whose locations did not conform to boundaries’ imposed by humans, between farm and conservation land, are unrecognised. The ethics of allowing values on production land to be ‘written off’ to freehold development is brought into question. Under tenure review, the establishment of parks and species preservation exemplifies an over simplistic cost benefit analysis, and maintaining an integrated approach could have provided for more sensitive conservation management on freehold land (Hinchliffe and Whatmore, 2006; Bryan, 2012). Providing critique has begun to open the field to other voices marginalised by tenure review, which by promoting dual objectives has with time stabilised a ‘split spatial hegemony’ (see Figure 8.2); rather than acknowledging the complexity of the terrain and negotiating sensitively with a firmer strategy.

Acknowledging pluralism recognises that conservation ‘processes’ are always a fluid negotiation between diverse interests. I emphasise the term process, for it accentuates inclusivity, where the notion of ‘solution’ tends to justify singular and technocratic, top-down approaches (Lorimer, 2012). The closure or defence of an ontological stasis, or an ‘objective knowability’ of nature represents the assertion of power over hybrid spaces. In
contrast, the position of ontological and epistemological pluralism brings to the fore questioning settled forms of ecological governance grounded upon ecological science and objective facts about nature’s realness and stability. This aligns with current thinking in dynamic systems ecology and novel ecosystems approaches that emphasise the ways in which ecosystems are always under flux and processes of hybridisation. However, this is not to assert a relativism that undermines the value of protecting indigenous and endemic forms of biodiversity, which is a core goal of national conservation objectives.

The openness of direction implied by pluralism does however destabilise power relations between ‘experts’ and ‘local’ claims. Singular solutions and the erection of boundaries lead to contest, which conflicts with the broader mantel for seeking to negotiate socially, politically, economically justified and feasible conservation processes that are also ecologically sound (Brechin et al., 2002). Arguments for such holistic approaches (including social, economic, environmental and political parameters) to the achievement of sustainable governance guides the work of various scholars (including, Pickerill, 2009; Kumar et al., 2013; Reed et al., 2009; Ojha, Cameron and Kumar, 2009). It is held that collaborative solutions are adaptive and more likely to be supported within a complex arena of plural claims if they meet parameters of the quadruple bottom line – balancing social equity with economic prosperity, defined parameters of ecological sustainability, and cultural viability (Scrimgeour and Iremonger, 2011; McCarthy, 2014; Robinson, 2011; Ahuriri-Driscoll et al., 2008; Brechin et al., 2002). However, positing pluralism and the openness of direction it entails lays down an unstable ontological platform for orthodox environmentalisms and advocacy, which is hard for many to accept.

The important political challenge that emerges is that no longer does a static pre-given nature exist as a reference on which to ground decision-making and the rejection of social praxis from ‘natural’ ecosystems. A pluralist politics, by acknowledging high country space as hybrid, refuses to rely on stable or familiar ontological foundations of ‘nature’ and ‘society’ as divided realms. Instead, each is always dialectical, political and open to change. However, as Bingham and Hinchliffe (2008: 83) assert:

[...] if not naturally, how else are we to form collectives, let alone collectives that have a better chance of survival? How do we carry on doing politics without [objective] nature to ground us or settle disputes? How can a democracy be built that at once refuses to kowtow to nature, but at the same time takes into account

177 The ‘quadruple bottomline’ concept is identified to offer a building block for more inclusive and sustainable management approaches, especially when integrated with Impact Assessment practices as an end outcome, for example in the creation of policy mechanisms within a pluralist context (see: Vanclay, 2004). The concept has frequently been applied within health sciences and as an indigenous health or cultural quality index (see: Scrimgeour and Iremonger, 2011; Ahuriri-Driscoll, et al., 2008).
the materialities, spatialities, and temporalities of an unruly and heterogeneous demographic of humans and nonhumans.

The instability and openness of the hybrid and pluralist position as a policy direction or political stance, is likely disconcerting for those who hold deeply their commitment to ‘saving’ fast degrading natures and halting biodiversity decline. It will be met by challenge from those whose worldviews have evolved within the modernist frame deep-seated in environmental thinking (Braun, 2004; 1998; Braun and Castree, 2000, Cronon, 1995; 1991; 1983).

Such assertions challenge settled power relations structured around the almost ubiquitous understanding in New Zealand conservation practice that nature should be separated, in order to be ‘saved’ from human impacts. As has been previously mentioned, saved is a representation that came through clearly in media and environmentalist discourse in Chapter 1, and also in participant discourse. When the process of spatial becoming is opened to plural claims, there exists no singular direction for the so called ‘saving of nature’, because nature is plural in form and there is no singular way of managing social ecosystems. Instead the politics of protecting ‘nature’ operate as a fluctuating negotiation between plural ontological and epistemological claims to the state and trajectory of social-space – as a continuous political and social process (Adams, 2004; Margules and Pressey, 2000). Therefore, social justice comes to the forefront, and in terms of ethics, decisions made now are understood to influence the next phase of landscape construction, as an evolving social-political process. It is noted that macro-level (State, legislative, structural and political) institutions will be the frameworks in which new relationships between protection and production develop as higher level synergies, as well as behaviours and attitudinal changes that constantly take place locally (Corson and MacDonald, 2012; Robinson, 2011; Knight, Cowling and Camp, 2006; Dietz, Ostrom and Stern, 2003; James and Klooster, 2002). However, environmental managers, conservationists, activists, policy makers and the public are required to accept and advocate from an unstable ground in order to begin a conversation, setting social conditions for learning rather than alienation.

What form might a pluralist politics take?
Adams (2004: 9) argues that, “social change lies in breaking down the compartmentalisation of [environmental] issues”. This also suggests avoiding the compartmentalisation of knowledge and values frameworks that construct production and protection interests oppositionally within macro-level discourses and representations of
high country space. While common ground was identified to exist locally, it is often overlooked by emphasis on oppositions (See Chapter 5 and 7). As Lurie and Hibbard (2008), Adams (2004) and Memon and Wilson (2007) contend, if policies are predefined and singular in both approach and foreseen outcomes, and if conservation is controlled centrally, there is no incentive to learn or for local communities to become involved.

The focus on finding a long-term adaptive approach to conservation is intended to negotiate agreements that communities view as legitimate, and therefore, involve processes and habitus more likely sustained in community knowledge and attitudinal systems (Lurie and Hibbard, 2008). However, this relies on establishing the socially constructed legitimacy of an intervention. In terms of definition, legitimacy is understood to be the most justified or appropriate values / conditions within a social field (Bourdieu, 2000; 1998; 1986). Consequently, the legitimacy of an intervention underlies actors buying into it, where Brechin et al., (2002: 46) argue: “focus should not be on voluntary versus forced compliance rather on fair enforcement of legitimate ... but social control”. To local interviewees in the preceding chapters, tenure review on many occasions was not perceived as a justified or legitimate way of managing high country interests. For example, several participants understood tenure review as a compensated eviction from their home-spaces and division was often viewed as unjustified where properties were socially and economically significant and not valued for ecological values alone. However, significant Crown remuneration and the promise of freehold rights eased the way for many lessees, therefore, enabling the expansion of conservation territory.

Potential benefits exist with investing in an opened political platform, encouraging local support for conservation objectives and to foster social learning and adaptive capacity. The position I take is that promoting constructive debate focused around adaptive co-management, compromise, knowledge and power sharing is more likely to achieve more socially justified conservation outcomes in the lived in and worked landscapes of the high country. This is exemplified by the opposition stimulated by tenure review based on actors feeling alienated from State-centred activities.178 Within the pluralist stance, politics over high country landscapes are open and more creative, getting beyond the politicised impasse stemming from the imposition of dualistic categories and interests constructed as opposing. The question therefore emerges as to whether systems of knowledge can be expanded and transform to influence social praxis? Or, can the

---

178 On the basis of conservation not achieving hegemony within high country space and therefore domination of the productivist order, as a constructed ‘other’ that is firmly in place and socially supported within the current constitution of high country social space.
knowledge spaces of conservation and farming be brought closer together, to negotiate a shared middle ground or strategic vision for high country space (see Scenario B: Figure 8.2), where tenure review has drawn dominant stakeholder groups apart?

From analysis in previous chapters, I suggest that focusing on maintaining and establishing strategic partnerships between the communities is a feasible and strategic way forward now that freehold tenure is allocated on many properties. Instead of perpetuating divisions between social agents and attaching them with broad generality to political affiliations and group identities a more nuanced approach is argued for and in Chapter 5 emphasis was placed on sensitively examining complex values and the spectrum of plural attitudes. Interrogating intersubjective experience could have been taken further and frameworks involving Social Network Analysis and Actor Network Theory could have been applied to understand agent interactions with other human and non-human actants. However, the core objective of the study was instead to examine structural issues impacting on local experience and provide an alternative political voice that used local experience to inform the macro-level policy context. Bourdieu’s structuralism has been applied to support this intervention, and network theory was considered not to fit well with this research approach.

Having critiqued structural issues with tenure review in depth, the rebuilding of localised politics in more convivial ways can now be developed, with regard to relations with the land and also in terms of respect for other interests and voices. This is where I suggest a network ontology could be applied by other scholars in future research, to further develop the key interventions made in the current thesis. In the following sections I reengage with the potential individuals hold as ‘brokers’ that can re-establish resilient network relations and dialogue within an increasingly fragmented governance framework. Reconnecting individuals and groups, the identities of which tenure review and the clash that ensued has stabilised associated with particularly static land and social categories, will hopefully expand and enrich dialogue. While such a political shift may be perceived by some as overly ideological, this study contributes by challenging the dualistic parameters of tenure review, stemming from neoliberal restructuring and highlighting issues within New Zealand’s conservation orthodoxy.

A collaborative way forward - individuals and knowledge change

The exciting aspect of accounting for pluralism in Chapter 5 and recognising that there exist many shared values and attitudes, but that also everyone has a different stance, is that
in place of defended sides emerges the possibility of a creative, inclusive political space (Bingham and Hinchliffe, 2008). The adaptive way forward, to get beyond the structural divisions erected by tenure review that I have critique with Bourdieu’s thinking, I suggest potentially exists in the connections between people locally. Expanding community capacity, building ecological knowledge and a shared ethos of respect towards nature and human others becomes the foremost focus. I suggest that the concepts and methodology derived from network ontology (for example, Social Network Analysis, Actor Network Theory) have potential for progressing collaborative management in future research contributions. This is especially the case now that critique in the current study has stripped back and highlighted the weaknesses of the normative conventions of tenure review.179

The complexities between two core-contributing fields of knowledge, habitus and political affiliation to this local network (being conservation and farming ‘land users’), have been examined qualitatively with a high degree of sensitivity. I argue that focusing on individual people locally and their sympathies to others offers the capacity to influence social control and knowledge change (Compton and Beeton, 2012). For example, scholars suggest the potential for focused circulation and interchange of knowledge, and also the creation of social capital, occurs initially between sympathetic actors and then gradually broadens to attitude changes within wider communities (Carlsson and Sandström, 2008; Bodin and Crona, 2009). In order to rebuild and improve connections between high country conservation and production groups network ontology could be applied in future research to expand the platform this research has laid by challenging the binary conventions of the current landscape management context. Importantly, the network ontology would add value because the notion of a network of complex and multifarious connections subverts the logic of bounding and the enclosure of nature and society as separated entities that binary ideologies impose. The stance of focusing on individuals emerged from participant analysis, both individually as composite knowledge spaces (see Chapter 4, Section 4.5.2 and Figure 4.2), and then showing the broader typologies of valuation in Chapter 5. Overall, the following discussion connects back with the analysis behind forming the spectrum of participants located between strongly productivist and protectionist values in Chapter 5 (Figure 5.4).

Some participants were identified as antagonistic and as people who reinforced alienation. However, occasionally these participants held key positions in terms of

179 Noting Bourdieu’s (2000) emphasis on ‘critique’ as a means to lay normalised conventions and commonsense open to criticism.
connecting with other ‘isolates’ within the network and other antagonists within groupings of actors.\textsuperscript{180} Several conservation employees for example, were begrudging towards the farming community, but a number of landholders also expressed inflexible attitudes towards conservation actors. They were antagonists within the communities, on the basis of holding uncompromising ecological or development focused views, and oppositional positions towards ‘others’. Antagonists like this are often the ‘noisy’ members of communities, offering politicised and simplistic rhetoric that gains attention but contributes to clash and polemic. Therefore, circumventing inflamed relations and focusing on common ground becomes increasingly important, where the majority of participants had more moderate and integrated views of local space.

A number of people within the communities were identified as brokers, whose multi-positioned and complex networks identified them as potential linkages between alienated communities. This recognition connects back to the analysis of individual knowledge spaces, which as Figure 8.3 identifies, reflect complex relational influences and diverse sources associated with micro-level and individual knowledge contributions.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure8.3.png}
\caption{A range of reflexive influences upon a broker’s worldview.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{180} Some participants were isolated, but through repetitive interactions with someone with whom they felt were sensitive to their claims, progress could be made.
Definitions differ between social network theorists, but connected individuals hold the potential to act as brokers (Newman, 2003; Bodin, Crona and Ernston 2006; Prell et al., 2009), or bridges (Bodin and Crona, 2009; Woodhouse, 2006; Lurie and Hibbard, 2008; Janssen et al., 2006), in terms of providing the function of conduits of knowledge transfer and offering the potential to broker integration within an increasingly disjointed network. Brokers exist as individual or organisational actors who carry many linkages to groups that would otherwise not be in contact with each other; an individual that embodies the bridging links of the community, holding a higher score of ‘betweeness’ (Bodin et al., 2005, see: Chapter 3). A ‘broker’ is someone who is influenced by multiple knowledge systems as is depicted in Figure 8.3, which are impressed upon them over a life course, establishing a broad ‘habitus’ and acting as a capacity to engage with and integrate plural views (Bourdieu, 2001; Bodin, Crona and Ernston 2006; Berkes and Folke, 1994; Burton and Wilson, 2006; Burton, 2004a). The diversity of connections is suggestive of a more complex worldview or ‘knowledge space’ and sensitivity to other interests within and beyond the study context. However, the network is never static. Connections (influences) are complex and always under a state of temporal and spatial flux.

I argue that tenure review, with the solidification of privatised control and insularisation of some attitudinal habitus, has eroded connections. This insight informed research objective 3, where breaking of connections and the compartmentalisation of knowledge cultures, reduced the capacity of collaborative processes (Adams, 2004; Tsouvalis, Watkins and Seymour, 2000); whereas, increased connectivity between actors within networks allow people to engage with the mind spaces of others, facilitating knowledge transformation.

Acknowledging the complexity of knowledge spaces supports the notion that policy and conservation interventions will more likely be supported locally if considered legitimate. As mentioned previously, effective co-management is facilitated by socially justified and feasible solutions, which more fundamentally are grounded on the construction of legitimacy, mutual reliance and trust among actors (Cashore, 2001; Backsträd, 2003; Marshall, 2007). A high degree of reinforced separation between groups undermines trust, whereas diversity and open/sympathetic connections are facilitative. Connectivity tends to enhance collaboration and therefore avoids conflict by reducing isolation and breaking down of social groups into resisting factions.

Coleman (1990), Carlsson and Sandström (2008) and Cumming et al., (2010) suggest that a diversity of connections to other groups and individuals opens up actors to
a large number of feedback opportunities from the social ecosystem and the varied knowledges of it. It is implicit that this diversity of actors with different knowledges, contributing to a broader, localised solutions will broaden the collective knowledge base and improve adaptive capacity (Folke et al., 2005). New knowledge and changing ecological, social and political conditions requires adaptive capacity and innovation to evolve (Gunderson, 1999; Walker et al., 2004). Therefore, integration of plural groups in dialogue is a more resilient system of governance, rooted in community knowledge structures and habitus.

While political will is important for facilitating collaborative management (related to regulative constraint), political cycles are short and volatile (Schneider et al., 2003; Robinson, 2011). Institutional change at organisational and policy levels exerts pressure both upwards, influencing ministers and government, and downwards, influencing practice. Conservation agencies can and do influence politics and politicians. They also clearly influence relationships with other parties, and grounded outcomes and localised politics. This suggests a dilemma, for under the current constitution of conservation as a State centralised activity, DOC is subject to political fluidity. For example, participants in Chapter 5 identified DOC as a political scapegoat where tenure review has alienated and broken down connections. However, it is well recognised in collaborative management scholarship from Western and developing contexts (including, Bryan, 2012; Brockington, 2004; Beedell and Rehman, 1999) that failure to integrate conservation with community aspirations in meaningful ways will lead to eventual failure to achieve ecologically sound and socially justified outcomes. For example, Borini-Feyerabend et al., (2002) argue that attempts at enduring environmental gains are derailed in the face of prolonged local opposition. This argument links back to analysis in Chapter 7, where the top down approach of tenure review established locally as a tussle for control that caused resistance. Therefore, my analysis suggests that under the current political paradigm, the optimal conservation process is for members of all stakeholder communities (conservation (DOC and Forest and Bird), production, public access, Māori, Fish and Game as but a few) to feel their claims are recognised and included in policy and practice. As a result, communities in the broadest sense are more likely to buy into objectives, which are therefore more resilient to macro level change and less likely faced with intense resistance.
Applications to a transformed landscape politics

Due to their structural positions within the social network, brokers hold multiple connections as people who are sympathetic and open towards the constructed ‘other’ within social space. Such an assertion relates to interpersonal connections and the complexity of actor ‘knowledge spaces’ which is expressed in Figure 8.3 above but draws from analysis in Chapter 5, (See: Figure 5.4 and Appendix 6a). The diversity of connections suggests the ability for the habitus of individuals to be influenced in reformist ways, which following Bourdieu, may normalise as others within the networks that comprise social groups and are influenced by alternative habitus’ towards and understandings of social space.\(^\text{181}\) However, this relies on the political space being opened up, rather than perpetuated in the defence of rigid dual oppositions. This supports Coleman’s (1990) notion that diverse but well-connected networks, when focused on a particular problem, foster buy-in and enhance collaborative social capital for resolution building.\(^\text{182}\)

Notably in the current study, some of the participants demonstrating traits of ‘brokers’ were involved in local river and land care groups and were often identified as holding broad connections to a range other organisations, situated in a network that extended beyond the local community (For example, Participant A and B in Appendix 6a).\(^\text{183}\) These broad connections often nourished extensive ‘knowledge spaces’ and the ability for the participant to engage with diverse viewpoints. In particular, the locally led land care groups that are currently operating within some regions of the high country were emphasised by various participants as holding important potential for forging closer relations and collaborative conservation within the current political context. These groups in the high country emerged from the grassroots as the re-creation of Rabbit and Land Management Boards, which were established in 1997 under highly political conditions, when successive governments rejected the introduction of calicivirus for rabbit control.\(^\text{184}\)

---

\(^\text{181}\) This reflects back on the capacity of regulative (land tenure, regulation and legislation) and behavioural and habitus based (dialogue and encouragement of different ways of thinking) constraint and influence on changing to social practice discussed in Chapter 3 (Bryan, 2012; Robbins, 2008).

\(^\text{182}\) In simple terms, theorists within social network analysis address that well connected networks are rich in collaborative social capital, towards solutions finding and the integration of social goals (Compton and Beeton, 2012; Memon and Wilson, 2007).

\(^\text{183}\) For example, Participant B (Fig. 5.4) – identified as a ‘broker’ – was involved with the Canterbury Water Management Strategy, a Landcare Group and is conservation-interested landholder. Many of the brokers operated within the small local groups and were in constant dialogue with the multiple agencies focused on managing the significant rivers in the case study (Rangitata, Rakaia, Waimakariri). Overall the approach suggests a shift towards a locally rooted conservation focus, which can be focused around network governance (van den Belt et al., 2013).

\(^\text{184}\) Rabbit calicivirus disease (RCD), also known as Rabbit haemorrhagic disease (RHD), is a highly infectious haemorrhagic disease that causes fatality in rabbits (Oryctolagus cuniculus) and was effective at controlling rabbit
Throughout the diverse high country regions, the effectiveness of land care groups is variable and some no longer exist. As mentioned previously, there are two groups that operate within the study region, the Rangitata Gorge Landcare Group and the Whitcombe (Rakaia River) Landcare Group, which are now briefly examined.

**The Rangitata Gorge and Whitcombe Landcare Groups**

The Rangitata Gorge Landcare Group formed in 1999 following on from the illegal release of rabbit calicivirus and the successful reduction in rabbit numbers throughout the region. There was less need for Rabbit Management Boards to remain active. However, at a meeting to discuss the future of the management board with other runholders and representatives from many government agencies, Rosemary Acland of Mt Peel Station proposed that the rabbit control focus the board previously held could be reformulated into a locally led river and land care initiative. The Whitcombe (Upper-Rakaia River) Landcare Group was formed after the Rangitata group’s establishment, however, in my discussions with participants it became clear that quite different political and management contexts have been determining varied outcomes for the two groups.

