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Introduction

1.1 Outline

Societal change begins when the perceptions of an individual or a group are altered. A change in perception can lead to conflict if not all members of a society hold the new belief at the same time. This study looks at how the resulting conflict can be resolved, particularly in relation to changes in land management.

Conflict in land management is rooted in interactions between people, and between people and their environment. In New Zealand an important cause of conflict is related to the development of National Parks. There are two main issues within this:

1. The development of National Parks involves a change in land use from private to public.
2. For some, the sole purpose of a National Park is environmental protection while others see recreation as important.

These differing views lead to the need for continuing debate as the patterns of land use change. Through this debate we can resolve the more immediate areas of concern in terms of land management while remaining aware that there will be new issues in the future that require further consideration.

The aim of this study is to look at these areas of concern and related issues in relation to changing land management practices and conflict resolution.
in Abel Tasman National Park (ATNP) over a 140 year period: from 1855 to 1995.

Prior to the formation of ATNP people would talk about “going down the Bay” as the area did not have an official name (Moncreiff 1965). For convenience the name ATNP will be used to describe the area over the entire period of this study, although the Park proper was not gazetted until 1942.

1.2 Themes of Study

1.2.1 The Public Ownership Debate

In New Zealand, as in other countries, there is need for land to be publicly owned and there are important reasons why this should be the case. The creation of public land can be linked to scenic and conservation values. Land is made public for these two reasons if it is deemed to have natural values of such importance or beauty that it must be preserved for present and future generations to enjoy. Land is also preserved for its historic value so that the population of a country can have access to the heritage of their forbears.

The creation of publicly owned land is linked to the idea of public good. The development of the ATNP and the Tonga Island Marine Reserve (TIMR), as considered in this study, illustrates the conflict between those who believe in the importance of public goods and those who want to protect their individual rights. A public good is an item that is freely available to all, or which the citizens of a defined territory have equal access to (Johnston 1994:487). ATNP is an ‘impure’ public good because it is located at a fixed locality (Johnston 1994:487) making it easier for local residents to gain access than those people who live outside the immediate region, although all have equal rights to its use. National Parks are in the state’s care because preservation of natural areas would not occur to an adequate degree under private provision in the eyes of today’s society (Auld 1983:258).

When TIMR was set up in 1993 there was widespread support for it (Taylor 1992:1) although there was disagreement over where it should be situated.
People agreed that a reserve would be beneficial, but no one wanted it next to their land, an expression of the NIMBY (not in my back yard) problem which dogs many new public and private proposals. There has also been a growth in private enterprise within the park and this could lead to conflict between the entrepreneur and the greater public if it is seen as exploitation of a public resource for private benefit.

The problem is that when land is set aside for public enjoyment conflict almost always occurs. This conflict springs from the fact that when land becomes public for the good of the majority there are negative effects for the local minority. This is particularly so if the land which became public belonged to individuals who are now dispossessed.

In the past, the New Zealand 'way' has been to let the anger which comes out of issues such as these to fester in the community. The only way people had to cope with such problems was to block the proposal before it went ahead. If this did not work the local community could adapt to the new situation and come to accept it. A more likely scenario is that community's anger about the event will become part of the memory of the community. If this anger grows over time, or if the proposal is not accepted, the community might react in the only way it can see remaining to it: through violence. This reaction may be sparked off by a particular event or be the result of gradually mounting pressure. At present, an example of this can be seen in Tahiti where the growing desire for independence in some parts of the community has led to an explosion of violence sparked by nuclear testing.

In New Zealand there has been a change in the population,s psyche. As a people we seem now less willing to allow the problems of our past drag down our future. An example of this is the attempt by both Maori and Europeans to address The Treaty of Waitangi. In 1975 the Treaty of Waitangi Act was passed which ratified the use of the Treaty which in the past had been ignored in New Zealand's legal process. It also set up the Waitangi Tribunal which is the prime means of giving effect to the Treaty. The 1975 Act and its extension of the Tribunal's jurisdiction under the Treaty of Waitangi Amendment Act 1985 mean that land tenure matters arising before 1975 and right back to 1840 can be investigated (Brookfield 1989:15). Socially we are also making an effort to bridge our differences with this year being Maori Language Year. The present National
Government has even attempted to ‘fix’ the entire history of colonisation with one lump sum payment so that New Zealand can move into the future without the problems of the past. Such a long and complicated issue could not be resolved in such a simple manner, yet both ‘sides’ continue to try and clean up this old wound.