The strategy devised by the community landcare groups implores all stakeholders with interest in the river valleys, including landholders, DoC, LINZ, Fish and Game, Regional and District Councils and iwi to act together to address growing concerns about invasive woody pest species. The invasion of the riverbed ecosystems by woody weeds threatens the nesting habitats of rare and endemic species of bird, like wrybill and banded dotterel as specific examples, for which the open Canterbury braided rivers provide nationally and internationally important breeding grounds. Both groups are working to develop and co-ordinate catchment wide collaborative strategies to control broom and other woody weed species within the upper Rangitata and Rakaia River systems and adjacent landholdings.

In particular, the Rangitata Gorge group has become important with co-ordinating the multi-stakeholder approach taken to manage scotch broom (*Cytisus scoparius*) over an expansive area of the upper Rangitata River. Broom is suspected to have been introduced

---

numbers in the high country. In July 1997, after considering over 800 public submissions, the New Zealand Ministry of Health, supported by the Ministry of Agriculture decided against the release of RCD in New Zealand to control rabbit populations that were reaching plague proportions and destroying the viability of pastoral properties in the high country. However in late August 1997 it was confirmed that RCD had been deliberately introduced near Cromwell in Central Otago. Several farmers in the Mackenzie Basin area admitted to processing rabbits that had died from the disease in kitchen blenders to spread the virus, desperate to reduce pest numbers in the area.
on machinery used to construct the Pott’s River Bridge, becoming invasive throughout the 1990s. While broom is a focus species for the Whitcombe Landcare Group as well, management approaches employed by both groups have led to the better control of various other species such as: wilding pines; elderberry; willow; blackberry; sycamore; tree and lupins (Lupinus polyphyllus and Lupinus angustifolia) and cotoneaster, an invasive garden escapee that is readily spread by native pigeon (Kereru). Group members also meet regularly to discuss adjacent land management practices affecting the Rangitata and Rakaia River ecosystems and consequently have become important for community dialogue where land management structures have become increasingly broken up and individualised with tenure review. For example, monitoring vegetation change on blocks of land placed in DOC control or those freeholded following tenure review has become a focus for the Rangitata Landcare Strategy. As a community centred and supported group, existing and affirmed management boundaries between ‘DOC-land’ and ‘farmland’ are more easily subverted. The group also holds broader tasks such as assisting with recreation management issues like hunting and fishing access, Didymo control and to increasing public awareness of key concerns in the valley. Furthermore, both groups advocate for the conservation of both social/historic resources in the respective valleys.

The upper Rangitata community were proud of what the group has achieved with a relatively small number of people involved, whereas in the Rangitata there are approximately 10 landholder families involved. In the Rangitata Gorge the annual control season starts with the ex-lessee of Mesopotamia Station, Laurie Prouting, undertaking an aerial assessment by helicopter to identify key areas to target with pest control. Then through a combination of aerial and ground control the eradication project is carried out. Twice a year landholder families and volunteers put on backpack sprayers and strategically spray expansive areas of the riverbed for pest species. As part of this the group has been working hard to raise awareness of the threat to habitat that broom and other woody pests pose to the catchment ecology to get other catchment users, like tramping clubs, fisher people, four wheel-drivers and jet boaters involved with control. They have been doing this through informing clubs of upcoming ‘control days’ and promoting their work within the local media. Significantly, the initiative recognises that the river and its associated ecosystems are important to many people and the community are driven to keep pest numbers as low as possible. It also recognises that DOC are constrained and the labour intensive practical functions of conservation can be administered effectively through local channels in some contexts.
Speaking with various participants, the success of the Rangitata group was considered the result of good leadership by several key members, as a well organised community group that people wanted to be a part of because positive outcomes were clearly evident. The group have been working in a collaborative manner for now over 16 years and due to the longevity of the closely knit community connections the annual pest management programme has become another focus of community interaction. The successes of the group are widely recognised and often referred to as an exemplary example of good local conservation practice. In 2007 the group was awarded $30,000 in funding towards broom control on private land from the Biodiversity Condition Fund. Then, in 2010 the group were presented a Supreme Award from Weedbusters New Zealand for the collaborative active management approaches being undertaken.\textsuperscript{185} Then in 2012, Environment Canterbury announced that the protection of the internationally significant biodiversity within the two catchments would continue to be supported by the Regional Water Committee, with the Regional Immediate Steps Braided River Flagship Project providing $540,000 of funding over 5 years to further support the Landcare groups’ achievements (Scoop, 2012).

In brief reflection, the experience of some within the Whitcombe / Rakaia Gorge group was slightly different. Compared to the Rangitata Group, the Whitcombe Group is less established but increasingly functions and outcomes have been improving. While excellent outcomes have been achieved, administration of the group sat with a much more limited group of people, and one in particular who had taken the responsibility for driving the group as its chairperson. Participants all highlighted how the group’s activities involved tricky neighbourhood work, directing where limited public funding should be spent on weed control, and where some of the neighbouring landholders were understood as less supportive of the committee’s objectives. It was also noted that as DOC has become more resource constrained with restructuring, more and more responsibility has fallen on the local landcare group, who are voluntary and at times felt under-capacity and expected to do more with less.

Irrespective of the complexities between the two groups, landcare committees provide an effective way of achieving weed and pest control, ecological monitoring and grounding conservation objectives locally. Importantly, the groups encourage collaboration and knowledge sharing about conservation in a mutually beneficial way. The

\textsuperscript{185}Weedbusters is a nationwide weeds awareness and education programme that aims to protect New Zealand’s environment from increasing weed problems through local public action and collaborative partnerships, which presents an alternative approach to the conventional DOC orthodoxy.
collaborative strategy acknowledges that previously landholders, LINZ, DOC and the Regional and District Councils were all investing time and resources into independent work but that there was little co-ordination. The landcare groups place the onus on all stakeholders contributing equivalently with conservation priorities grounded locally. Institutions like DOC provide important contributions within the groups. For example, DOC provides technical knowledge and invests resources. However, ecosystem protection is constructed as a shared activity, which transforms the perceptive framework from conservation being a State administered activity on DOC managed ‘public land’ to a shared responsibility on ‘our land’. However, the emergence of these groups signifies clash between modernist ‘DOC-centric’ conservation and post-modernist models of conservation. The post-modern model emphasises localisation and integration, seeking to root knowledge sharing and connection between communities and conservation structures. This competes with the divisive logic embedded within the centralisation goals of fortress conservation approaches manifest in the Protected Natural Area Program and tenure review. Such insight links to the broader ethos that this study concludes with, emphasising conviviality towards human and non-human others and grounded on seeking integration and accepting complex meanings of social-natural hybridity.

8.3 A different political ethos – conviviality, integration and hybridity.

In the invigorated political space proposed by adopting a pluralist frame, effective governance and achieving just conservation outcomes suggests co-operation. Any proposed approach will be a fluid process on negotiation (Sladecek, 2010; Rummens, 2009; Van Bouwel, 2009), but should focus on social justice and recognition of equity within the high county around a shared ethos of conviviality towards non-human nature and human actants (Lorimer, 2012; Bryan, 2012; Whatmore, 2009; Hinchliffe and Whatmore, 2006). A space of openness and agonism emerges – rather than antagonistic clash in the quest for hegemony – requiring an overt power assertion that stimulates resistance locally (Bourdieu, 2000; Sladecek, 2010; Jones, 2014). This openness relies on the capacity to negotiate between plural claims, and signifies the responsibility to navigate between anti-science and biological conservation as a technocratic, science-based endeavour in its entirety (Berkes et al., 2002).

In light of issues with division between nature and society, the politics that eventuates should avoid ideology of purified preservation and begin to encourage sensitive relations with the high country as an inherently socialised hybrid ecology (Hobbs et al.,
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2009; Whatmore, 2002; Ingold, 1993). Integration and a holistic approach were notions reiterated by many participants (one example is Participant C in Appendix 6a, and this was a theme of discussion on hybridity within Chapter 5). I examined in Chapter 5 and 6, how the regional landscape is comprised as an integration of multiple layers of value as a pastiche that constitutes it as meaningful from various ideological vantage points. The parts contribute to the meaning of the whole; because the landscape is integrated. However, this integration of values is dynamic and will change as new forms of landscape meaning arise (Olwig, 2007).

Revisiting one study for comparison, in Chapter 3 I examined Bryan’s (2012) investigation into the Natura2000 approach to conservation across the European Union as a theoretical example. Bryan (2012) explained how landscape conservation strategy in Ireland had embraced a more flexible and integrated approach, acknowledging the paradigm shift towards humans-in-ecosystems approaches to conservation and a novel ecosystems or systems view emphasising the function, rather than pristine condition, of ecological communities. The systems view recognises that human-nature relations are no longer necessarily detrimental to biodiversity and at times are even acknowledged as an essential element to a landscape; especially those, like the high country, where a mode of production has established cultural significance. The approach recognises landscapes as under constant becoming and that society is deeply intertwined within nature, so therefore, a need exists to foster more socially just methods of ecosystem and biodiversity protection.

186 For example, reflecting momentarily on the landscape changes that have occurred historically in the Mackenzie Basin (or other landscapes), with the development of the hydropower from the 1950s onwards. Many of my generation and I, drive through that region and the major impacts are accepted, integrated within the landscape for the way it has always been. This suggests the adaptability of landscape perspectives. However, it is not to assert that intensive development is ‘ok’, but to suggest that these impacts need to be negotiated openly, and debate on aesthetics can be politically challenging.

187 As an aside, a systems view emphasises connectivity’s between organisms rather than linear, cause-effect thinking and mechanistic views that justified protecting ecologies as stable and valued components of an ecosystem in isolation. A systems approach is often termed non-equilibrium ecology – and understands ecosystems as under constant dynamic flux. The paradigm shift towards a systems view entails a move away from “the old command and control approach based on ‘linear cause-effect thinking’ and ‘mechanistic views of nature’ as ‘productive, predictable and controllable’” (Berkes, 2004: 622). The systems approach to ecology, often termed ‘non-equilibrium’ ecology, dismisses the notion of any natural equilibrium or ‘balance of nature’ (Kricher, 2009). Nature, from this perspective, is dynamic and highly variable (Drenthen et al., 2009; Adams, 2002). While Natura 2000 on one hand suggests a shift towards more integrated nature society relations in line with more functionalist thinking (i.e.: a shift towards “humans-in-ecosystems” and away from the ‘reserves’ philosophy), it is primarily informed by ‘a static approach to biodiversity protection’ (Ledoux et al., 2003: 258) based on a “no net loss” policy.

188 For example, where a production system has maintained contemporarily valued landscape integrity, regardless of a history of modification, as in the majority of European Landscapes. The analogies to the New Zealand high country are explicit, as a long humanised landscape, which has retained some intact ecological values. The pastoral lease has retained an integrated system based on what are perceived to be more sensitive practices compared to current transitions occurring.
(McAfee and Shapiro, 2010; Zimmerer, 2000; Braun, 2004). The focus on site management in collaboration with communities, rather than strict bounding and protection from humans signifies an important paradigm shift towards inclusivity in EU conservation policy (Bryan, 2000). In broad terms, the approach seeks to encourage local support and to foster social learning around conservation, as a means of establishing community custodianship and to encouraging sensitive, low intensity production models. In Chapter 6, I examined how under the pastoral lease an ethos of productivist custodianship, while contested, had established within the subjectivities of landholders as an integrated management strategy. Irish and EU policy is seeking to encourage the development of productive stewardship and seek strategies for protection of biodiversity across the landscape as an integrated whole. In New Zealand, however, tenure review has gone the opposite tact, erecting boundaries across a traditionally less bounded landscape, a space where social, economic and environmental dimensions have not been separated out under the traditional leasehold production system. Integration and expanse were key factors contributing to the cultural values for the landscape, examined in Chapter 5.

The influence of society on high country space is a constantly evolving, social, economic, political and in a broader sense, ‘ecological’ project. Politics progress forward along with spatial production, but emphasis can be upon equity and strategy. Removing society from high country space is impossible and ‘restorations’ that involve the removal of human history from spaces are a matter of social fabrication and relational meaning making (Wallace, 2014; Kruks, 2014; Ingold, 2011). The recognition that nature is plural and deeply imbricated with society forces major changes to prevailing conservation wisdom, that frequently relies on an illusion of the ability to return a preserved ‘natural stasis’ or condition of potential restoration once separated and enclosed in boundaries. Openness leaves a disconcerting political ground for defending ecology, whereas a fence represents security and peace of mind in knowing special ecosystems and natural values will be retained into the future. This is a valid concern in the face of changing farming models in low land ecologies (Weeks et al., 2013; Walker et al., 2006) and transforming habitus of relations, associated with the bounding and scaling intervention of tenure review. Therefore, the openness of a pluralist position need be supported by building capacity and legitimacy within local spaces.

189 While the paradigm in policy thinking is beginning to transform, Bryan (2012) outlined how in practice there remains a dependence on boundaries. She made explicit the tensions between modernist, boundary based approaches to conservation and post-modern, adaptive and collaborative approaches.
8.4 **Concluding remarks on a shared ‘ethos of conviviality’ for the high country**

The question therefore, is how to proceed politically, recognising pluralism and not yet again being “over-determined by nature” (Bingham and Hinchliffe, 2008: 83), as a static ‘ontological thing’ defended as the ultimate reference to what society is not (Anderson and McFarlane, 2011; Braun, 2007; Cronon, 2002; 1995; White, 2004; 1995). The useful concept of ‘conviviality’ emerges from recent inquiry into hybrid geographies, with more-than-human and assemblage thinking. Emphasis in this field of research is placed on the interactive co-production of nature and society and authors argue politically for the need to recognise non-human agency and forge relations between humans and non-humans based on respect (see: Lorimer, 2012; 2005; Braun, 2008; Anderson and McFarlane, 2011; Whatmore, 2002; 2006). However, the concept of conviviality is borrowed in the current study to emphasise the need to forge an ethic of more convivial relations between ‘other’ people and grouped interests.

Bingham and Hinchliffe (2008) borrow from the Dutch philosopher Annemarie Mol (2002) to offer a way toward the reconstruction of a more just high country landscape politics, when the present research has opened up tenure review logic to critique. They emphasise focusing on epistemology, or ways of knowing nature and space, as creative and emerging realities, rather than focusing on 'ontology' as stable structures, closed and politically defensive ideals of nature. Nature, as a particular ontological thing or stasis, normalised within the habitus of a particular group relates to an aspired for social hegemony, and therefore may be wielded as a weapon in political argumentation. This inherently connects with the assertion of symbolic violence towards other visions of high country space, facilitating contest from the multiple epistemologies that refuse to be marginalised, becoming a fundamental cause of conflict.

Transforming perception from ontology to epistemology, remodels the politic to ask the question of ‘what is right’, in terms of ways of knowing and interacting with other humans and non-humans that are intricately woven into complex social-nature assemblages. This is a negotiable framing that offers potential for agreement, compared to political justification of ‘what is real’. As Mol (2002) suggests, the first step in moving such questions forward is abandoning the edict that issues of approach and ‘what to do’ should be settled by what is ‘real’, natural or assumed common sense. Instead, an ethical approach

---

190 As mentioned in Chapter 3 such a politics has become an extension of geographical thought, following the early hybridity thinking of scholars like Haraway (1991) and later Whatmore (2002). Authors including Bingham and Hinchliffe (2008), Hinchliffe and Whatmore (2006), embracing ANT to embark on what they describe as a more-than-human geography.
should grasp “the painful nettle that reminds us ‘what to do’ always involves asking ‘what is good’” (Bingham and Hincliffe, 2008: 83). Therefore, moving forward suggests letting go of the illusion of hegemony, that one group’s partial vision for space is ‘better’ and therefore, should be prioritised over any other, and hence leading to conflict. What is good encompasses the social, the cultural, the economic and the ecological, providing potential for balance between interests with emphasis on establishing ‘good relations’; rather than the extraction of humans and social use from nature. In place of division there is an argument for integration, which returns the discussion in an iterative way back to Chapter 5, and the arguments from participants for the need for balance and the recognition of hybridity and integration of values in approaches to the managing the diverse cultural landscapes of the high country.

In summary, analysis within the thesis has identified the need to bridge a widened gap between productivist and protectionist visions. Tensions between social aspirations for ‘conservation’ and ‘production’ as opposing were clear in macro-level debates and conservation policies like tenure review perpetuates disunion (Norton and Miller, 2000). Dualistic tensions are holding back the ability to share and collaborate, tapping into resources and expanding knowledge already held locally by disengaging groups from one another. However, I consider that with focusing locally there exists a middle ground between the development and preservation focused visions (identified in Chapter 5). Notions of landholder custodianship in the high country were frequently espoused by participants, which could be reinstated as tool for bracketing argumentation. Renegotiating a shared ethos of custodianship, which although it is contested and under transformation following tenure review, is a symbolic concept that was shared between conservation and farming actors (see Chapter 6).191 In Bourdieu’s (1998: 34) words “myths obtain beliefs” – structuring attitudes and practices and shaping definitions of what is understood appropriate, in terms of human use of spaces and resolving social-ecological issues. The varied interpretations of custodianship were perceived problematic, for example, some conservationists rejected landholder custodianship, for productive emphasis was retained, rather than preserving the integrity of indigenous biodiversity and ecosystems. However, connecting from the theoretical framework into the analysis and this discussion, an over-

---

191 Although productivist in its emphasis, and by no means uniform (some landholders evidently upheld land husbandry responsibilities under the pastoral lease better than others), most participants agreed that there existed a level of ‘conservation interest’ and custodianship under the pastoral lease. Most participants (especially in retrospect of contemporary occurrence of intensive development) agreed that the pastoral lease instilled a level of custodial care. Even if unintentional or regulated by the lease tenure, it relied on a mode of shared and higher level, integrated land management.
emphasis on indigenous values and ‘naturalness’ may operate in cognitive frames of conservationists as a red herring. Ideologies advancing division of a landscape do so at the expense of more integrated approaches and allow inroads for neoliberal transformation with privatisation, separation between land holdings and alienation between social groups.

A contemporary ethos of ‘custodianship’, related to affirming historical ideals, remained influential within the subjectivities of many landholder participants. Therefore, I suggested in Chapter 6 that potentially, in order to tap into and empower local capacity, conservation policy could latch onto this resilient ‘myth’, bracketing political argumentation over the complexities of its definition and practice (Boltonski and Thevenot, 2006). Negotiating where common ground between actors over this concept and its practice exists and where it diverges provides the potential to exercise it as a tool for opening up a politics focused on knowledge expansion. This ethos offers a potential element for lessening the constant justification of difference between conservation and farming fields, as a concept that can potentially be negotiated as one of shared affiliation and aspiration, in terms of what it means to local communities. Re-engaging with and seeking to enhance this subjective, but once resilient notion of landholder custodianship attached to the pastoral lease, may allow the concept to be used as a tool in forging collaborative management objectives, as a generosity that allows shared interest in partnership. The precursor to doing so however, is challenging duality constructs, in order to engage this cultural myth while its memory is intact.

Encouraging generosity towards the custodial efforts of landholders’ (historical and contemporary) seeks to enhance connections, where it is noted that better-connected networks improve communication, favours collaboration and restraints opportunistic and individualistic behaviour (Coleman 1990; Burt 2000; Lin 2001; Lin, Cook and Burt, 2001). Individuals begin to share empathy and responsibility with others in social spaces. This is occurring within the two local land care groups reviewed above, which constrains non-altruistic behaviour as opposed to division and isolation from others, which intensifies it. Therefore, it is understood that “capacity and performance is improved with integration and connection” (Burt, 2000: 347, see also, Carlsson and Sandström, 2008). Integration between the groups corresponds to the capacity for facilitative collective action towards negotiating a shared direction, as a compromise based prioritisation of needs and aspirations held by plural social agents and groups (Provan and Milwards, 2001; 1995; Apart from a minority, especially several participants in younger generation of traditional landholders and those who had bought in recently at enormous expense and were seeking to make a productive return on investment (examined in Chapter 6).
This fosters within an institutional system the ability to make decisions and solve conflicts between different stakeholders adaptively and recognising multiple values and objectives in a politically agonistic and compromising manner (Jones, 2014; Sladecek, 2010; Van Bouwel, 2009; Rummens, 2008; Schaap, 2006; Hinchliffe and Whatmore, 2006; Mouffe, 2000; 1999). By way of concluding the analysis within this research, I consider that embracing the strengths of an existing claim to landholder custodianship may provide the root to reconstructing a less conflicted political future and more sustainable outcomes than the alienation created by tenure review. However, questioning ‘what is good’ (Mol, 2002) relies on acknowledging what is socially justified and feasible, not just ecologically pressing. An integrated trajectory begins by recognising custodianship that in many examples has been upheld within the temporally changing constructs and meaning for high country that have evolved since the institution of the Pastoral Land Act in 1948. Embarking on a gradual process of building capacity and improved net sustainability outcomes I argue relies on building good will, which with tenure review has been reduced and as is depicted in Figure 8.2, litigation has begun to stabilise an alienated doxa. The dialogue begins with a round of applause for landholders in order to encourage sensitive relations in the next phase of high country landscape emergence, in whatever form that might take, in a way that sees the State and its agencies working with not against local stakeholders, which was a challenge many participants put towards DOC as a centralised and powerful organisation.

---

193 It is acknowledged by Cumming et al., (2010) and Ojha, Cameron and Kumar (2009) that diversity within a group or network of groups and agents is desirable for adaptive management. However, diversity will underpin conflict if not channelled agonistically.
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9.0 Introduction

In this final chapter I bring together the theoretical threads that have extended through the thesis. I synthesise and draw further meaning from the key interventions made by the study and offer some broader conclusions.

In Section 9.1 I summarise the central argument drawn from the localised research approach; which in short, identified the complexity of values positions and intersubjective attitudes relative to macro-level politics and relations between production and protection orders in tenure review. To complete the central critique within this thesis, it is clear that those who accept orthodox conservation thinking and practice in New Zealand might consider that the tenure review of the high country pastoral leases has been an overall success in terms of conservation gains. This is reflected in much of the media coverage that has surrounded tenure review, which highlights prominent social attitudes associated with the benevolence of conservation outcomes arising from tenure review (Cope-Williams, 2013; McCrone, 2010; Taylor, 2005; Trigham, 2005; Broad, 2005, Cronshaw, 2004; Hutching 2004). After all, some commentators are fast to emphasise how a significant area of previously pastoral land has been “released from the outdated pastoral leases” (NZPA, 2004: n.p.) by the process, and ceded to the assumed public benevolence and technical expertise of DOC management control. Along with tenure review, the simultaneous action of various Nature Heritage Fund purchases has accumulated an expansive area of previously pastoral land for extrinsic conservation. In the minds of many people in New Zealand these outcomes might suggest the removal of precious landscape and ecological values from the exploitation and damage by high country pastoral farming practices. The novel contribution of this study, however, has challenged this orthodox interpretation. The findings trouble the idea of benefits from preservation by uncovering how “sanitising” (Todhunter, 2005: n.p.) or “cleansing” (Hutching, 2004: 11) of high country spaces and the “destruction of cultural heritage” (Rural News, 2005: 6), was alienating and became a deep root of conflict associated with the policy process. By presenting evidence from 84 participant interviews and applying several different theoretical lenses, I consider that firming boundaries between protection and production objectives with tenure review is largely inimical to net conservation benefits at a landscape
scale; and further, goes a significant way to undermining integration that characterised the pastoral lease model. Notably, this assertion aligns with the contributions of various other scholars; including, Walker, Brower and Stephens (2009), Walker, Price and Stephens (2008) and Walker et al., (2006).

The remainder of the chapter (Sections 9.1.1 and 9.1.2) unfolds by addressing each research objective in brief – drawing out the broader significance that each dimension entailed. The chapter is structured to reflect Figure 1.3 in Chapter 1, which makes explicit the rationale of the thesis; in which the tenure review debate was deconstructed in Chapters 5, 6 and 7. Chapter 8 offered suggestions regarding the adoption of a pluralist approach to ‘reconstruct’ a less alienating high country landscape and conservation politics, which is reengaged with to conclude the current chapter. This method of deconstructing and reconstructing is a core approach to how the issues within the thesis have been intellectually framed, and also inspired the manner in which I integrated different theoretical approaches to progress the discussion beyond polarised positions often evident in macro-level discourses.

9.1 The key learning’s from the localised analysis

In many cases, relationships between landholders, the State and other stakeholders have deteriorated in the high country. This is frequently depicted in grey literature that covers high country landscape issues (refer Appendix 1c). Landholders, whether operating on freehold land or continuing under the pastoral lease frequently discussed feeling antagonised and alienated from the imperatives of conservation – or at least ‘conservation’ as it is often constructed in normative discourses as a DOC/State controlled activity, separate from production activities. Instead of emphasis on integration and collaboration, DOC is reinforced as the preeminent interest vested in saving static ideals of ‘nature’ and focused on restoring indigenous ecosystems at as distance from society and worked spaces. At the same time, DOC as a centralised organisation is constantly exposed to the whim of national-level politics, undergoing frequent restructuring and increasingly resource constrained with core functions undercut under rhetoric of efficiency (Littlewood, 2013: 3). Evidently, the model of divide and control ecological protection is problematic and outdated in a social space such as the high country, which is why significant conflict has surrounded tenure review.

Notably, the ideology that conserved / preserved landscapes are valuable when beheld from a distance is deeply rooted in modernist ideology and foundations to the
Western-centric National Park Movement. As Wallace (2015: 205) asserts, such ideology guides ecological protection in New Zealand’s post-settler society, but relates to a “country-wide dogma from the earliest days of settlement, which has reduced land in New Zealand to spheres of production and conservation”. The result of erecting physical and psychological boundaries like this is a powerful force of othering, and in the high country, communities no longer maintain such personal intimacy with landscapes and environments, on which their ideology and livelihoods have long been rooted (Pawson and Brooking, 2013); or, at least those relationships with space are vastly transformed. What such a separatist ideology fails to recognise is the inherently complex and dynamic social character and various meaningful overlays that comprise high country spaces, such as those uncovered within the case study region central to this investigation.

While the preceding summary has addressed the core argument from the thesis, each dimension of the analytical chapters contributed to a detailed and contextualised understanding of issues with tenure review. As a coherent argument, the thesis developed by deconstructing issues with tenure review using various theoretical tools, and then identifying nodes for reconstructing a more equitable, less alienating landscape politics. Various authors have investigated tenure review and critiqued the outcomes of the policy approach. For example, as we saw, Brower (2006, 2008) offered a highly political assessment of tenure review, and interpreted issues with tenure review as being caused by capture of the process by a socially ascendant farming class. In essence, I consider that Brower’s class focused perspective assumes a singular idea of high country farmers as a homogenous autarchic class, and that each farmer or farming family held significant influence on the political process of tenure review and obtained similarly lucrative outcomes from the process. However, by analysing the localised high country case study central to this research, it has become clear that the attitudes and objectives of different high country farmers are much more diverse. Additionally, this analysis has shown that the political process and the relative power relations involved in tenure review were dynamic and changed attitudes and objectives over time. What I have also sought to emphasise is that while often framed on ideas of benevolence and broader social interest in public coverage and nationalist ideals, the conservation lobby is also a politically significant constituency. Therefore, tenure review manifested as a temporary resolution between the different ideals of different social groups, which underpinned the ideology of separation between competing land management ideologies and practices. Brower’s argument was also, to some extent, supported by detailed ecological assessment that highlighted issues
with landscape change stimulated by tenure review and scarce improvement with stopping biodiversity decline (Walker, Brower and Stephens, 2009; Walker, Price and Stephens, 2008; Walker et al., 2006). However, I argue that much of the previous critique is limited by providing only a small piece of whole puzzle, stopping short of challenging the philosophical foundations of tenure review as a policy approach and spatial reform resting on dichotomy thinking and separatist conservation logic.

I consider that political economy approaches, such as those on which Brower’s critique rested, can only take us so far because such a lens is poor in terms of addressing matters of identity and understanding the operation of alternative forms of power due to a predominant emphasis on economic power and capitalistic orders. Thus post-structuralist ideas and competing discourses are also important. We can see this with how complex notions of nature emerged in interviews and by how meanings of and relationships with space were being negotiated and rapidly changing, whereby participants were not driven by the dynamic flux capitalist transformation associated with economic logics alone. For this reason, the alternative epistemological lenses I applied to analyse and deconstruct issues with tenure review have provided a fuller understanding of the broader social, cultural and political context and ramifications from a policy intervention that sought a “simple split” (Wright, 2010: 2) between ecological protection and production values on adjacent land titles. In terms of mechanics, as is addressed in the following section, each research question contributed to the integration of theory and research data to provide an alternative reading of the tenure review issue, and empirically, the thesis has covered subject matter that has not been dealt with in the same way before.

9.1.1 Deconstruction Phase (Research Objectives One and Two)

Research Objective One:

‘What do concepts drawn from social constructionism, such as theory around ‘social space’, hybridity and the relational co-production of nature, add to the assessment of high country space?’

Overall, the analysis of relational and intersubjective complexities of values and attitudes held by individual participants inspired by Research Objective One highlighted how biodiversity conservation in the high country is a highly complex social and political practice. Tenure review involved allocating values and separating land use categories. However, the terrain this was imposed across is more than a physical landscape, as it is
space overlapped with social, economic and ecological values, as well as complex resource dependencies and intimate landscape associations. In this way, a conservation agenda such as this entails a constant process of negotiation and power relations, whereby, as Adams (2004: 3) explains “from converging trajectories of land use priorities for conservation and peoples’ needs, arises much potential for conflict”.

The ways that social agents negotiate complex positions within and between different networks, communities and discourses were analysed in Chapter 5. Relative positions are underpinned by multifarious values and situated inter-subjectivities, which develop through experiences that influence and create a complex and changing ‘knowledge space’ and interpersonal habitus (Seymour, Watkins and Tsouvalis, 2000). By way of appraising this initial dimension of the research approach, I consider that a key strength of engaging the critical value analysis was how it challenged pre-conceived / generalised assumptions of the positioning of individuals associated with particular interest groups. Allowing individual participants to vocalise their attitudes revealed the complexity of social context and values claims of local participants and identified the closeness and / or divergence of viewpoints for individuals situated in particular social categories as ‘conservationist’ or ‘farmer’. However, to reengage with the assertion made above, the variance in the views of individual farmers’ matters, as the complexity of attitudes and values disrupts understandings of class homogeneity and the extent to which their relative bargaining power as a class has reduced over time. The lobbying of organisations such as Federated Farmers in policy debates politicises the views of farmers as being focused purely on production. However, this was not the unanimous set of values, attitudes and praxis articulated within local context, and ideas of grouped habitus are complicated by the complexity and contradictions within individual reasoning and discourse.

In this sense, the first dimension to the study began to deconstruct issues associated with the dualism constructed between nature and society in tenure review, by drawing attention to relational / intersubjective responses that challenged this normative construct. In so doing, the a priori foundations were reset for understanding the complexities of tenure review, where previous critique had failed to challenge this dualism in sufficient depth. The logic of separating between nature and society remained accepted as common-sense, even though issues with the ideology were regularly apparent within media coverage, institutional and academic discourse. The findings from this critique provided a nuanced platform upon which the rest of the thesis developed: first, by applying the structural ideas of Bourdieu to untangle social spatial change and social-political unrest.
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stemming from tenure review; and finally by reengaging with social complexity and pluralism to illustrate potential for engaging with a different spatial politics194.

**Research Objective Two:**

‘What are the critical issues with relations between conservation and agriculture objectives in the local study context?’

Research Objective Two was employed specifically to examine tenure review as a structural transformation with localised outcomes. Bourdieu’s framework enabled a deep interrogation of the model of land reform as a divisive social-spatial practice, and analysis sought to shed light of three dimensions, as follows:

- Separation, scale and transforming productive habitus and relations with the land;
- Modified relations with boundaries between production and protection;
- State-society relations and concepts of power.

Examining the outcomes of separation with tenure review identified the complex influence the process has had on local social-spatial and economic relationships. It also speaks to the relationship between protectionist and productivist orders at a higher level of policy and social-political arrangement. As Wallace (2015) considers, as a settler society, New Zealand’s social psyche continues to operate from an embedded nature / culture dichotomy and exemplifies less mature concepts of landscape and associated management approaches than many international contexts. The analysis within this thesis has extended these considerations, highlighting how productivist and protectionist objectives are often generalised in a polarising macro-level discourse attached to assumed ideas of normal habitus for agricultural and conservation practice. However, as mentioned above, by focusing locally polarisation was identified as problematic, which underpins the clear need to: 1) better inform the national media and institutional discourse of complex relationships with land and social ‘others’ in the high country; and, 2) avoid conservation practices that

---

194 Importantly, this empirical approach aligned with the methodological principles of Pierre Bourdieu and Doreen Massey, who amongst other scholars, have consistently negotiated a niche between micro (agency) and macro (structural) level analytic within their respective thinking on social-spatial orderings and power relations.
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affirm static concepts of nature and advance the separation / externalisation of nature from society, alienating communities from integrated and collaborative management approaches.

At this juncture it seems important to consider how tenure review was administered by the State, under a dualistic edict that in 1991 satisfied the neoliberal privatisation of the regulated pastoral lease resource and modernist preservation ideology. As the second dimension to Research Objective Two, Chapter 7 focused on social resistance and defensiveness towards constructed ‘others’ within the local context. Bourdieu’s metaphors of the field, habitus and capital provided tools to: 1) examine the shifting power relations between productivist and protectionist orders; and 2) analyse how various participants’ perceived power to be articulated between these social orders within the tenure review process. By engaging with Bourdieu’s conceptualisation of the defence of difference, it is clear that during social struggle competing social groups seek to challenge the authority of each other to entrench a particular social-spatial order. In tenure review, the land asset and values attributed to it were struggled over and became the focus of social rift. A key finding from this study is that as tenure review involves separating and reallocating values, biodiversity was transformed into a liability, as landholders viewed biodiversity as a risk to being able to secure production and control land values.

Furthermore, as a logic derived from State policy, I consider that social resentment towards lessees clearly evident in the critique of some scholars, including Brower (2006a; 2006b; 2008) and in the public coverage of tenure review was somewhat unjustified. Lessees followed clear State incentives, moving into tenure review for economic benefit, both from reimbursement involved with surrendering conservation values to DOC control, and potential offered by obtaining freehold land for development and diversification. Such development potentials had long been sought by lessees, but were constrained by State regulation under the pastoral lease. However, the State does not exist autonomously from social forces - taking conservation away from farmers into the centralised responsibility of DOC while simultaneously enabling farmers to exploit previously dormant development potentials was a way of balancing the aspirations of different, powerful constituencies (i.e.: farming and green praxis) within high country space. However, the lack of foresight associated with this mechanism was how it would dramatically transform the cultural landscape and potentially undermine net conservation benefits.
In light of this fundamental issue, the final dimension of the thesis offered insights into reconstructing a transformed landscape politics. In uncomplicated terms, the approach proposed advanced on the analysis of individual subjectivities undertaken in Chapter 5. The pluralist framework acknowledges complex resource reliance and values that diverse groups hold for high country space, in a manner that seeks integrated management, rather than alienation based on recognising the evolving composite of values and resource dependencies that comprise high country space.

9.1.2 Reconstruction Phase (Research Objective 3)

**Research Objective Three:**

‘What is the ethical import and political potential of challenging duality constructs between nature and society in terms of building a platform to allow for the negotiation of plural spatial meanings and fostering social learning?’

By way or deciphering the broader meaning from the study and how Research Objective 3 worked within the thesis, it is clear that in New Zealand, as a post settler society, new versions of valued landscapes are constantly being created in conjunction with dominant social, political and orthodox ideological regimes. As Wallace (2015) asserts, new meanings are increasingly at odds with, and contest, traditional categories of landscapes and nature. This is why a dichotomous policy framework such as tenure review is so uninformed and limiting to creative potentials for future social-spatial emergence and innovative sustainability outcomes. In short, the approach relied on prioritising static, binary categories of nature protection and production, which in turn also rendered the identities and practices / habitus of participants within those normative groups static. However, these categories are constructed and are all under a constant state of flux.

In theoretical terms the thesis is not necessarily globally ground-breaking, for discussions on alienating and separatist conservation / preservation practice have long been ruminating within the international literature. For example, as Brown (2005: 1) emphasises in the IUCN context for developing countries,

Thinking on protected areas is undergoing a fundamental shift. Whereas protected areas were once planned against people, now it is recognised that they need to be planned with people, and often for and by them as well. Where once the emphasis was on setting places aside, we now look to develop linkages between strictly protected core areas and the areas around: economic links
which benefit local people, and physical links via ecological corridors to provide more space for species and natural processes.

Similar rhetoric is currently circulating in New Zealand’s political and conservation discourse, for example with the latest Government’s emphasis of forming conservation partnerships (see Chapter 8). However, tenure review and various other national conservation agendas continue to exemplify State centric approaches that set nature against people. Importantly, this does not mean that all existing conservation parks are ineffective or redundant. However, conceptualising the integration of social values with other dimensions of values does identify the need to develop more mature, less rudimentary and alienating mechanisms for managing indigenous biodiversity in social-ecologies like the high country and influences how various stakeholders are engaged with and respected. Thus, the final phase of the thesis (Chapter 8) focused on integrating collaborative management theory into the research to identify reconstructive potentials. In particular, the connections and relations between conservation and farming communities were reengaged with, in a way that highlights subverting higher level conflicts and accepts that landscapes are plural and hybrid.

Research Objective 3 re-engaged with the understanding that shifting perceptions, representations and expectations of what high country spaces should be and are used for, reflect the dynamism of:

- Fast paced capitalistic processes associated with an open, neoliberalised economy;
- Complex social beliefs attached to powerful social values systems and diverse social-cultural identities; and
- The involvement of national level politics and social power hegemonies in policy formulation and implementation in local landscape contexts.

These matters were each discussed in depth in chapters 5, 6 and 7, but were developed in Chapter 8 by highlighting that there is an alternative, more adaptive management approach, compared to the current status quo of separatism.

Analysis has identified that spatial politics invested in should be a supportive agonistic pluralism under which conservation values existing on properties are more likely to become assets in the mind spaces of landholders, rather than ignored due to the liability to production that they pose. In light of the findings within the present study, biodiversity
preservation methods can underpin alienation. Hence, encouraging integrated and community-focused management procedures that promote partnership will likely produce improved net conservation and sustainable management outcomes. In this regard, Norton and Miller (2000) from an ecological perspective consider that to effectively conserve native biodiversity in New Zealand’s rural landscapes, four matters need be considered, including:

i. What might realistic goals be for native biodiversity protection in a particular localised social context?

ii. How might different land uses and boundaries be better arranged to better meet native biodiversity protection and production goals?

iii. What is the optimum land use arrangement for retaining native biodiversity and ecosystem functions (for example, in the high country, does low intensity pastoral and separated model better enhance biodiversity outcomes?)

iv. How can native biodiversity protection benefit and improve productive returns and outcomes for land managers / owners?

With influence on the policy context, several other strategic learnings emerged from the present study and expand on the work Norton and Miller (2000) by highlighting the importance of engaging with local values to ensure the social sustainability and longevity of a conservation activity. These learnings relate to:

- **Effective Context Analysis**
  - Understanding and promoting cultural values and an integrated view of social, economic and ecological values dimensions overlaid across a landscape, and the complexity of relations between macro and micro-scale politics.

- **Management Approaches / Partnership**
  - Developing appropriate management strategies that identify values that would otherwise be relatively invisible and not accounted for in management decision
making, especially when a policy / management approach is broken down into an overly simplistic policy binary such as the logic within tenure review.

- Encouraging exposure to different ways of knowing high country spaces, through a mutually supporting, ‘knowledge nourishing’ and context adaptive structure such as a Landcare Group.

In particular, the Landcare Group approach, which sits outside the orthodox ‘DOC centric’ conservation management strategy, was acknowledged as a potentially effective mechanism for achieving strong outcomes by engaging the interests and dignity of local communities, and integrating plural stakeholders into a transparent framework. Further, I suggested that upholding generosity towards custodial efforts made by landholders will allow for refocusing on developing shared strategy. Accounting for epistemological pluralism means that alternative values are not cast to the periphery and marginalised, but recognised as equivalent aspects of an integrated management context. This is a dimension that will be reflected in the habitus of local relations, where instead of defending an ontological stasis or a singular concept of nature over other, complex values and ideologies are upheld as different, but similarly valuable and mutually nourishing ‘knowledge spaces’ (Turnbull, 1997). Fundamentally, the high country is a hybrid cultural landscape, overlaid by many complex facets of cultural heritage, which challenges the primacy that is placed on ecological heritage within conservation ideology. The importance of cultural heritage is such that it turns on its head the idea that separating high value ecological systems from the production systems in the high country somehow returns those areas to a pristine wilderness, celebrated for their ecological values and untouched by human activity. Such a concept is a matter of selective representation and obfuscates from view the generations of social interaction with spaces. It is also politically and ethically moribund, failing to acknowledge more or less sustainable social practices within high country spaces, because all are seemingly considered negative within a use-free preservation frame.

Accordingly, this research contributes to a significant gap in the New Zealand literature. By providing a balanced critique of tenure review as a policy intervention generating complex outcomes and the redefinition of landscape values locally, I have begun to identify different potentials for a pluralist landscape politics. These ideas apply not only to the high country but can also be developed in enriching ways within other national conservation contexts. In this way, engaging with space as integrated signifies a
potential for New Zealand’s conservation ethos to begin catching up with some of the more social equity oriented approaches internationally; including among many other initiatives, Natura 2000 and the Natchitoches Declaration on Heritage Landscapes adopted in March 2004 at the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) International Symposium (see: Bryan, 2012; McClean, 2007). Each of these two examples emphasise:

- Conserving landscapes, biodiversity and cultural values as an integrated whole;
- Focusing management on the points of interaction between people and nature;
- Conceptualising people and local communities as a conservation resource and as stewards of working landscapes, who can be encouraged in a particular management direction under particular tenure and production regimes.
- Understanding that management should be undertaken with, through, for and by local people.

Unlike New Zealand, in the United Kingdom and other European and American landscapes, fewer indigenous values often remain intact and often more emphasis is placed on protecting historic landscapes, as well as cultural and farming heritage. Therefore, while significant biodiversity remains intact within the high country it is important to recognise and not disregard the identity and character of distinctive historic and contemporary social dimensions that coexist within high country environments, and manage the landscape accordingly.

However, in 2005 a press release was published by Lincoln University, authored by Ben Todhunter, a Rakaia Gorge farmer, who was at the time chairman of the High Country Trustees (which became the High Country Accord to advocate for lessees during tenure review). The press release reflected on international trends within conservation practice and identified that an alternative approach to tenure review existed, whereby multi-uses – tourism, agriculture, conservation and indigenous values, to name but a few, are not mutually exclusive and can be managed holistically. The report emphasised that tenure review of Crown pastoral leases was continuing to separate conservation values from agriculture “based on the assumption that conservation would automatically conflict
with economic use” (Todhunter, 2005: n.p.), and forewarned of the various complex issues that were beginning to intensify around tenure review. Shortly after the press release, however, there was a further lapse in terms of identifying the strengths of multiuse and providing for shared equity in landscape management. Forest and Bird and Federated Mountain Clubs unveiled a wish list of new National Parks they wanted created and the idea of a new six pack of national parks culminating from tenure review and NHF purchases, of which two parks are now largely completed.\(^{195}\) This impetus led in part to the Labour government’s focus on conservation accumulation, whereby it was considered that opening up park land with tenure review was “tantamount to nationalisation of land and the alienation of some areas from farming activities” (Hutching, 2005: n.p.). To an extent, this project of amassing conservation land instigated the polarisation and conflict between diverse interests that ensued, and exemplified tensions associated with ‘locking up’ land for conservation or farming on freehold, which in turn opened up the previous tenure mode to new production methods. In short, this brings us full circle, where clearly landscapes are tied to deep feelings of national identity, however, from diverse standpoints, as has been examined in a nuanced way within this study.\(^{196}\)

In summary, instigated in 1989, the policy of tenure review is an on-going process. It has entailed converting some of the generally large Crown perpetual pastoral leases (originally totalling 303 properties) on a voluntary basis, to privatised freehold held by the original lessees in exchange for the return of land holding Significant Inherent Values, foreseen to require extrinsic protection, and public access values, to Department of Conservation control and management. The process has implemented a dualistic convention, which advances a particular concept of nature as requiring separation from society. In particular, the study has foregrounded thinking in contemporary, constructionist geographies and social theory acutely aware of the issues stemming from Western environmentalisms that rely on the resilient duality erected between nature and society. Such logic systems conceive of ‘nature’ contained within one external sphere, and the economy, society and politics in another, and subsequently seeks isolation between the

\(^{195}\) Still proposed and in process
- Kaikoura Ranges in North Marlborough.
- St James / Spencer Mountains.
- Upper Rangitata.
- Hawke Dunn/Otake, Pisa Range and Remarkables in Otago.

\(^{196}\) I.e.: from farming perspectives emphasising the pastoral mode and changing contemporary farming practices; conservation ideas that focus on the high country’s natural heritage, landscapes and biodiversity; for Maori and the widespread connections that Tangata Whenua held with the land in regions of the high country prior to colonialism; and in terms of New Zealand’s public, who hold diverse values for high country spaces.
two. However, this fails to understand or make room for complex interactions and linkages between nature and society within ever increasingly ‘hybrid’ landscapes.

On one hand there is a sense that tenure review sought to separate still existing relics of ‘pre-human’ indigenous ecosystems from social and economic use, which in modernist logic is considered contrary to protecting nature and wilderness values, because use is considered intrinsically damaging. However, in this manner, natural values and the landscapes that encompass them are fetishesized at a distance, external from the incursion of society, which leads to the marginalisation and erasure of pre-existing histories within spaces socially constructed as ‘natural’. On the other hand privatised development is encouraged and has been sought by lessees due to the economic variability of pastoral agriculture and presence of alternative use value. This binary framework therefore advances an alienating separatist practice, but obscures potentially more sustainable uses of social spaces and the integration of values within landscapes that retain valuable ecologies, but also longstanding socio-cultural and economic associations. Aligned with the thinking of Bingham and Hinchliffe (2008), Memon and Wilson (2007), Memon and Perkins (2000), Memon (1993) and Bührs and Barlett (1993), tenure review represents an uneasy unity or Faustian pact between deep green and neoliberal logics. In this thesis, I have argued that both ideologies are complex and powerful at various scales within New Zealand society. Emphasising Bourdieu’s methodological principles, a locally grounded research approach was employed to understand how ‘the landscape’ is socially constructed and untangle changes occurring due to tenure review. Analysis highlighted that division categorises separated spaces as either ‘for production’ or ‘for protection’, leading to narrowed habitus that may undermine the potential to look towards or maintain more sensitive forms of production. An impasse arises, where ‘locking away’ purified nature in externalised parks and reserves, may negate social responsibility for ‘other’ natures, especially those produced from and more obviously ‘human impacted’.

To briefly re-engage with the core argument from the thesis outlined in Section 9.1 above, binary logic is contrary to the post-modern call for encouraging sensitive cohabitation between human and non-human others (Manning et al., 2009; Whatmore, 2002; 2005; 2006; Braun, 2006a; 2006b). Constructionist geography has now for a significant period of time been focused on identifying potentials for establishing more convivial ethics and making room for nature and non-human others within social spaces. Emphasis is placed on the lively, multi-natural geographies and landscapes created by
human interactions with nature and the creation of many hybrid forms (Zimmerer, 2007; Whatmore, 2006; Braun, 2005).

The important argument gained from concepts of hybridity and multi-naturalism, is that removing humans and production from ‘nature’, will not ‘save’ or restore pre-human nature. But removing humans will transform and direct nature in a different, “human influenced trajectory of change” (Braun, 2006b: 194). Therefore, notions of contesting social-spatial orders that have been uncovered throughout this thesis exemplify how the productivist hegemony across the high country landscape is increasingly open to challenge by other claims to social spatial order. However, as Harvey (1996: 186) asserts, removing humans from nature would be “disastrous for all species and all forms [of life] that have become dependent on it”. By acknowledging how natures are hybrid in form, postmodern eco-politics becomes about navigating diverse trajectories of social-spatial change. It is therefore necessary to devise strategies that work with plural claims and negotiate direction agonistically. This study has identified potentials for encouraging this kind of politics, however, corresponding with the post-modern pluralist position, such approaches should be defined locally, to engage with the strengths of a particular network and the complexities of local context.

The pluralist frame inspires a different, contextually nuanced form of politics. Acknowledging and working with multiple claims seeks to engage the dignity of local people and increase their capacity to learn and protect, rather than detaching them from land and values with conservation proving a divisive force of social alienation in landholder psyches’. Rebuilding capacity is a gradual process, which will require building linkages that tenure review has broken down. Within such a conclusion I recognise that boundaries are not ‘bad’ in all cases, regions and spaces. There is a sense that in some examples ecological values and important ecosystems are best set aside for extrinsic protection and active management. However, it is the approach through which such an outcome is achieved that is important. Analysis in the current thesis has highlighted that in social natures like the high country, division / separation for extrinsic protection needs to be negotiated openly and agreed on. Approaches to conservation should not be so ideologically simplified, as the tenure review experience shows this loses the essence and core objectives of the policy. Furthermore, a deeper understanding of the broader potential impacts on the social-cultural, economic and ecological landscapes should be achieved at the outset of developing any strategy.
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Appendix 1a

Seeking Security - Todhunter letter

‘Big Ben’

Perth Street

Timaru

July 4th 1941

Dear Mr Todhunter, [founding chairperson of high country committee]

I sincerely hope that the high country element in the South Island will get busy this election year and feature demands that the State should listen up in the interests and preservation of our calling. The industry is slipping badly; we are continuing in it because mainly our equities are locked up in it, and too because so many of us love the life and know no other.

Unless the State equalises the enormous increase in running costs by reduced rentals and helps us to stand up to the rabbit pest and weeds, there may be wholesale relinquishments after the war. The authorities are not meeting reasonable requests for reasonable rentals and have dug in their toes to a degree that makes us believe that their actions are ruled chiefly by obstinacy and autocratic office dictation. And they have broken their promise regarding high country appointments to the Canterbury Board.

I cannot help the industry adequately unless the industry gets up on its hind legs. A bit of direct action is sometimes supremely effective. In many respects the administration is trifling with us – the Minister has no time for us.

Yours truly

T. D. Burnett. [M.P. for Temuka (1919-1941)- original owner of Mt Cook Station]
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Appendix 1b

The objectives of Tenure Review, under the Crown Pastoral Lease Act 1998

Extrapolating insight from Armstrong, *et al.*, (2008: 8-9), Part 1 of the CPLA reaffirms the provisions of the 1948 Act and its amendments in relation to the tenure and rental reviews. Part 2 makes provision for tenure review setting out details of the objectives for tenure review and the process required to achieve those objectives.

The objectives of Part 2 are –

(a) To (i) Promote the management of reviewable land in a way that is ecologically sustainable:

(ii) Subject to subparagraph (i), enable reviewable land capable of economic use to be freed from the management constraints (direct and indirect) resulting from its tenure under reviewable instrument; and

(b) To enable the protection of the significant inherent values of reviewable land –

(i) By the creation of protective mechanisms; or (preferably)

(ii) By the restoration of the land concerned to full Crown ownership and control; and

(c) Subject to paragraphs (a) and (b), to make easier –

(i) The securing of public access to and enjoyment of reviewable land; and

(ii) The freehold disposal of reviewable land.

By way of summary, applying the aforementioned objectives of tenure review under the CPLA 1998, entailed the following:

• Promoting the ecologically sustainable management of the Crown’s interest in high country land.

• Enabling reviewable land capable of economic use to be freed of management constraints.

• Protecting important inherent values of reviewable land by creating protective measures of restoring the land to crown ownership and control.

• Securing public access to high country land.

• Taking into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.

• Taking into account any purpose for which the Crown uses or intends to use the land.
• Ensuring that high country conservation outcomes are consistent with the New Zealand biodiversity strategy.

• To establish a network of high country parks and reserves.

• To foster communities, infrastructure and economic growth and the contribution of the high country to the economy.

• To obtain a fair financial return to the Crown for its assets.

In summary, before allowing farmers freehold the Crown is required to ensure that land with Significant Inherent Values (SIVs) is protected, or ‘preferably’ restored to full Crown ownership and control. Only then is land capable of economic use considered for privatisation under tenure review.

As explained in Chapter 1 and developed further in Chapter 2, this sets in motion a particular, western-centric conservation logic focused on the centralisation of ecological values in the control of the State. This logic within tenure review divided between ‘nature’ in need of preservation away from land that is categorised for productive use.
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**Appendix 1c**

Themes from grey literature and media review.

| Economic               | • ‘You can’t be green if you are constantly in the red’  
|                       | • Economically viable farms – best option for ‘saving the high country’. |
| Landscape and ecological | • Complexity of landscape and environmental values.  
|                       | • Celebrate the role farmers perform as environmental stewards. |
| Political and policy issues | • Lip service to collaboration with landholders.  
|                       | • Issues with local, regional and State politics.  
|                       | • Councillors rushed and under pressure.  
|                       | • New high country rental system  
|                       | - Proposed to move away from issues of amenity valuation and to focus on productive value. Stock carrying capacity.  
|                       | - Hoped that the pastoral lease will remain a good system of tenure in light of uncertainty with previous rental systems. |
| Conflict and Polarisation | • Public outcry over cubical farming in the Mackenzie and Omarama Basin (2009 -2010)  
| Polarising environmental / resource issues | • Polarised interests  
|                       | - Greens Opposed to “factory farming” in the region.  
|                       | - Waitaki and Mackenzie District Councils – complex – encouraging rates, protecting landscapes and resources.  
|                       | • Environmental Defence Society (EDS) Symposium on the Mackenzie Basin (November 2010).  
|                       | - Labelled an “Imposium” and surrounded by call for farmers to boycott. However, the symposium was instigated to get polarised interests within the Omarama and Mackenzie Basin regions communicating in a more open forum.  
|                       | - Exemplified conflicts between farmers and other local interests.  
|                       | - Genuine concern that the local farming community had been sidelined.  
|                       | - “EDS a sham that overrode local rights”, because “environmentalists and government had already decided the way forward from the top down” (Finnie, 2010). |
|                       | • Mackenzie Sustainable Futures Trust developed from Environmental Defence Society symposium (Bruce, 2011).  
|                       | • Crown Pastoral Land Act 1998  
|                       | - Amendment to encourage alternatives such as whole property purchases by Crown for conservation.  
|                       | - Encourages multiple uses on pastoral leases.  
|                       | • National Government’s three pronged plan for managing pastoral leases (2011 – 2012)  
|                       | - Recognise effective stewardship, better economic use, improved relationships with lessees.  
|                       | - Too much land driven into DOC hands with tenure review.  
|                       | - Rescinded Labour’s policy preventing the sale of lakeside land. |
|                       | • Forest Creek Access dispute.  
|                       | • “Too much potential for adversarial action and not enough for conciliation” (Familton, 2010; 9).  
|                       | • Birchwood Station purchased for $10 million by Crown organisation, the Nature Heritage Fund (NHF).  
|                       | - Exemplified “cleaning the high country of farming activity and history” (Hutching, 2004: n.p.).  
|                       | - Amount paid for conservation land highly controversial.  
|                       | - “good news for farming community” for it inflated tenure review marker and values being paid at bargain(ing)(ibid.).  
|                       | - National Spokesperson, Shane Ardern criticised the Birchwood sale as:  
|                       | "idealism out of control by an urban focused, socialist government” (Cutt, 2004: n.p.) in response to the Labour government’s programme of taking land for the creation of conservation estate. .  
|                       | - Accumulation and struggle for centralised conservation control under Labour Party.  
|                       | - Opposition – economy versus use free preservation. |
|                       | • St James Station purchase by NHF.  
|                       | - Government funding under Labour scrutinised. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues with Separation and Division</th>
<th>Tenure review coverage / issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Public scrutiny.</td>
<td>- Issues with piecemeal land reform – hastened decline of indigenous biodiversity relinquished from higher level Crown oversight with the Pastoral Lease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Exemplifies the removal of pastoral history from the landscape.</td>
<td>- Federated Farmer’s chairman – Graham Reed asserts that green grass and stable soil is better than dust, hieracium and rabbits, illustrating how people see different values within landscapes – as a dust bowl in need ‘improvement or a natural desert rich in indigenous flora.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “High country chasm” (Wallace, 2004a: n.p.) forming as separation and conflict between lessees and Labour Government intensified.</td>
<td>- Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, Jan Wright, faulted the simple ‘split model’ for not protecting habitats, threatening water quality, diverting resources from high conservation priorities, disadvantaging merino farming by preventing high altitude summer grazing and changing the character of high country farms threatening loss of heritage and landscape values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tension and anger (Withington, 2004).</td>
<td>- Park Ideology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fish and Game ruling sours relations in the high country (Bristow, 2004).</td>
<td>- Considered by some as freeing up the high country from farming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Polaris ing irrigation proposals in the Mackenzie – Omarama Basin and also the proposal for cubical/enclosed farming on the Ohau flats.</td>
<td>- $79 million set aside to establish a new network of high country national parks and reserves in 2004. An additional $46 million was budgeted to cover costs of tenure review settlements in order to progress tenure review under then Conservation Minister Hon. Chris Carter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Issues with piecemeal land reform – hastened decline of indigenous biodiversity relinquished from higher level Crown oversight with the Pastoral Lease.</td>
<td>- Carter proposed that 2.2 million hectares of some of the most beautiful and valuable land had to be unravelled from the outdated Crown leases and control and the use of about 300 high country families, and instead be placed in the centralised control of the Crown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Federated Farmer’s chairman – Graham Reed asserts that green grass and stable soil is better than dust, hieracium and rabbits, illustrating how people see different values within landscapes – as a dust bowl in need ‘improvement or a natural desert rich in indigenous flora.</td>
<td>- Farmers feeling under attack by pressure from Crown seeking conservation accumulation (Wallace, 2004c).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, Jan Wright, faulted the simple ‘split model’ for not protecting habitats, threatening water quality, diverting resources from high conservation priorities, disadvantaging merino farming by preventing high altitude summer grazing and changing the character of high country farms threatening loss of heritage and landscape values.</td>
<td>- DOC expansion with tenure review “destroying farming heritage” (Todhunter, 2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Considered by some as freeing up the high country from farming.</td>
<td>- Barossa Tenure Review – coverage of outcomes (2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- $79 million set aside to establish a new network of high country national parks and reserves in 2004. An additional $46 million was budgeted to cover costs of tenure review settlements in order to progress tenure review under then Conservation Minister Hon. Chris Carter.</td>
<td>- Proposals for the Wolds and Maryburn Stations on the shores of Lake Pukaki.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Carter proposed that 2.2 million hectares of some of the most beautiful and valuable land had to be unravelled from the outdated Crown leases and control and the use of about 300 high country families, and instead be placed in the centralised control of the Crown.</td>
<td>- Scale change and division suggested to lead to intensification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Farmers feeling under attack by pressure from Crown seeking conservation accumulation (Wallace, 2004c).</td>
<td>- Pursuing land for security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strong rhetoric of balance and freeing up for protection (NZPA, 2004).</td>
<td>- Landscape will become just like Canterbury Plains on the flat valley country of the Mackenzie and Omarama Basins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Proposals for the Wolds and Maryburn Stations on the shores of Lake Pukaki.</td>
<td>- Long waits for outcomes and to receive land title (Hill, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Scale change and division suggested to lead to intensification.</td>
<td>- Disempowered DOC and Neutral LINZ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pursuing land for security.</td>
<td>- Generally good outcomes from an access perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Relinquishing land from Crown control to Regional /District Council planning.</td>
<td>- Calls for clarity and transparency regarding tenure review outcomes and expense (Wallace, 2004).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Landscape will become just like Canterbury Plains on the flat valley country of the Mackenzie and Omarama Basins.</td>
<td>- Questions about the sustainability of pastoralism versus the split method of tenure review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Development rights with freeholded land from tenure review.</td>
<td>- Tenure review results in major loses to merino industry, undermining and leading to the unviability of traditional high country pastoralism (Wallace, 2004d).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Localised tenure review outcomes
- A more flexible approach to tenure review could have achieved better outcomes for multi-interests rather than ring fenced conservation (Rural News, 2005).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Localised tenure review outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park establishment with tenure review:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mt Cook National Park extended;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Te Kahui Kaupeka Conservation Park established;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Various NHF whole farm purchases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drylands Parks to be established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Emotive issues associated with the ‘altruism of conservation’ with establishing a Drylands Conservation Park in Northern Mackenzie Basin, and ideas of secured public access (Rae, 2014).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split methodology leading to “paradise lost” due to landscape modification (McCrone, 2010: c5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation land “locked up” due to focus being retained on park conservation (Piddock, 2011: 7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Reasonable compromise with the split method of tenure review” (Gibb, 2004: n.p).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clent Hills Station - NHF purchased entire 12,181 hectare Clent Hills Station and then sold 80% to Crown, the other 20 % was allocated between neighbouring properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers for lessees to enter tenure review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Property rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Economic development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Political security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Public scrutiny over rentals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “high country farmers under pressure to pay more and more for their Crown leases or sell up” (New Zealand Herald, 2005: C02).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“This land is our land” (Ibid.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### High country landscape values
- 'The high country is New Zealand’s strongest brand’ – diverse stakeholders, diverse activities, diverse ecology and environments. |
- Rural idyll and urban rural divide (Van Beynen, 2011). |
- Tourism imagery |
  - Lord of the Rings. |
  - Tourism considered a $2 billion dollar industry and much of that relies on so called ‘natural’ and picturesque landscapes. |

#### DOC logic and management approach
- Overly “nativist” focus on only indigenous ecology (Littlewood, 2010a: n.p.). |
- Major issues with fire danger (Bristow, 2004). Fire risk perceived due to conservation land being un-grazed and fire burden (build-up of dead vegetation) is rapidly increasing. |
  - A ‘landscape under threat’ |
  - Wildling pines, rabbits, weed issues, development. |
  - Why alienate landholders? |
- Growing issues with Canada Geese. |
- Leadership issues with Fish and Game – stance of being anti farmer (Emerson, 2011a; 2011b). |
- Opposition between tourism and agricultural production (Cope-Williams, 2013). |
- Rent Issues. |
- Tensions between DOC/Crown and QEII Trust covenants – farmers seeking control to avoid DOC and be ‘game keepers’. |
- Opposition between Forest and Bird and Fish and Game |
- Widespread Tensions |
  - DOC and Farmers (Norman, 2005; NZPA, 2005a; 2005b; Wallace, 2005) |
  - Power and influence of DOC (Taylor, 2005) |
  - Concern for Canterbury’s braided rivers (Ralston, 2014a). |
  - Continued vegetation and biodiversity loss (Ralston, 2014b)
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- **Issues with separation**
  - Lessees alienated from properties and decision making.
  - Wanaka high country advocate Sir Tim Wallis argued that tenure review is alienating, farmers felt they were being shut out of decision making and out of their properties (Holland, 2005).
- **Public access tensions.**
- **Overseas ownership** (growing issues and focus of media coverage between 2001 and 2015).
- **2013**
  - DOC restructuring.
  - DOCs emphasis on corporate partnership.
- **National Freshwater Forum**
  - Water quality management.
  - Water quantity and storage for dryland irrigation.
- **Diversification**
- **Rabbit numbers steadily increasing post RCD (2012, 2013, 2014).**
- **Te Awaroa Trail and Alps to Ocean cycle way** – more evidence of getting on side with adjacent landholders to achieve outcomes.
- **Landcare groups in local coverage (The Timaru Courier, 2013).**
- **QEII Trust covenants gaining prominence in high country regions as an alternative to DOC control.**

### Opening up the land

- **Locking up (for conservation or farming) / opening up (for conservation or farming)** opposition.
- Landscape tied to deep feelings of national identity, however, from diverse standpoints.
  - **FARMING** – the cultural heritage of the pastoral mode and changing contemporary farming practices.
  - **CONSERVATION** – the high country’s natural heritage, landscapes, biodiversity.
  - **MAORI** – Tangata Whenua’s connections with the land in the regions of the high country prior to colonialism.
  - **ACCESS** – diverse values and ‘wish list’ of parks and tracks.
- **Park and reserve wish list:**
  - Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society and Federated Mountain Clubs unveiled a wish list of new National Parks they want created.
  - Emphasise how opening up this park land with tenure review is tantamount to “nationalisation” of land and the “alienation” of some areas from farming activities (Hutching, 2005).
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An analytical summary of social, economic and environmental transformations

Introduction: The gradual transformation of a resilient cultural landscape.

Leighly and Sauer (1963) understand cultural landscapes, like the high country, as an expression of how cultures transform spaces progressively into landscapes of composite social, physical, spiritual, economic meaning and value. Interestingly, back in 1963, the authors emphasised the importance of recognising the texture and integrity of local spaces and landscapes in social research. Swaffield and Brower (2009: 161) however, identify the fluid nature of cultural landscapes and their transformation through social processes; noting that the “destructive character [of society] comes from layering and gradual accretion over time of patterns of land use and management artefacts and shared meanings”. Symbolic values are embedded within and translated beyond local context through the meanings attributed to local space within social context and knowledge frames (Olwig, 2002). In this way landscape values operate to socially construct meaning and these meanings are constantly under challenge and transformation.

Under the UNESCO World Heritage Convention, cultural landscapes are a focus of protection, classification and emphasis on maintaining cultural practices that retain valuable character (UNESCO, 1999). The thinking behind maintaining a static landscape quality is not exactly aligned with theorising space as fluid, which is emphasised by the constructionist frame. However, at a national level, cultural landscapes are one of the most widely recognised heritage landscapes (Fowler, 2003). By their very nature as hybrid social-spaces, cultural landscapes are also vulnerable to the rapid change with processes of neoliberal capitalism and associated productive and social transformation. With processes of globalism, local landscapes are opened up to the influence of global markets, consumers and capital.

Aspects of transformation, including biophysical / environmental, social, political and representational, have characterised the history of the high country as an always-fluid landscape. Such change has been covered in depth by environmental historians such as McGlone (1989), Brooking and Pawson (2010; 2007; 2002) among many others scholars. The high country as a cultural landscape has evolved over a long period of time, which within this analytical summary is broken down into five temporal phases: 1) pre-human transformation and adaptation; 2) pre-European colonisation; 3) early productivism; 4) contemporary productivism; 5) post production and multi-functionality – recent transformations and alternative claims to place and landscape. Each of these five phases becomes a subheading that guides the structure to this appendix.

Phase 1: Pre-human habitation – transformation and adaptation.

Climate and landscape

As an island in the mid-latitudes of the roaring forties, New Zealand has a fluctuating synoptic climate, but the temperature gradient does not contrast greatly between summer and winter. Only in the inland areas, such as the alpine and basin country of the central
South Island, is the climate more continental. However, wind is a very characteristic factor of New Zealand’s environment, as well as a sharp rainfall gradient between inland and coastal climates. Also, sitting along at the edge of the Pacific and Indo-Australian tectonic plates, New Zealand is a landmass uplifted rapidly, but is also eroded at a dramatic rate, leading to the large, flat outwash plains that characterise the eastern regions of the South Island.

Interpreting the geomorphology of the terminal moraines of the Southern lakes, Tekapo, Pukaki, Hawea, Wanaka and Wakatipu all terminate at an almost perfect 500 millimetre rainfall gradient. Then the top end of these lakes, are almost a perfect 1000 millimetre rainfall gradient, then the first horizon is located approximately at the 1500 millimetre rainfall. This distinct climb in rainfall illustrates the huge erosion potential of fluvial processes, following periods of dramatic glacio-fluvial transformation in the prehistory of alpine valleys, leading to a distinct topography of the high country region. Most of the high country consists of the same rock type, namely greywacke sandstone. However, in Central Otago processes of metamorphism and heating has created schist forms (a stronger, but fracturing rock type), which leads to a different topographical character.

Flora and Fauna

New Zealand’s high country flora is dominated by slow growing species. This is associated with the variable maritime climate, characterised by very rapid change. For example, at Tekapo there were three frosts in January 2015, therefore indigenous species have had to adapt. For example, much of the indigenous biodiversity has evolved dark colours and some also have hairy surface tomentum as an xerophilous adaptation, in order to get rid of heat, insulate from cold and regulate water loss. Furthermore, grass and sedge species are generally slow growing. One weakness of the etymology of ‘tussock grass’ is that tussocks are likened to common, fast growing grasses, rather than native tree species. Many tussock and sedge species, for example, Carex Secta and red tussock have characteristics of trees, and if aged, likely range between two and 500 years old.

In terms of agriculture, most pastoral species (for example, cocksfoot and brown top grasses and clover species) were introduced from British climates with lesser requirement for such adaption. This means that the early onset of cool temperatures leads to plants shutting down photosynthesis and a short growing season. Also, come early spring in September, many of these species will start to photosynthesis and grow when five days of fine, warm weather occur, expecting this climate to continue for a 5 month continental summer, only to be damaged by subsequent frosts. The climate sensitivity of introduced pastoral species has been an aspect of the logic behind the traditional pastoral mode and retaining mixed, native/exotic pasture in the high country.

Glaciations in New Zealand have been recent in geological terms. There have been four advances up Lake Tekapo, at around 300,000, 100,000, 30,000 and the last at about 10,000 years ago respectively. The effect of glaciations at these spread periods has been dramatic on landscape form as well as flora and fauna composition, where respective advances have cleared the central South Island of biota (Leschen et al., 2008; Knapp, 2007; McGlone, Mildenhall and Pole, 1996; Thomsen, 2002; Wardel, 1980). Forests were pushed right to Nelson and Southland, the evidence of this is that podocarps have re-established
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relatively quickly, but beech forest has only been slowly migrating back. This is one train of thought behind the origins of the South Westland beech gap, where it is suggested that beech species have advanced slowly out of the Tasman Valley, reaching the Rakaia and Rangitata valleys, south in the Lindis Pass and top of the Tasman Valley (Knapp, 2007). There exists no evidence of Beech Forest being in the Godley Valley (in which Lake Tekapo sits) since the last glacial maximum (pers. Comm., David Scott).

Phase 2: Pre-European human history

Early polynesian settlers began to transform the landscapes of the central South Island early in settlement. Birds dominated New Zealand’s indigenous ecology, and no large grazing undulates and mammals meant that bird species had evolved to be large and an excellent food source for early Polynesian immigrants. Prior to settlement Moa populations were abundant and an estimated 20 to 30,000 Moa skeletons were found at the Mouth of the Waitaki, and Moa bone fragments were picked up across the Mackenzie Basin and in sand deposits around Tekapo (pers. Comm., David Scott). Furthermore, there has been research undertaken into how the abundance of moa had significant grazing effects and also impacted on the evolution of New Zealand’s indigenous ecology. For example, thorn and thicket structures on species such as matagouri, caprosma and young lancewoods are likely adaptations against grazing.

The Polynesian era, between 500-1000 years ago provided the first evidence of land use by another culture prior to European pastoralists. Molloy (1969) highlighted how the high country landscape has been under a transitional sequence of human impact, since long before colonial settlement. By investigating buried subsurface charcoal, soil composition and vegetation layers, Molloy (1969) was able to determine to some extent the bio-history of the Porters Pass area, including land use changes and burning cycles at different periods of time. What emerged from this Molloy’s research was evidence that natural fires before human habitation were more widespread and frequent than initially thought, which has since been supported with radio carbon dating. Fire has long characterised the transformation of inland New Zealand landscapes and ecosystems and spikes in charcoal remnants in soil layers corresponded with episodic fires used for the hunting of Moa.

Phase 3: Early productivism – transformation with European settlement.

The English and the Scottish have long been determined rivals, however, in around 1820 the King of England visited Scotland for the first time in 100 years. The king was welcomed at Edinburgh by Sir Walter Scott, who chose to wear a pair of grey and white woollen trousers. Subsequently, the woollen Scottish tartan was adopted as the fashion item of choice, which suddenly increased international demand for wool. Great Britain could not supply sufficient and neither could the continental commonwealth, and such increased demand was a precursor influence to the colonisation of New Zealand and Australia, building what David Young (2011) referring to Pawson and Brooking (2010) describes as an empire that began with the naturalisation of grasses. The construction of New Zealand as a far away and relatively empty conquest of the British Empire was based on securing new land. England was increasingly over populated and the security of the agricultural food supply was questioned (Brooking and Pawson, 2002).
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Christchurch and Canterbury was a planned English settlement and to be firmly Anglican. Dunedin and Otago was a planned Scottish Presbyterian settlement. However, this was complicated where the first family to arrive and settle Canterbury and the area of Christchurch, the Deanses, were Scottish and Presbyterian. Planned settlement was also complicated by the discovery of gold in Otago, but this encouraged the shift in Canterbury towards crop farming to supply Otago gold mining, which was a movement away from initial subsistence and roaming agriculture. With regard to the beginnings of the cultural mystique attached to the high country, the saga of John Mackenzie is important, and covered by McNeish (1972), in *The Mackenzie Affair*. Insight is found especially in the appendix to this book. Yes, there was a man named John Douglas, alias John Mackenzie, who was caught stealing sheep at the now Mackenzie Pass. He was tried and convicted but then, was fully pardoned one year later. McNeish explains Douglas’s plight to have been cause in a first case of miscarriage of justice within colonial New Zealand law. However, at the time Mackenzie became a myth or ‘imaginary’ for New Zealand’s urban poor, as an inspiring social narrative just before the first ships arrived from Europe. Mackenzie was given all the characteristics the poverty stricken colonial people throughout the country desired. Not only was Mackenzie a thief and a rustler from a well off southern gentry, he was also imagined to be the best shepherd in the world. Mackenzie assumed a mystique about him that is attached to the Mackenzie basin, and the early productivist history of the high country.

Social figures like John Mackenzie and Samuel L Butler each add to the identity, heritage and imagery of the high country, which early on was isolated and beyond the civility of urban spaces. Shortly after Mackenzie was pardoned however, the first four ships of settlers arrived and consequently led to the rise of the big estates in Canterbury, Otago, Southland and other regions of New Zealand. However, the hinterland and alpine areas remained a ‘wasteland’ beyond civilisation, where settlers did not venture fully for several decades, except for those most hardy, intrepid or in search of cheaper land.

Significant for the current study, fee simple freehold was granted early on lowlands like the Canterbury Plains, whereas, in the high country, European occupation was legitimised by the nominal purchase of land by the Crown. Breaking up of large colonial estates was a phenomenon experienced particularly in Canterbury and Otago. A key provision of the Treaty of Waitangi was that henceforth only the Crown was allowed to purchase land directly from the Maori. This sought to regularise the transfer of land from Maori to colonials under the Treaty and ensure the ‘integrity’ of the process (Orange, 1989). Prior to this, land had been controlled in an ad hoc manner (McAloon, 2003).

Control of ‘wasteland’ and transformation to productive land

Similar to the transformation of British landscapes examined by Tsouvalis (2000), early productivists in New Zealand worked within the ideological framework of the perceived necessary transformation of un-productive ‘wastelands’ into ‘productive lands’. Put in the perspective of early farming, when in a position of marginality people seek to protect land and security. Cultivation requires investment, and therefore, the impetus within British colonial psyches has long been to control, or own the land on which investment is made. Therefore, on-going claims to title and land security characterised the history of New Zealand’s development, and especially the high country political context. As titles were
increasingly taken up on lowlands, claims were made to the more marginal and less easily transformed lands in the interior of the South Island.

The interior high country however, was still considered to be wasteland into the 1920s, where it remained relatively under productive from a pastoral perspective. In the high country, early lease regulations entitled no right of renewal or exclusive occupation, and the control of land was always under flux. That is why there was a process of ‘grid-ironing’ or the freeholding of curtilage areas around the homestead of high country properties, which occurred mainly between 1850 and 1910. As a result, on almost all high country runs, the homestead, some other buildings and cultivated paddocks (in early days, for oat chaff for horses) are on freehold land, purchased off the Crown for security. Each of these historical aspects means that contemporary discussions regarding tenure review and the reallocation of land rights must be situated within this history and operate within a complex system of various land titles.

### Changing systems of early productivism

High country farming has always been characterised by periodic economic and environmental crises (O’Connor, 1984; Peden, 2011; Holland, 2014). The 1920s and 1930s signified big depressions in the high country, where merino sheep were only valuable for wool, but even wool markets had slumped markedly (Macdonald, 1926). Similarly, what have been described as the ‘rabbit plagues’ began to intensify (Peden, 2011). At this point in time the high country landholder was perceived as a victim, and the defender of the high country against the pestilent rabbit. In Canterbury and Otago, periodic increases in rabbit numbers have had a major impact, which led to the establishment of locally led rabbit control boards (O’Connor, 1981). However, this was a political move, as a result of the government refusing to allow the release of rabbit calicivirus disease in order to control numbers. On-going in contemporary times, pest species like rabbits and hieracium, a species of invasive, spreading cushion weed, have had profound effect on the economics of high country pastoralism and also caused dramatic changes to the landscape and ecology (Peden, 2011; High Country Accord, n.p.).

Social and political concern in the 1920s also surrounded the lack of fertility associated with high country pastures and issues with erosion. In 1926, the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research (DSIR) was established with the core functions of investigating the better management of grasslands, soils and agronomy. Two aspects of thinking from the DSIR became highly important in the subsequent transformation of high country grasslands. First, the use of fertiliser / superphosphate meant that production output picked up; and second, in the 1930s supplementary feeding of stock began to be common place. However, in order to provide supplementary feed the landholder had to accumulate enough hay in the growing season to feed out in winter, especially for wintering through young animals. As a result, farming orthodoxy shifted towards mono-culture production on the flat valley floors to supplement mixed, low intensity pastoralism on the tops and valley country. Supplementary feeding supported lessees to continue winter-summer seasonal rotation of stock at a whole property scale but also ensure better stock retention and mortality rates. Of note, initial concerns for native species and ecological science at this time in the 1920s was dominated by natural historians like Cockayne and McCaskill among others, who understood that human influence within ‘nature’, as an
Appendices

objective, measurable entity, as damaging. However, it was in the area of soil conservation that McCaskill became nationally prominent.

A series of big floods in the 1930s and 40s led to the stop banking of all the major rivers by the ministry of works, which coincided with the thinking of McCaskill and other scholar’s instrumental in the New Zealand soil conservation movement. The critical idea within this the soil conservation movement, was that with overgrazing in the high country and inland regions, rain fell on compacted land with low levels of vegetation and did not absorb. However, McCaskill (1973) argued the need for broader approaches to soil management, emphasising training landholders as soil conservators, rather than the engineering of infrastructure that mitigated the effects of flooding and erosion (stopbanks and culverts). McCaskill succeeded with lobbying for the incorporation of his logic into the Soil Conservation and Rivers Control Act, which was enacted in September 1941 and as a result the Soil Conservation and Rivers Control Council was established. The aims of the council were to:

- Promote soil conservation;
- Prevent and reduce erosion;
- Prevent flood damage; and,
- Use land in ways that would achieve these aims.

The objectives of the council were in part achieved through the establishment of local area Catchment Boards. In 1944, McCaskill himself became a foundation member of the North Canterbury Catchment Board and by 1945, 11 boards had been formed and by 1967 there were another six similar authorities (Te Ara Encyclopedia, n.p.).

The objectives of soil conservation were also implemented through encouraging the spreading of fertiliser for better pasture growth, and therefore, it was hoped better slope stability of steep land. Then, in 1946 the council devised a system of subsidies that encouraged retirement of land and the fencing of land considered unsuitable for grazing. Extensive tree planting and forestation (often with exotic plantation timbers like Douglas Fir and *Pinus Radiata*, which are now problem species) was also subsidised. The orthodoxy of soil conservation and avoiding erosion and flooding incited the perceived need for effort with revegetating marginal / erosion prone lands. Much investment and research that went on at this time, for example in the Cragieburn Ranges and Porters Pass area in Canterbury (with the University of Canterbury School of Forestry) and at Mid-Dome in Northern Southland, conifer species were imported and planted to research their effectiveness at stabilising land for combatting erosion. However, these experiments are one factor behind the introduction of forestry and major wildling tree issues in the Porters Pass, Craigieburn Range and around Flock Hill in the Waimakariri River Valley and some other high country regions.

Later, Catchment Boards decided that the subsidy system should be implemented with a whole farm approach, where high country lessees had to agree to a farm plan that was based on land capabilities. The first surveys were undertaken in 1952, which divided farmland into either classes, four arable (class 1, 2, 3, 4) and four varying scales of non-arable (classes 5, 6, 7, 8). The inheritance of the soil conservation movement was implicated in a first large scale advance towards retiring land from production, which tenure review extended. Class 8 and Class 7E land, the most friable classes within the soil conservation
zones, were retired from pastoral production and ethics of mixed / integrated land management became prominent with the management of other land. Importantly, elements of the soil conservation movement and integrated land use were explicit within the rationale for establishing the Land Act 1948, and the stimulation of demand for security in high country lands, where agriculturalists had previously operated under a series of insecure land tenure licenses.

The Land Act 1948
The social interest in soil conservation also led in part to reviving the leasing arrangement to give a right of renewal to secure investment in the upkeep of high country pastoral land, as an explicit rationale of the Land Act 1948. However, seeking security was also driven by a wish for landholders to become more productive with investment in land development potentials. Early on, some of the original runs were developed and farmed relatively effectively in order to capitalise on colonial wool premiums. However, other more marginal runs continued to operate as a squatted arrangement, where successive legislations coincided with several permutations of pastoral licences and leasehold agreements over high-country and inland basin country, which did not guarantee secure title.

Traditionally, high country farming families were not especially wealthy and high country land was worth very little. However, this began to transform with the ‘long boom’ of the 1950s, depicting the boom and bust economic dynamic that has continued to impact on the high country agri-economy. Fluctuating markets, dependency on international commodity prices for fine wool fibre and meat, corresponds with variable financial returns (Pawson and Brooking, 2002), and subsequently, the economic viability and sustainability of high country pastoralism has been widely debated (PCE, 1991; Wearing, 1998; McFarlane, 2011).

The current form of the pastoral lease was established under the 1948 Land Act, which formalised rights of perpetual renewability of 33-year leases, with 11-year periods for rental review. This gave security to investment and productive improvements made to leasehold property, incentivising what within the continuing productivist discourse, as productive ‘improvement’ (Rosin, 2012). As a unique and innovative piece of legislation, the clauses of the Land Act 1948 regulated a shared mode of productive management across the expansive and friable interior lands. The farming lobby argues that the Land Act signifies the Crown alienating ownership rights of the land, which has been more firmly asserted in the Common Law associated with the Fish and Game case. While the Crown maintained some control over leasehold land use, strength to this farmer claim is granted, where it is recognised that pastoral leases have ordinarily been traded on the open market at similar values to fee simple freehold land values (Armstrong et al., 2008).

In the 1940s, 50s and 60s significant advances were made with productivist development. In particular, the Tussock Grassland and Mountain Lands Institute was established in 1960, investigating pasture development options and high country production improvement, while continuing to investigate erosion and potential strategies for revegetation and hydrological management, which continued to be major concerns. At the same time, there was also significant concern about the impact the burgeoning deer population was having on native ecologies, which led to the forest service investing in deer
culls (leading eventually to helicopter wild venison meat harvest and the then live capture for the establishment of the deer industry). Importantly, the Forest Service was focused more on economic production and land erosion than on native biodiversity. However, the Forest Service’s responsibility for managing indigenous forests and national parks was transferred to DOC with the 1987 restructuring of the State sector, which became a State organisation with the sole purpose of managing the conservation resources as well as public access and amenities. This was illustrative of the increasing social importance and political clout that conservation / preservation objectives were gaining within national politics and social psyche, often advanced around separation logic behind the establishment of national parks and reserves.

On pastoral lease land, the land management paradigm of mixed pastoralism and multiuse continued. Integrated pasture management was the traditional logic of pastoral lease management, whereby sheep foraged and grazed everywhere across the landscape, and it was understood that the alpine and basin ecosystems could sustain a harvestable product. This is to some extent rejected by Wearing, (1998), Mark et al., (2009), Mark (1990) as unsustainable. However, the pastoral lease did encourage conservative pastoral use and provided a function of bureaucratic regulation over the landscape. Relationships between state and local leaseholders formed the core feature of land management and more implicitly, as a landscape management strategy from this point on. Crown land representatives provided key knowledge conduits within this mode of multiple use management (Land Settlement Board, 1979). Integrated land-use models continued throughout the 1970s and 1980s (see for example, O’Connor et al., 1982 and Floate, 1994), where in collaboration with pastoral lands officials, lessees were both regulated and encouraged to maintain the continuity of a low intensity pastoral landscape. By the 1990s, the landscape qualities maintained by this mode of land use had become assumed within a national imagery, which reflected a pastiche of other emerging social / cultural values.

Under lease arrangements and the Land Act 1948, lessees required permission to develop land, other than for pastoral purposes. However, with the arrival with technology for aerial topdressing of superphosphate (developed in New Zealand in the 1940s and adopted globally throughout the 1950s), thinking progressed and lessees began to understand how their farms could be made more sustainable through the winter. Ordinarily in the high country, winter is a difficult season. Winterfeed for retaining stock on properties has always been the most constraining factor. This is where the terms ‘winter safe’ and ‘sweet country’ emerge, where low altitude, north facing slopes, clear of snow rapidly and therefore, stock are less likely to succumb to cold and food deprivation. A decent amount of winter country has always been an important aspect behind the viability / success of different high country properties. However, the broad acknowledgement here, is that farmers were wanting to develop to produce winter feed, for all stock, not just the rams, horses and the cows as had originally been provided with supplementary feed. In the 1950s and 60s people started feeding the hoggets’ and young stock. This led to improvement with production output and breeding success and also meant higher premiums because stock could be retained through winter and pre-winter surfeits in the market as surplus stock were quit could be avoided. However, this push for livestock and pasture ‘improvement’ was seen to have dramatic influence with intensification of productivism on leasehold properties; partly due to land retirement for erosion factors and
there also provision of government subsidies for farm development, compensating for developing feed and improved agricultural outputs.

**Phase 4: Contemporary productivism**

**Tenure review under the existing Land Act 1948 (1991-1998)**

Prior to the instigation of tenure review in 1991 there had been increasing pressure on government from pastoral lessees for reform, in order to allow for land development in various ways, both with diversification (post-production) and different productivist models. However, this pressure began to align with the neoliberal scheme, whereby government in the 1980s sought to relinquish administrative requirements and the costs of pastoral leases.

On the other side of the discussion there was the on-going rise of conservation / preservation claim within high country space. However, the issue with this is the separation logic of tenure review, on which the study focuses. For leaseholders that did not want to develop, the pastoral lease has continued to work effectively as a mode of tenure, or in many cases, development has been undertaken on previously restrictive leases. However, there have been periods of gradual and more rapid inward movement of land intensification and ‘improved’ farming into the inland basin country of the South Island. In the 1840s, places like Geraldine or Peel Forest were the beginning of the interior ‘wasteland’. Now with issues of cubicle farming proposed at Omarama and vast central pivot irrigation of areas of land covered in the media, the traditional imaginary of high country rural space is clearly under transformation and a new social-spatial geography is emerging.

**Contemporary ideas and historical connections**

Moon (2013) explains how 19th Century European explorers and colonists named and claimed. In doing so they began to construct a nationalist geography that has been fluid in time, but has retained a strong reliance on productivism (see also, Ginn, 2008). However, European narratives of New Zealand reached their maturity in the mid-20th Century (Moon, 2013), as New Zealanders adapted an emerging nationalist identity, seeking some separation from mother England. For example, painters and poets used New Zealand’s dramatic landscape to encapsulate an emergent nationalism and what it meant for New Zealand as a nation separated from colonial Britain (Moon, 2013; Bell, 1996, Cushen, 1997; Lough, 2005). Aspects of identity in the traditional cultural psyche of the high country suggests imagery of hardy individuals, living, working and making their place within a wide and beautiful but unforgiving landscape. However, as Brower (2006a) argued – this traditional identity is changing, where some lessees are becoming property developers, meeting the demands of amenity migrants for high country property with lucrative reward (this is a dynamic also suggested in Woods, 2006; 2007; 2009 and Dominy, 2001).

Books, paintings, poetry, TV advertisements and consumer products all connect into and celebrate the mystique of the landscape’s pastoral heritage in contemporary ways (Law, 1997, Swaffield and Pawson, 1998). Overtime, the hegemony of this identity and its attachment to the expansive pastoral mode/lease tenure has become stronger and socially power-laden. However, the high country run-holder, the team of autumn musterers and their connection with the landscape that has frequently been celebrated, is increasingly
being replaced by alternative modes of production, and increasingly the cultural layer of pastoralism across the landscape is undermined. However, whether this cultural landscape is maintained, or whether to let bygones be bygones is a focus of national contest. Increasingly, productivist representations have come under challenge by interest groups with alternative claims to high country space.

**Phase 5: Multi-functionality and post-production.**

**Neoliberalism – “The New Zealand experiment”**

New Zealand has liberalised trade more fully than many other countries, seeing it as a way to break down barriers and isolation from global capital on which New Zealand relies heavily (Dalziel and Lattimore, 2004). The idea of the 'New Zealand Experiment' (Kelsey, 1995), represents how fully liberalised New Zealand's agro-economy became and in very short time. Restructuring of the New Zealand Political economy in the late 1980's and 1990's had dramatic impact on New Zealand society (Boston *et al.*, 1991; Le Heron, 1989; Rosin, 2008), and was especially traumatic for New Zealand farmers and rural communities (Sandrey and Reynolds, 1990, Wilson, 1994). Economic structures had remained reliant on agricultural exports of sheep meat and wool fibre (Brooking and Pawson, 2002). This economic reliance upon agriculture continued throughout the 20th Century. For example, during the ‘Long Boom’ of the 1950s and 60s, per capita living standards rose amongst the highest in the developed world and the basis was meat, dairy and wool demand in the Northern Hemisphere (Easton, 1997).

The United Kingdom’s entry into the European Common Market in 1973 however, instigated a long decline in terms of trade for New Zealand. In response, the government introduced production subsidies, tariffs and currency controls as protectionist measures to insulate the local economy from external economic fluctuations. In the 1980's, under the Muldoon era of politics, agricultural subsidies equated to the current level in the European Union. However, the New Zealand economy could not sustain the level of borrowing required for subsidising the agriculture industry, which had lost efficiency. The result of such long-term subsidisation was severe macroeconomic imbalance and subsequently, New Zealand’s agricultural products had lost competitive advantage within external markets. The currency crisis in 1983 and 1984 led to dramatic change at the 1984 General Election. The David Lange Labour government was elected and the Minister of Finance, Roger Douglas introduced a dramatic policy of liberalisation. Coined ‘Rogernomics’ by the New Zealand Listener Magazine, it instigated the transformation and deregulation of New Zealand’s economy, public and private sectors, society and environmental legislation (Boston *et al.*, 1991).

**Transformed governance**

In relation to landscape governance, there are three dimensions to neoliberal deregulation that are important to the current study, in terms of acknowledging the complex changes occurring within high country space.
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1) Agriculture was deregulated and all subsidies were removed, which led in some cases to fear of rural collapse. This became entangled with a discourse of resilience, whereby agriculture has remained attached to a national narrative of what agriculture represented as the backbone of New Zealand's economy, a lineage that tied with the successes of the 1950's and 60's, but continues in contemporary discourses.

2) The State/public sector was deregulated and privatised and the Crown relinquished significant land assets. This is certainly a dimension clear within tenure review, where multiple-use land management was rejected, and a dualised / bimodal policy of land management was adopted, as a means of balancing imperatives of agriculture / production (diversified and efficient) and protection/conservation (administered by the newly formed Department of Conservation) (Wilson and Memon, 2005; Norton and Miller, 2000).

3) There was a broad overhaul of conservation management. In 1987, the National Forest Service was disestablished as a large, multi-objective department - that covered industrial forestry and native 'conservation' forestry. Exotic forests were corporatised and then privatised. The remainder, forestry and land deemed of high conservation and indigenous values were transferred to the control of the newly established Department of Conservation (Birchfield and Grant 1993; McIntyre et al., 2001). Lands and Survey was also disbanded, shifting responsibility for reserves and National Parks to the newly established DOC, with centralised and consolidated control over conservation land. The remainder of Land and Survey functions were consolidated into the mandate of Land Information New Zealand.

At this time, overhaul of landscape and environmental management came with the Resource Management Act 1991, which consolidated and replaced many previous and fragmented resource management laws and regimes within one integrated framework (Fisher, 1991). The overarching philosophy and purpose is couched within the ideology of sustainable management. The politics of the definition and slippery nature of sustainable management as a neoliberal concept applied to managing the effects of land-use activity and development are examined in detail in Chapter 3 and elsewhere in the thesis (see: Memon and Perkins, 2000; Harris, 1993).

As a result of passing the Resource Management Act 1991, local government was reformed into a two tier local / regional structure based on a 'New Public Management' model, based heavily on public choice theory and emphasis on clear, measurable links between policy, budgets and operations. Swaffield and Brower, (2009; 165), state that these four elements of restructuring "opened up New Zealand's political economy to the full forces of globalisation" at a time when the current wave of 'second modernity' (Beck, 2000) was gathering momentum. This has become particularly prominent in transformations associated with the recent developmental boom in high country space.

Neoliberal influence on rural change and landscapes

Coinciding with neoliberal restructuring, the national conservation lobby had grown in political power and pressured for a centralised conservation agency to end multiple use management. They favoured the division of protection and production into a bimodal
strategy, relying on a traditional dichotomy between nature and society, which underpinned the logic of tenure review. Before market reforms and the period of deregulation, conservation advocacy groups perceived the multiple land-use model being developed on Crown land as "multiple abuse" (Brooking and Pawson, 2002 or Young, 2004) and "state-sponsored vandalism" (Bührs, 2000: 33). Increasingly, however, questioning has surrounded whether multiple use, integrated land management, was a more balanced model of land use, compared to the alternative approach embedded within the split methodology of tenure review.

Le Heron and Pawson (1996) highlight how liberalisation has had a profound impact on diverse landscapes. The consequences of neoliberalism on rural and cultural landscapes has been a growing multidisciplinary interest nationally and internationally, associated with issues including:

1. Global integration of industrial and agricultural production and marketing through information technology (Goodman and Watts, 2013; Held et al., 1999).

2. Deregulation of markets and increased mobility of internal and global capital (Harvey, 2000; 2005).

3. Increased interconnection of local and regional communities with networked global society (Castells, 2000); Second Globalisation and "Second Modernity" (Giddens, 1990); sped up social relations and time-space is compressed (Harvey, 2000; Massey, 2005).

All are agreed to have major impacts on local cultural landscapes, which have remained resilient over long durations, such as the high country (Brower, 2009). As a distinctive cultural landscape, the high country is currently undergoing transformation, due in part to tenure review. However, overall, tenure review is complex because it is a tool for mediating between multiple claims and interests.
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Appendix 2b

Constructing wilderness by erasing human histories – Yellowstone National Park

A number of Native American tribes made seasonal use of the land allocated to form the Yellowstone National Park, however, the band of Eastern Shoshone known as the ‘Sheepeaters’ had resided permanently in the Yellowstone region for around 11,000 years (Merrill, 2003).

Ferdinand Hayden was not the first to propose the Yellowstone’s creation as a National Park. However, he was the park’s most passionate advocate, and in 1871 completed a full geological survey. Hayden’s ideology advocated the need for “setting aside the area as a pleasure ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people” (Merrill, 2003: 208). ‘The people’ were an elite subsection of white American population who could afford access to such distant nature spaces.

Recognising the Yellowstone to be a “priceless natural treasure” (Merrill, 2003: 210-211), Hayden argued that if protection was not legislated and enforced; “the vandals who are now waiting to enter into this wonder-land, will in a single season despoil, beyond recovery, these remarkable curiosities, which have required all the cunning skill of nature thousands of years to prepare” (ibid.). As a result, Indian tribes left the region under assurances of a treaty negotiated in 1968 that was never ratified. The tribes were excluded from the National Park, removing them from the localised cultural and livelihood connections.

This instigated the violent history to the park’s establishment in order to support the ideals of elite urbanites that sought retreat to a nature free of human influence. This history of injustice remains often unrecognised. The social potency of protecting nature, and the contemporary benefits of national parks such as Yellowstone, discursively erases the lingering impacts of reforming ‘purified nature’.
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Appendix 3a

Study Information Sheet

The Contested Place of Tenure Review in New Zealand’s High-Country

INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS

Thank you for showing an interest in this research project. Please read this information sheet carefully before deciding whether or not to participate. Thank you for considering this request.

What is the Aim of the Project?
The New Zealand high country has significant value and meaning to the people who live and work there. Tenure review of high country pastoral leases has been a controversial issue, and media coverage has depicted antagonism between high country rural and conservation interests. This coverage has at times created a polarity that shadows the complexity of issues faced by the high country community and I wish to explore this further.

What Type of Participants are being Sought?
I am seeking to interview landowners and other high country people who have perspectives regarding tenure review and the conservation of the high country more broadly.

What will Participants be Asked to Do?
Should you agree to take part in this project, you will be asked to participate in a relaxed interview, at a time and place that suits you. The interview will seek to explore your views on tenure review and conservation of the high country. Please note that you will be kept anonymous within the analysis and may decline to answer any particular question or withdraw from the interview at any stage.

What Information will be Collected and What Use will be Made of It?
The data collected will focus on the various ways that the farming community values the South Island high country. Information will cover personal opinions and attempt to establish shared perspectives and innovative ways of understanding the high country as I lived and worked landscape. The data will take the form of notes and an audio recording of the interview if you permit. The information gathered will be used to write a thesis for the completion of a doctoral (PhD) degree in Geography.

What if Participants have any Questions?
If you have any questions about this project, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact either;

Ben Payne
Department of Geography
University Telephone No.: 03 479 3767
Email psybed479@student.otago.ac.nz

Associate Professor Michelle Thompson-Fawcett
Department of Geography
University Telephone No.: 63 479 8762
Email mf@geography.otago.ac.nz

Thank you for your consideration.
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### Summary of participants and coding identifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant no.</th>
<th>Organisation/Role</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Coding Identifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male landholder – older generation (recently retired)</td>
<td>Rangitata Gorge</td>
<td>Male Landholder 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female landholder – older generation (wife of 1)</td>
<td>Rangitata Gorge</td>
<td>Female Landholder 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Male landholder – older generation</td>
<td>Rangitata Gorge</td>
<td>Male Landholder 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female landholder – older generation</td>
<td>Rangitata Gorge</td>
<td>Female Landholder 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Male landholder – younger generation (son of 3 and 4)</td>
<td>Rangitata Gorge</td>
<td>Male Landholder 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Male landholder – older generation</td>
<td>Rangitata Gorge</td>
<td>Male Landholder 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Male landholder – Older generation (recently retired)</td>
<td>Rangitata Gorge</td>
<td>Male Landholder 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Male landholder - younger generation (recently moved back to run) (Son of 1 and 2)</td>
<td>Rangitata Gorge</td>
<td>Male Landholder 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Male Landholder – younger generation</td>
<td>Rangitata Gorge</td>
<td>Male Landholder 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Male Landholder – older generation</td>
<td>Rangitata Gorge</td>
<td>Male Landholder 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Female Landholder – older generation (wife of 10)</td>
<td>Rangitata Gorge</td>
<td>Female Landholder 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Male landholder – younger generation</td>
<td>Ashburton Gorge</td>
<td>Male Landholder 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Female Landholder – younger generation (wife of 12)</td>
<td>Ashburton Gorge</td>
<td>Female Landholder 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Male landholder – older generation</td>
<td>Ashburton Gorge</td>
<td>Male Landholder 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Female Landholder - older generation</td>
<td>Ashburton Gorge</td>
<td>Female Landholder 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Male landholder – older generation</td>
<td>Ashburton Gorge</td>
<td>Male Landholder 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type of Landholder</th>
<th>Gorge</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Male landholder – older generation</td>
<td>Rakaia Gorge</td>
<td>Male Landholder 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Male landholder – older generation</td>
<td>Rakaia Gorge</td>
<td>Male Landholder 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Male Landholder – older generation (Parent of 12 and 21)</td>
<td>Rakaia Gorge</td>
<td>Male Landholder 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Female Landholder – older generation (wife of 19, parent of 12 and 21)</td>
<td>Rakaia Gorge</td>
<td>Female Landholder 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Male Landholder – younger generation</td>
<td>Rakaia Gorge</td>
<td>Male Landholder 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Female landholder – younger generation (wife of 21)</td>
<td>Rakaia Gorge</td>
<td>Female Landholder 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Male landholder – younger generation</td>
<td>Rakaia Gorge</td>
<td>Male Landholder 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Female Landholder – younger generation</td>
<td>Rakaia Gorge</td>
<td>Female Landholder 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Male landholder – older generation</td>
<td>Arthurs Pass/Torlesse</td>
<td>Male Landholder 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Female Landholder – older generation</td>
<td>Arthurs Pass/Torlesse</td>
<td>Female Landholder 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Male landholder – older generation (absentee owner)</td>
<td>Arthurs Pass</td>
<td>Male landholder 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Newcomers to high country landholdings**

#### Domestic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type of Landholder</th>
<th>Gorge</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Male Landholder</td>
<td>Rangitata Gorge</td>
<td>New Landholder 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Male Landholder</td>
<td>Ashburton Gorge</td>
<td>New Landholder 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Male landholder</td>
<td>Ashburton Gorge</td>
<td>New Landholder 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Female Landholder (wife of 30)</td>
<td>Ashburton Gorge</td>
<td>New Landholder 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Female landholder</td>
<td>Arthurs Pass</td>
<td>New Landholder 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Male Station Manager</td>
<td>Arthurs Pass</td>
<td>Manager 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Male Station Manager and primary worker</td>
<td>Rangitata Gorge</td>
<td>Manager 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### International

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type of Landholder</th>
<th>Gorge</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Male Landholder (absentee)</td>
<td>Rangitata Gorge /Ashburton Gorge</td>
<td>Int. Landholder 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Female Landholder (semi permanent)</td>
<td>Rangitata Gorge</td>
<td>Int. Landholder 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant no.</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Coding Identifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Male Landholder (semi permanent) (husband of 36)</td>
<td>Rangitata Gorge</td>
<td>Int. Landholder 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Male Landholder (absentee)</td>
<td>Arthurs Pass/Coleridge</td>
<td>Int. Landholder 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Male landholder</td>
<td>Arthurs Pass</td>
<td>Int. Landholder 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Female Landholder</td>
<td>Arthurs Pass</td>
<td>Int. Landholder 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Male landholder</td>
<td>Rakaia</td>
<td>Int. Landholder 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Male landholder</td>
<td>Rakaia</td>
<td>Int. Landholder 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Male landholder</td>
<td>Queenstown</td>
<td>Int. Landholder 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Female landholder</td>
<td>Queenstown</td>
<td>Int. Landholder 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Male landholder</td>
<td>Wanaka</td>
<td>Int. Landholder 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key informants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant no.</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Coding Identifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Former landholder now manager for an international interest</td>
<td>Queenstown</td>
<td>Key Informant 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Male Landholder. Prominent member of high country community and high country accord.</td>
<td>Wanaka</td>
<td>Key Informant 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Former landholder and prominent member of Federated Farmers.</td>
<td>Timaru</td>
<td>Key Informant 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Male landholder involved with Fish and Game and hunting access lobby.</td>
<td>Ashburton</td>
<td>Key Informant 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Female Landholder with involvement in landcare groups.</td>
<td>Rakaia</td>
<td>Key Informant 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Retired landholder</td>
<td>Tekapo</td>
<td>Key Informant 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Conservation Actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant no.</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Coding Identifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Department of Conservation</td>
<td>Male area manager</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>DOC manager 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Department of Conservation</td>
<td>Male area manager</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>DOC manager 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Department of Conservation</td>
<td>Male area manager</td>
<td>Otago</td>
<td>DOC manager 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Department of Conservation</td>
<td>Male area manager</td>
<td>Twizel</td>
<td>DOC manager 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Department of Conservation</td>
<td>Female manager</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>DOC manager 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Male employee</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>DOC employee 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Male employee</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>DOC employee 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Male employee</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>DOC employee 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Female employee</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>DOC employee 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Male Manager</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Fish and Game manager 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Female employee</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Fish and Game employee 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Local member and advocate</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Forest and Bird advocate 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Local member and advocate</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Forest and Bird advocate 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Regional authority Manager</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>ECan Manager 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Regional authority Employee</td>
<td>Timaru</td>
<td>ECan employee 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Local authority Planner</td>
<td>Timaru</td>
<td>Planner 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Local authority Planner</td>
<td>Ashburton</td>
<td>Planner 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Legal Prominent lawyer</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Legal rep.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Legal Representative for high country community in several cases.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal rep.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Consultancy Landscape architect</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>Landscape architect 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Consultancy Landscape architect</td>
<td>Queenstown</td>
<td>Landscape architect 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Consultancy Landscape architect</td>
<td>Wanaka</td>
<td>Landscape Architect 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Consultancy Grasslands ecologist</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>Grasslands ecologist 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Consultancy Landscape ecologist</td>
<td>Mackenzie</td>
<td>Grasslands ecologist 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Consultancy Grasslands ecologist</td>
<td>Peel Forest</td>
<td>Grasslands ecologist 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Consultancy</td>
<td>Liaison between DOC/LINZ and landholders in tenure review</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Tenure review liaison 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Consultancy</td>
<td>-Landholder</td>
<td>Rakaia Gorge</td>
<td>Tenure review liaison 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Liaison between DOC/LINZ and landholders in tenure review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Consultancy</td>
<td>Land valuer</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>Land valuer 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Consultancy</td>
<td>Land valuer</td>
<td>Timaru</td>
<td>Land valuer 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Prominent lawyer</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Legal rep. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>High country legal rep.</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>Legal rep. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>Former speaker of the house at time of CPLA</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Political informant 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Walking Access NZ</td>
<td>Walking Access Commission</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Access Commision rep. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Regional authority</td>
<td>Liaison with local land care groups.</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>ECan employee 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Personal communications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christchurch.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Ethical Consent Form

The Contested Place of Conservation in New Zealand’s High-Country

CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPANTS

On signing this consent I have read carefully the information sheet concerning this project and understand what it is about. All of my questions have been answered to my satisfaction and I am comfortable participating in this research. I am aware that I am free to request further information at any stage.

I understand that:

1. My participation in this project is entirely voluntary;

2. I am free to withdraw from the project at any stage without disadvantage;

3. Audio files and transcripts will be destroyed at the conclusion of the project, except any raw data on which the results of the project depend will remain in secure storage for five years, after which it will be destroyed as per the University of Otago’s research policy;

4. This project involves an open-questioning technique, therefore the exact nature of questions are not predetermined prior to the interview. In this way the interview is free to develop with individualised inquiry, however I am aware that if the interview develops in such a way that I feel hesitant or uncomfortable answering questions or discussing issues that I deem to be overly sensitive, I can decline to answer question(s) and/or withdraw from the project without any disadvantage.

5. The researcher is well aware that being a controversial issue, some information may be sensitive. If at any stage I am uncomfortable answering questions or discussing a particular issue there will be no pressure placed on me to answer the question. In this situation I can chose to discuss the next point or remove myself from the interview.

6. At every stage during the extent of this project stringent precautions will be taken to protect the anonymity of myself as the participant and the confidentiality of material discussed with the researcher.

7. I agree/disagree to be audio recorded (please indicate by circling one).

I agree to take part in this project.

(Signature of participant) ............................................................... (Date) ...............................................................  

(Signature of researcher) ............................................................... (Date) ...............................................................
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Interview Schedule: Farming participants

Your personal perspective – values and the landscape

1. What do you value about the high country?
   Prompts - I guess what I am getting at is – what draws you to live and work up here?

2. What do you see as necessary to retain these aspects you value?

3. What is your vision for [property name]? How do you see it in 25, 50, 100 years time?
   Prompts - In terms of economic growth? Protecting areas of it? How do you see the future of your station?

Transition

4. Are there different ways of looking at the landscape?
   Prompts - through a political, social, economic kind of lens? How do you think of the landscape?

5. What has changed in the time you have lived in the high country?

6. How dynamic is the high country environment?
   Prompts - Will the high country be understood in a different way in 50 to 100 years time?

7. How have your values and attitudes changed?

Conservation

8. What are your opinions of high country conservation?

9. How do you understand or value the landscape and its conservation?

10. Do you consider your knowledge of this environment would be useful for conservation?

Tenure review

11. What are your experiences/opinions of tenure review?
    Prompts - Why have you maintained your property under pastoral lease? Or, why did you volunteer for tenure review?

12. What do you think tenure review has sought to achieve in the region?
    Do you agree with these objectives?
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Interview Schedule: Conservation participants

**Institutional role**

1. What is your role within [organisations name]?
2. What have been the complexities within tenure review?

**Your personal perspective – values and the landscape**

3. What do you value about the high country?
4. What is necessary to retain these values?

**Conservation Parks in the region**

5. What do you this the vision for the [name] Conservation Park is?
6. Is there a clear understanding of what retired land in the upper Rangitata, Ashburton and Rakaia basins will success back to?
7. Do the various stakeholder interest groups value high country space differently?
8. Do landholders understand the Department of Conservation's vision? And do they recognise the biodiversity and ecological value that exists in this high country region?

**The conservation of the South Island high country.**

9. What are your opinions of land tenure review and the status of high country conservation more generally?
10. There is a body of literature that suggests ecological protection is attracted to the idea of excluding people and use of nature. What is your response to this?
11. Does high country conservation and agriculture work together?
12. Rather than separating between production and protection values are there alternative approaches?
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Appendix 4a

Box 1: The benefits of pastoralism – ‘low intensity’ and ‘more sensitive’

Quotation 1
The sheep have protected the landscape, kept it in balance and kept the weeds down…. The pastoral lease regulated that low intensity more than any other approach can (Male landholder 2).

Quotation 2
It has always been a more sensitive approach [to farming] especially when compared to what’s happening with intensification … traditionally I think farmers have had it in mind to protect the land and not farm too hard, but technology changes, it allows more intensive use and more money inputs mean more outputs and taking (DOC Manager 2).

Quotation 3
The lease controlled us, we had to farm the land sensitively … part of the Land Act was understanding the land as friable… it was eroding and it was seen that farming that land in a protective way was beneficial which is disagreed with now, but I think many people would agree that lighter grazing has protected the land, it would have no value if early practices continued … the land was pretty wrecked (Male landholder 10).

Quotation 4
There has always been an understanding that if you look after the land, it will look after you (Female landholder 5).

Quotation 5
… from the integrated land management in the 80s tenure review has been a major step backwards. There is not integration, it’s [land uses are] all just separated (Landscape ecologist 3).

Quotation 6
A result of tenure review to date has been that land is either conservation or farmland. There is not sensitivity for mixed categories or integrated land use (Grasslands ecologist 1).

Quotation 7
… dividing the landscape with [tenure] review is behind losing the natural and cultural heritage of the high country. . . the pastoral lease was more sensitive and in-tune with the environment (Female landholder 8).
Box 2: Custodianship, tensions and competing values

Quotation 1

**Interviewer:** Do high country conservation and agricultural interest values and understand the high country landscape differently?

**Participant:** Undoubtedly yes... the conservationist sees some sort of preconceived vision of what it was some time ago... but what time period they are thinking of, I am unsure... was it 18000, 1400 or 1200? But the sad thing is that both conservationists and farmers see themselves as custodians (Female Landholder 3).

Quotation 2

They are individuals, but they are farmers . . . it is all about economics, they are managing land from an economic point of view and they’ve gotta make hard calls… so although many see themselves as custodians or stewards, I don’t think so at times (DOC Manager 6).

Quotation 3

… the goal is to maximise profit. They are farmers, they always have productive and economic gain in mind, there are always trade-offs (Landscape Architect 3).

Quotation 4

**Interviewer:** Are their different values between conservationists and farmers?

**Participant:** There always will be won’t there, I mean DOC are not profit driven at all. Until now, they haven’t had to be. It is an ideal world they live in, and the more extreme the greenie the more idealistic they are. Luckily some of the local management team are a bit more practical. They realise the properties have to be productive, it rests on a question that should be put across at a national level as to whether the public want productive custodianship or preservation (Recent Landholder 2).

Quotations 5

**Interviewer:** Is there an agricultural conservation interest?

**Participant:** What are you meaning by conservation?

**Interviewer:** You tell me.

**Participant:** Talking to me personally... in terms of agriculture and the continued use of high cellulose vegetation for ruminants... it is not even an issue from an agricultural perspective... It is a continued issue as a form of herbage. It is a personal issue in terms of... that is how I remember it... in one of my opinion pieces I question... how much is enough? I mean, every bit of land is significant to someone... that is the gate I jammed my finger in when I spotted the first hieracium plant on the home farm... and next door was the only plant of a rare species that I had ever seen... every land is significant to someone... so basically DoC and tenure review... operating with basically an open cheque book could take everything they valued, but it was valued by others (Male landholder 5).

Quotation 6

There’s certainly subjectivity to conservation, which is a tension [between us and others] … There’s a difference between belief or value... I am deeply interested in the conservation of species, particularly one member of it... me. Also because of my values system... I’m certain that I’m worth more than a sheep... but I was equally certain that a sheep was worth more than a black stilt...

I have come to the particular way that I view it … but there are a range of ways. (Grasslands ecologist 1).
Box 3: Ideas of identity and nationalism.

Quotation 1

It is said that it [the landscape] is an important part of the cultural history and identity of New Zealand, but it’s a bit trite … in no other industry in New Zealand would people be expected to continue in a system that is out-dated and inefficient … a lot of this land can be put to much better use, and I guess that being here… living here you recognise that because in my experience, you don’t stop to take in the view that often… the views that are part of nationalism and identity are also productive and should be kept productive (Male landholder 10).

Quotation 2

I think that the potential to manage the landscape in the national interests has gone with the pastoral lease because it [tenure review has broken up the land… but it is certainly not as possible in the past just because district plan rules strictly regulate where building and subdivision can occur but there is no broader view with managing the landscape as something that is really valuable for national identity.

Are you familiar with Plan Change 13 in the Mackenzie Country? … It really restricts development to nodes and anything in between is discretionary. In fact there is even suggestion that it should be non-complying. So it is pretty difficult to do any subdivision outside of those nodes and that has not gone down too well with landowners in the Mackenzie. There is some merit in that approach but I don’t 100% support it because I think that it is not a landscape based approach, it has no higher-level strategy or objective about what that landscape means from a perspective of national value. It is about preventing things happening. I mean it is done by a Landscape Architect who came up with the policy with the [landscape] values in mind but I think there are probably other areas apart from the nodes that were identified where there could be some development. I just think that Plan Change 13 was a little bit kneejerk, a little bit prescriptive, concrete and restrictive and that alienates people (Landscape Architect 1).

Quotation 3

My background first, I was bought up in the high country on a sheep station, on the shores of Lake Pukaki, hence my love of the high country and my familiarity with it. It has shaped me, it is who I am and I am passionate about its landscapes and communities. However, I also think that the continuation of the landscape is important to New Zealand, it is important that we have the heritage of the high country as a piece of our identity, but sadly, we have transformed it now… the farming as making money has over taken the family ethic at times I think… and also, the protection of nature values. (Landscape Architect 3)

Quotation 4

It’s from the national perspective that the high country needs to be looked at … its values and meaning … the economic value of destination high country and the mystique and brand that evokes… but often that is done in a way that alienates local people … seen as not managing the land properly (DOC employee 4).

Quotation 4

There really has to be a debate on land use… putting preservation and conservation as a land use… versus anything else… There really is the need for a National discussion on how much land should be allotted to the preservation and conservation state. I will throw down a figure… no more than 20% of New Zealand should be in conservation estate in any shape and form… it’s already at 34% and increasing with tenure review (Male landholder 4).
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Appendix 5a: International landholders

There were many complexities that emerged from interviewing 11 international landholders, several of whom were married couples, others had property in the case study region and in high country regions beyond. Unfortunately there is not sufficient breadth to go into depth with regard to international ownership within the current study. However, various issues are identified below, which could be developed in further research.

By way of overview:

Some international interests/investors within the high country have been long-term residents and committed community members. Others are very short term and transient staying for minimum amount of time required by the Overseas Investment Commission or in order to avoid paying New Zealand taxes.

Speaking with international owners exposes diverse values and visions for high country properties. For example, Mutt Lange who has been mentioned elsewhere in the thesis was respected as an exceptional example of international ownership, with his focus of public access tracks and restoration of ecological values on Motutapu, Glencoe, Mt Soho and Coronet Peak stations near Queenstown. However, other participants spoken to, especially in DOC and other New Zealand lessees, felt it was problematic that such huge amounts of land could be passed to international control.

Valuations were certainly not mutually exclusive, but international landholders did hold attachments to particular value dimensions identified in Chapter 5. Some international participants held developmental values for example, with the development of Forest Creek Station in the upper Rangitata valley into a large-scale conifer forestry operation by Canadian owners. A significant level of complexity arises with this however. For example, tensions emerge where forestry, as a renewable resource and also a carbon sink is currently supported by the State within the Emissions Trading Scheme. However, undertaking this development within what many claim to be an outstanding landscape area, was highly contested.

Other international landholders were captivated by the cultural stories of the high country, as well as seclusion and privacy. Plus New Zealand is a secure place to invest due to a stable political system and with an encouraging overseas investment approach with the current National government. However, many had the capital to maintain and invest in restoration projects and intensive fencing of waterways, as two prominent examples.
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**Box 1 - Participant A – Female Landholder**

This participant reflected deeply on the subjectivity of her values. Being raised in a small West Coast coal-mining town had influenced her worldview markedly. She stated, “I saw a lot happen on the Coast and I have always had a huge belief that someone has to speak up for the land, we are transforming the land so rapidly with our use … it is out of control”. Following studies in resource management, she married into the high country, onto a relatively small but fertile property that has historically been entirely freehold. On several occasions she illustrated clear values for indigenous ecology, stating as examples: “we must protect what’s left”; “everything I do is to maintain and enhance the integrity of the indigenous ecology”; “my strongest guiding principle is to protect indigenous biodiversity”.

However, having arrived in the region with self-proclaimed, “fairly high brow conservation ideals”, the participant was interesting in a theoretical sense because of the direct way that she reflected upon feelings of hypocrisy and internal contradictions as she negotiated her values for high country space. “I am a fence sitter, I am a very grey person, I certainly don’t have black and white values, and they have become greyer as time has gone on, related to our lifestyle, the difficulties of farming here”, she argued. I questioned her about whether she identified herself as a high country farmer or a conservationist and she stated, “I see myself as a hill country, intensified property farmer, or the wife of one, yeah I do”. She then qualified that she has changed her points of view on a lot of things, a tempering and internal negotiation of her perspective. Comparing the vision for the property to that of her husband, she believed that he was much more development focused. “There are huge amounts of compromise for us both” she stated, “it is a balancing act and sometimes we battle, but I would like to think we keep each other honest”.

In her opinion, their situation has meant that economics tended to override her green ambitions as a smaller, front hill property, with fertile and relatively flat layout. However, she believed that with businesses on smaller scale properties that are often more economically marginal, “money overrides conservation” and “where there isn’t a drone like me natural values do not get a great deal of consideration”. Her perspective also explained how the masculine drive to develop was in her opinion a pertinent element of the high country as a historically masculine landscape, and the wish to perpetuate ‘masculine productivism’ if pervasive. “[Y]oung men want to be as productive as possible and follow in the footsteps of their fathers” she asserted, highlighting distinct connections to Bourdieu’s examination of habitus and the reinforcement of conventional social praxis.

Importantly, each of these reflections highlight how worldview is relational and personally embodied, in the sense that it is the foci of internal negotiation as the participant reflects on particular discourses and influences that nuance their understanding of a context through a relational dialogue within themselves and between place and others.”
Box 2 - Participant B – Landscape Architect

Growing up in the Clutha Valley as a run holder’s daughter, the participant believed her knowledge, attitude and values began with early experiences. Farming, understanding the biodiversity and what she described as being “the modest farming” approach under the pastoral lease, she perceived to have established a deep love and connection to the high country. She explained how her father was a “very conservative farmer” and he would never cultivate land that had not been already, but did over-sew and top-dress with fertilisers. While no longer a resident in the high country she has maintained a lifelong connection to the region – “it shaped”, and as she explained has become “part of me”. She valued the stasis of the traditional pastoral system as a more balanced land management approach.

The participant’s university studies focused on botany, ecology and zoology and landscape architecture. The Hon. Robert Muldoon presided as Prime Minister during the early period of her career in farm advisory, and she explained resenting Muldoon and the destructive incentives/subsidies his National government applied for “production regardless of the consequences” and a scheme “all about quantity not quality”. She voiced disgust at the amount of clearance that occurred during the Muldoon era of the late 1970s and 1980s. A period of politics, which she referred to in a way that highlighted the extension of social capital, attached to a narrow concept of production in the national good with the need for farmers to be as productive as possible, at whatever environmental cost as the “lifeblood and backbone of the [national] economy”. When these subsidies were lifted with neoliberalisation, a dimension of competitiveness and market efficiency amplified the need to be highly productive and efficiency driven, extending production focus. In the participant’s opinion, the current generation of farmer continues to grapple with understanding an alternative order for high country space. For so long politics and social understandings have emphasised the social and economic importance of “production at all costs”.

She argued that tenure review was yet another production focused policy set to erode New Zealand’s rural landscapes. She felt this to be especially evident with the current National administration, downgrading the RMA and cutting conservation funding and employment, illustrative of reduced state impetus for environmental protection. As an avid labour supporter, she advocated the Nature Heritage Fund approach to the outright purchase of high country property for conservation purposes, rather than the patch approach manifest in tenure review.

Broad worldview position

Overall, a range of influences shaped a broad landscape philosophy and worldview that encompassed a holistic range of landscape dimensions. A landscape understanding “rounded off” through exposure to a complex range of sources, and what she views as a balancing act between a strong value for high country farming and communities and also, value for “what is special” in terms of the regions indigenous ecology and landforms.

Importantly, the participant’s values were not mutually exclusive, but were complexly intertwined. This assertion is summed up in the quotation that follows, analysing the overlap and intertwining of values, where the participant expressed:

I value a lot of things. I value the nature of the high country, the culture of the high country, the natural and cultural heritage, the lifestyle and its distinctiveness in New Zealand and the world. The country is so diverse, I mean I come from the warmest and driest high country, but there are parts that are quite wet and wooded. We were on the range and basin country, blocks and flat top mountains, and that is very different from the steep scree slope country at Ben Macleod [Rangitata] and Glenfalloch [Rakaia] up here. I also value the recreational values, the values of the ecology, landforms and the indigenous flora and fauna. But I also value farming, I have a connection with it, I love merinos.
Box 3 - Participant C – Male Landholder

Economically driven, Participant C was the only participant who discussed secure tenure as a “hard won democratic right” and “the hallmark of democracy”. In doing so, he justifies a developmentalist attitude towards high country space. Development and irrigation represented vibrancy, prosperity and the improved financial position of landholders. His advocacy for accepting an integrated, hybrid landscape emerged from a suggestion that the irrigation and transformations occurring within the landscapes of the Mackenzie Basin adds a new and interesting layer of social meaning. To him, development and irrigation represented vibrancy, as it demonstrated prosperity and the improved financial position of landholders.

However, a sense of paradox emerged from the participant's narrative, illustrative of a disjoint between attitude and actual praxis. The participant for his home valley, the Rangitata, advanced the value of the traditional heritage attached to the pastoral lease. This historical connectivity was evoked when discussing the vision for his family property, as having “Samuel Butler written all over it”, with value in his family maintaining the property as a traditional, horseback managed station. This is depicted in the detailed quote from his narrative:

... to me, it is a [farming] system that is more in tune with the environment. My vision has got Samuel Butler written all over it. That in 1860 he came here to run sheep, we are now in 2012 and I am still running sheep. I see real heritage value in us continuing to run this property as a genuine, high country pastoral run, summer country, winter country, the traditional autumn muster, we are so traditional here, we don't use helicopters. We just walk and ride horses. It is challenging at times, it is economically tough, but I think that there is value in the traditionally high country run.

Theoretically, this identifies the complexities that are inherent in personal worldviews, and the dilemmas that are embodied and negotiated at a personal level. He also advocated the integration of the landscape and the different elements that make the space socially meaningful in different ways:

... when I look at the Ahuriri [valley], the mountain tops are special, the bush is special, the terraces with the tussock grassland going to the river are special, the pockets of woody vegetation, together it is an integrated landscape that is special. Similarly there is value to small homestead nestled into the backdrop of the mountains. I see both native and exotic forests, both in their own patches and they are integrated. Irrigation for people faced with drought is also valuable and to them it fits, it is integrated.
Appendices

Appendix 7a

Laurie Prouting’s speech at the DOC opening of the new conservation park which included part of the ex-Mesopotamia Pastoral lease 22.4.09

Greetings and welcome to our patch

Samuel Butler took up the lease of this property in 1860 off the “waste lands board” and named it Mesopotamia, he farmed it for four years, doubled his capital and shot through. My father managed the property for Bob Buick who was the overseer appointed by the National Bank after the then owner Sir William Nosworthy went broke through snow storms and a plague of rabbits. My father was a dynamic person, he dealt the rabbit a mighty blow from which they did not recover and he kept the pressure on, he built a new woolshed, homestead, built a bridge over Forest Creek and constructed five mile of new road from that bridge to the homestead, built protection works on the banks of the Rangitata River to protect the flats, helped pioneer topdressing and over-sowing and deer farming, worked to get a school built, was instrumental getting the power up the gorge, followed by a new telephone line as the old earth working line would not cope with the new power lines running alongside, we have worked hard and with a passion to keep the property going forward. I remember people asking my father what his secret to success was, his answer “that he was the first owner/manager since Samuel Butler” and after that just hard work.

The property has been farmed now for nearly 150 years producing 75,000kgs of wool per year, plus sheep meat plus beef from 400 cows and more recently deer, this to us is real produce that can be readily traded for overseas funds, sadly today and during the past nine years production has been, according to the last administration, a dirty word. It is only now that the world seems to have hit a banking snag that the population have realised that there is not much nutrition in a promissory note and some of them are not worth the paper they are written on, I think very soon we will hear the word production reappear.

Believe me, as a family we did not want to give up one square centimetre of land and tenure review was far from our mind, it was not until our government paid $10,000,000 for Birchwood station that I knew the writing was on the wall, we had two options, one to do Tenure Review or go broke. We negotiated long and hard with the crown for a fair deal, we were devastated by some of the submissions of the various organisations like the Forest and Bird Society, Hugh Barr and the likes sitting in their comfortable armchair firing shots from a distance, trying their best to discredit us, we were thankful for the serious input and fairness of both Mike Cuddihy and Mike Clare, I am sure that if it was not for their patience and understanding that the outcome could have been much different. Mike the comment that appeared in one of the newspapers about Malcolm saying “this Tenure Review was a deal done with the devil” don’t worry I think it was a she devil he was referring to.

After saying this I would like you to look around at the scenery, the country side, even the photo on the invitation that DOC sent to you and ask the question “has this farm suffered under 150 years of farming” I think not, the Native bush that we see on the front of Sinclair and up Bush and Birch stream is in pristine condition and expanding, there are
no wilding pines on the parcel of land going from Mesopotamia leasehold back to the Crown, there are no rabbits, very few deer, the thar are under good control, there is no broom or gorse, no Wallabies, no wild pigs, I challenge DOC the new guardians of this land to maintain the status quo.

As a family we feel squeezed between DOC on one hand, who are already in control of a third of the land area of the South Island and want more and on the other hand the wealthy overseas buyers who come out here with a Million dollars, exchange that for two million as they walk in and compete with the NZ young farmer for farm land. Labour government’s last salute before they left office was to go out on a shopping spree and paid $40 million of tax payers money for St James station saying it was now in New Zealander’s hands for all time, I wouldn’t be too sure about that, I think a few decades down the track some administration could very well sell a chunk of Fiordland to the Americans or Chinese to get the country out of the an economic disaster, WATCH THIS SPACE.

There are some people I would like to thank, Janine Sidery for your human face in those grey walls of the new DOC office, for your cheerful, helpful advice and your bright eyed approach to filling out the many forms of concession documents, Janet and Chris of the Geraldine office have been nothing but courteous and helpful, George Hadler, thanks for not being too bossy up to now and we trust you will continue to be a good neighbour in the future, Alasdair Ensor and Meredith Lowe for your very professional advice, to my own family Malcolm and Sue for putting up with the stressful times of the seemingly never ending negotiations of this Tenure review, Neroli and Harley for all their support not forgetting my wife Anne and grandchildren Grace, Ella, Fergus and Pieta.

Over to you George.
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A tabulated summary of current land use and transformations happening on properties within the case study region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Arthur's Pass</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cora Lynn Station</strong></td>
<td>Smaller property, therefore relatively low viability. Under the property’s current management, balance is being sought between semi-intensive pastoral farming and ecotourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grasmere Station</strong></td>
<td>Grasmere is a historically significant high country property, but holds large flat lands under freehold ownership. Over the last three years the current owner, Peter Morison has attempted to obtain consent to irrigate these flats, which have been previously irrigated. Morrison’s proposal was declined following a series of heated hearings. ‘Grasmere Lodge’ is an exclusive, luxury lodge nearby, but is operated separately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Craigieburn Station</strong></td>
<td>University of Canterbury Leasehold. Significant coniferous forestry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flock Hill Station</strong></td>
<td>University of Canterbury/educational Lease. Managed by a Kiwi couple, Richard and Anne Hill. Three men hold the lease, one is American, and the other two are New Zealanders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avoca</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Woodstock</strong></td>
<td>Foothills type property. Freehold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Castle Hill</strong></td>
<td>Is a prominent high country property that is notable for the limestone formations, which historically were included within the lease. It is a very harsh, high altitude and dry property. Castle Hill went through the process of a pseudo-tenure review, when DOC was looking for a partnership in the management of the land left over from division. The property, which was significantly reduced in scale recently underwent restructuring, focused on production by securing contracts with companies to supply wool, and the mystique of Castle Hill provides marketing cache. Some intensification and development has been undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brooksdale</strong></td>
<td>Foothills property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mt Torlesse</strong></td>
<td>Foothills property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benmore</strong></td>
<td>Foothills property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Right hand bank of Rakaia Gorge</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Manuka Point** | An interior property, which has had a succession of owners, including foreign investors.  
- 7,400 hectares;  
- 1,700 merino ewes, 2,300 merino wethers;  
- 300 deer (fallow and red);  
- Hunting lodge has 93% overseas clientele;  
- 180 concrete trucks in convoy for lodge construction, furthest that concrete has ever been carted in New Zealand. |
| **Mt Algidus** | Historical property. Mona Anderson wrote “A river rules my life” (1963), an account of her life at Mt Algidus. The river is the Wilberforce, a beautiful braided river, at times underestimated for the torrents of water that charge down the upper catchments of the Rakaia River. A sequel, “The good logs of Algidus”, appeared in 1965.  
An Australian national who lives full time on the property currently owns Mt Algidus. However, the property has a history of change over, for it is a notoriously difficult property to farm profitably. |
| **Glenthorpe** | Owned by an international landholder, who has undertaken done some intensification, but has also made considerable effort with fencing off waterways and wetlands. His motivations are to develop the low rolling country, which is stipulated in the Overseas Investment Office (OIO) agreement to purchase. For a foreign national to obtain ownership of a high country block they have to provide a farm plan and strategy that specifies how the property will be ‘improved’, with emphasis
tending towards productive improvement. For example, how the stocking capacity will be improved and overall benefit New Zealand through intensification and development, to make a property more profitable in terms of productive exports and contribution to GDP and other areas in terms of contributing to job numbers.

It is necessary for the prospective overseas purchaser to show how they intend to improve or maintain profitability and productivity. However, this is potentially a conflict with a broader interest in retaining the high country in a particular way or in terms of encouraging more sensitive production attitudes. For example, Mutt Lange has followed a completely different trajectory of ‘development’ on Motutapu, Mt Soho, Coronet Peak and Glencoe stations, which diverges away from conventional productivism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lake Coleridge</th>
<th>Absentee New Zealand owner – domestic capital.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Oakden</td>
<td>Foothill type property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hill</td>
<td>Foothill type property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleridge Downs</td>
<td>Foothills type property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Ben</td>
<td>Foothills country – historically freehold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic absentee owner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Rock</td>
<td>Foothills type property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Left hand bank of Rakaia Gorge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glenfalloch</th>
<th>A historical pastoral lease established by and still held by one branch of the Todhunter Family. Now operating in conjunction with Upper Lake Heron Station another Todhunter property, as a farm as well as accommodation, conference facility, tramping, heli-ski and adventure tourism operation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,900 hectares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,500 ewes and replacements (2,500 perendale, 1,000 merino),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>310 cows, 290 other cattle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Double Hill</th>
<th>Pastoral leasehold, and a property held long term within the family. Hutchison property, originally held by the Ensor family, but an Ensor daughter married a Hutchison.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,950 hectares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,800 perendale cross ewes, 2,300 hoggets,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>550 cows and 120 replacements, 300 other cattle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glenariffe</th>
<th>Has completed tenure review, and subsequently changed in scale of operations dramatically.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>850 hectares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,500 Romney ewes and replacements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150 cattle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glenrock</th>
<th>Operated as an intensive, irrigated crop farming operation on alluvial flat land. This has been allowed on the pastoral lease. The property has diversified with visitor lodgings for fly-fishing, jet boating and access to the Te Awaroa Trail between the Rakaia and Hakatere valleys.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>340 hectares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growing wheat, barley, peas, turnips and kale, plus some stock grazers (sheep and cattle).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cottage and cook shop available for holiday accommodation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glenaan</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,035 hectares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,700 merino ewes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,400 merino hoggets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>600 romney ewes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 cows and 100 replacements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redcliffs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,985 hectares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,200 merino ewes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400 halfbreed ewes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,900 hoggets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200 cows and 180 young cattle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleardale</th>
<th>Historically freehold. An intensive operation with central pivot irrigation on the flatland terraces of the Rakaia River.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,280 hectares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,500 ewes and 1700 hoggets, 250 cows plus replacements (Merino, English Leicester, half-bred and Angus Cattle stud).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 hectares of cereal crops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Hutt</td>
<td>A large deer farm. Entirely freehold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 3,000 hectares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 3,000 hinds, 2,000 velvet stags, 3,000 replacements and trading stock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 200 cows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Hill</td>
<td>- 2,700 hectares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 4,500 crossbreed ewes and 900 replacements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 50 cattle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburton/Hakatere Basin</td>
<td>Retained as pastoral lease. Diversification into tourism with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Lake Heron</td>
<td>- 20,000 hectares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 5,000 merino ewes, 2,500 replacements, 2,500 wethers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Arrowsmith</td>
<td>Currently in the tenure review process. Yet to be concluded. Some diversification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 9,000 hectares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 5,500 ewes, 3,000 hoggets, 2,000 wethers (merino).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 400 Angus cattle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 700 deer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clent Hills</td>
<td>No longer a leasehold property due to Nature Heritage Fund purchase. This process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 5,900 hectares incorporating land purchased from Barossa Station tenure review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 15,000 merino sheep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 600 Angus cattle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 600 deer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barossa</td>
<td>This property recently completed tenure review and Barossa now ceases to exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 900 kWs power station in conjunction with Mainpower. 400 hours equivalent of power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 520 grazing dairy heifers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 900 kW power station in conjunction with Mainpower. 400 hours equivalent of power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Annual rainfall 675 mm at Castle Ridge compared to 1000 mm at Barossa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Rangitata/Lake Clearwater valley</td>
<td>Historically significant pastoral lease that is currently within tenure review negotiations. Currently operates as a semi intensive property, and a breeding stud for draught horses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erewhon</td>
<td>The property has completed tenure review, relinquishing most of the original leasehold property to the Department of Conservation and retaining 1200 hectares of freehold land. The bulk of this is productive and fertile flat lands on the edge of the Rangitata River, which is irrigated and grazed intensively. However, Mt Sunday, a roche moutonnée sits independently within the middle of this flat land. It is an interesting geological formation that became a significant setting for the Lord of the Rings trilogy, on which city of Edoras was constructed with majestic views up to Mt D’Archie, the Lawrence and Potts Rivers. For this, reason it is a tourism attraction in the area. The back country of Mt Potts was set up as a back country ski field with the use of snowcats, instead of rope tows or chairlifts to access terrain. This evolved into Helipark NZ, a semi-guided pay as you go heli ski operation in a controlled environment that was the first of its kind in the world. In 2004, the immediately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Potts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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previous owner, Dewsbery, started Southern Alps Heliski to offer private charter heli-skiing in the Two Thumbs range. Subsequently in 2011 Alexandre Germanovitch, a Russian-British magnate purchased Mt Potts and closed Helipark to undertake an extensive refurbishment as a tourism destination.

### Hakatere

Farmed as one unit with Mt Possession Station - 20,000 hectares in total. Major transformation and juggling of land with the Nature Heritage Fund purchase of Hakatere in order to form the central piece of the Hakatere Conservation Park. The Harper Range is now largely controlled by DOC.

- 9,500 halfbred ewes and replacements.
- 750 Angus cows plus replacements.
- 2,500 deer.

### Mt Possession

Operates as a combined unit with Hakatere Station. Originally, Mt Possession was a university lease, which has similar regulations but is different to a perpetual pastoral lease. A large amount of land surrounding Lake Clearwater is public, but land on the other side of the Hakatere Clearwater Road has been freeholded with tenure review.

### Inverary

Historical property. Intensified flats. Low intensity tops. Foothills property with generally good rainfall and climatic gradient (especially on the flats). A DOC participant referred to the current landholders, the Chapman’s as managing the property as how an “old time high country farmer” would do so, and understood the property to be “beautifully looked after” for a property that could be much more intensive.

The property was under tenure review negotiation, but the lessees removed themselves from the process.

- 4050 hectares.
- 6,500 Perendale ewes.
- 2,000 hoggets.
- 600 Angus cows.
- 250 other cattle.

### Tenehaun

This property, which backs onto Mt Possession and Inverary, has completed tenure review. Considerable land taken off them during tenure review but is fertile foothill country and is intensively managed. Several participants believed that a property such as Tenehaun and Inverary should have been entirely freeholded as productive units, because there was very little value for DOC to manage. But in both cases, values were negotiated. Issues with tenure review were clear where trying to divide such properties as ecological values were diffuse throughout. As a landholder stated, “but LINZ tried to take something from everyone, it wasn’t strategic and they got a mixture of pieces and pockets”.

### Mt Somers

Held by the Acland family since 1860s. Has long been operated as a relatively intensive farmed unit.

- 3,800 hectares.
- 10,000 romney ewes, 3,000 hoggets, 2,000 merino wethers.
- 3,000 deer.
- 850 dairy cows.
- 200 cattle.
- Owners also own and operate Staveley Store and Farm Shop.

“I’ll just a farm now, a large intensive farm” argued one landholder, referring to the current setup of Mt Somers Station, illustrating categorisation as a production unit, and the distinction between land and values previously within the leasehold, now under DOC control.

Mt Somers was pastoral lease, but a very long time ago. Under the run plans the mountain was surrendered, back to the Crown. The Aclands gave it back because at that time they did not graze it and therefore thought it best be in Crown ownership. Retrospectively, it would have been more advantageous to have waited for tenure review and received the pay-out “for what the land became worth with tenure review”. However, due to this surrendering of the mountain, a lot of Mt Somers station has historically been freehold.

The earlier surrendering of land from the lessee is analogous with tenure review. Mount Somers was Class 8 land, land that was non-grazeable and therefore, retired (Catchment Board run plans – fenced off and taken from production the highly fragile lands (class 7 and 8), and encouraged the topdressing and over sewing
of the less fragile land to compensate. Hence, the run plans were not dissimilar to tenure review because it has resulted in retiring top country. However, tenure review was argued by some to be less strategic as run plans focused on land capacities for different uses. A percentage of Class 7 and 8 land that was retired under the run plans is now in freehold subsequent to tenure review. So for example, on Mt Peel on the Coal Hill gullies, there is a fence at the bottom where the original run plan excluded this land from grazing, it was put in as a 50/50 share fence between the Crown land commission and the landholders to have minimal grazing of the fragile land. At the top of the hill, the fragile and eroding gulley is included in the freeholded pastoral landholding, because that is where LINZ foresaw it as most convenient to locate the fence. Shows complete contradiction between one set of policies and tenure review. Undermining the efficacy of previous land management strategies, on a matter of political convenience and motivation and a conservation logic requiring division.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winterslow</th>
<th>9,000 hectares.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Run in conjunction with owner’s 215 hectare farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3000 perendale ewes and replacements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150 trading cattle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edendale</td>
<td>940 hectare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,500 deer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500 cattle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mesopotamia**

Tenure review complete, leading to some transformation of the remainder of Mesopotamia Station. Examined in detail within Chapter 6.

**Forest Creek (and The Tui)**

Forest Creek and the Tui were originally part of the Mesopotamia Leasehold. These properties since this time have been freehold, and are currently owned by Canadian interests who have accumulated both runs under the name of Forest Creek and are developing extensive forestry over the property, and have retained pastoral farming over some areas.

**Ben Macleod**

Retained as a pastoral lease. Greater return farming it as a low cost, low risk property, as well as maintaining it’s cultural heritage. The property has been diversified into hunting operations. From a family perspective, a neighbouring landholder believed it was a very bad decision for the current landholders to not take the tenure review opportunity. He stated, “they should’ve gone into tenure review, taken a cheque for 5 million, secured the future of the family and closed up Forest Creek and the Ben McLeod Range [which was understood as some of the most easily erodible country in the region]”. Ben Macleod was the one property argued to have required tenure review. However, this identifies a particular argument, that for landholders for whom tenure review offered advantage, it was undertaken and completed. For others properties, where there was less obvious advantage, they have often been retained under pastoral lease.

**Rata Peaks**

This property has not been volunteered for tenure review and is retained as a pastoral lease. There was an unusual deal undertaken with the Crown originally, where by the property destocked the tops in exchange for groins being installed in the Rangitata River to protect the flat lands on the river valley. This is now seen as negative, and that land should not have been taken out of grazing.

**Stew Point**

A domestic, absentee owner owns the property. It is retained as a pastoral lease, but within the parameters of this lease, the property has been diversified into an extensive hunting estate with a luxury lodge. Perceived by a neighbour as in “better shape than it ever has been” and “well looked after” in a productivist view. Stewpoint and Coal Hill are each landholdings that have been leased/managed together for the past approximately 40 years. As single properties they are both uneconomic, but when operated together, they are an effective unit.

**Coal Hill**

Assumed into Stew Point.

**White Rock**

- Long terms absentee International ownership.
- New Zealand managers.

Along with Waikari Hills below, was originally pastoral lease, but was subsequently converted into a small grazing run and then freeholded.
Pastoral leases in the foothills could be reclassified as small pastoral runs on a stringent grounds that there were no signs of erosion, poor farming practices, evident in the land being in good productive condition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waikari Hills (see below)</th>
<th>Freehold. Bought in 1972 by the Acland family as a small grazing run, and the property was converted to freehold incrementally over the subsequent decade.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt Peel</td>
<td>Mt Peel has completed tenure review and subsequently freehold. Today it operates in conjunction with Waikari Hills, as one entire freehold property. Approximately 7000 acres went to the Crown with tenure review, 7000 acres was retained by the Acland family as freehold. With the 3000 hectares of Waikari Hills it is a combined property of 10000 acres. So in fact, tenure review resulted in a zero sum cost to productive land and therefore capacity. The family received a substantial payout for the land ceded back as 3000 hectares didn’t match the 7000, which freed up capital for succession and investment. The Crown they basically drew a line at 3000 feet, 7000 hectares went back. High altitude was not grazed anyway. Lochaber haven’t gone into tenure review, so basically, tenure review has just extended the paddock size of Lochaber dramatically, because the sheep can still graze what is theoretically DOC land, because there is nothing to stock them, even though the Crown put significant expense into demarcating where Mt Peel finished and the DOC estate/Lochaber station begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klondyke</td>
<td>Klondyke, an original pastoral run is now a large dairy unit, but is on flat land on the opposite side of the Rangitata River to Mt Peel Station. The property has been intensively developed for a long period of time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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