The ways of addressing the problems of the past are varied and involve letting those in some way affected by the development of an area of public land remain a community free of anger about past events. The easing of these feelings can come from compensation, perhaps in monetary terms, although money will never replace the spiritual link that many people have to land they were once connected with. Another form of compensation can involve the replacement of land taken away with new land, preferably near the previously-owned land and of similar environment and value. Another important step is to make a formal apology which acknowledges the detrimental effects on the community due to the removal of the land and eases feelings of resentment in a way that cash alone may not do. A recent illustration of this in New Zealand is the desire expressed by the Tai Nui people for a formal apology from the Queen to go with the physical return of their land.

In some cases the negative effects on a private community of the removal of land for the collective good may actually outweigh the benefits. If this occurs the decision has to be made whether to continue with the proposed development of public land or not.

1.2.2 Conflict Resolution

The process for resolving these problems is called conflict resolution. This topic will be considered once the term ‘conflict’ has been defined. Conflict, in The Dictionary of Human Geography (Johnston 1994:85-86) is “a situation involving struggle between two or more protagonists”. Morton Deutsch, an authority on conflict resolution, says that conflict exists “when incompatible activities occur” (Deutsch 1973:10). He believes “conflict, is usually about one or another of several types of issues” (Deutsch 1973:15): control of resources, preferences and nuisances, values, beliefs and relationships between parties (Deutsch 1973:15-16). Coser (1956:8), in his study of Simmel’s work on Conflict, defines social conflict as “a struggle over values and claims to scarce status, power and resources in which the
aims of the opponents are to neutralise, injure or eliminate their rivals". While Simmel sees conflict as a way "to resolve divergent dualisms, it is a way of achieving some kind of unity, even if it be through the annihilation of one of the conflicting parties" (Simmel 1955:13). The final definition given here comes from Bercovitch (1984:125 in Durkin 1988:19) who defines conflict as "a perception of incompatibility between two or more actors and the range of behaviour associated with such perceptions". In the present study it will be shown that conflict occurs between those who assign different values to, and have different beliefs about, the resources of the ATNP and how they might be dealt with.

1.2.2.1. Sociology and Conflict Resolution

Bercovitch (1984:125 in Durkin 1988:19)) argues that conflicts need to be managed, as "their non-resolution tends to be dysfunctional for the system in which it occurs, especially when conflict behaviour becomes destructive behaviour". Resolution involves the resolving of conflict but the resolution of one conflict is often the basis of a new one. There is often a continuous cycle of conflict and conflict resolution, with new conflict building on the resolution of old conflicts. This view is supported by Johnston (1994:85), who states that much of what geographers study results from conflict, and the outcomes all too often provide the context for further conflict. The German philosopher Hegel proposed that an idea, which he called a thesis, is normally challenged by its opposite or antithesis. From conflict between the two comes synthesis. This synthesis later becomes the thesis which could face a new challenge by another antithesis (Sligo 1990:10). This illustrates how change is continuous, an idea also supported by Barrows (1925) who stated that for the geographer "the only permanent thing is change".

In an ideal world conflict could be predicted and resolved before it took place. But as we know, this is rarely the case. In fact, if this did occur we might not find that the world is a better place. Sociologists believe that conflict is often what ties people together. Without a common enemy or problem to face, what need is there for a community to come together? It is by overcoming adversaries that groups form a common bond. For this reason Simmel and Coser looked at the functions, rather than the dysfunctions, of social conflict. Simmel's central idea in his study of conflict is that "conflict is a form of socialisation" (Coser 1956:31), while
Park and Burgess (Coser 1956:20) rank conflict among the few basic forms of human interaction. Coser (1956:8) goes on to say that "far from being a 'negative' factor which 'tears apart', social conflict may fulfil a number of determinate functions in groups and other interpersonal relations". This is not to say all conflict is good. Certain forms of conflict are destructive to group unity and may lead to their disintegration. In total there are sixteen propositions in Simmel's work which show the basic functions of social conflict (Coser 1956). These propositions include the group-binding functions of conflict, conflict with out-groups and how conflict establishes and maintains the balance of power.

From this discussion it is possible to see that the sociologist's interest in conflict has revolved around its functions. In today's society it is planners who look most at conflict resolution.

1.2.2.2. Planning, Mediation and Conflict Resolution

The general expectation of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), which is New Zealand's leading legislation in relation to resource management issues, is that it will attempt to resolve resource issues, particularly through the use of mediation, before they develop into serious conflicts. Resource management is concerned with the process of adjusting (mediating) between the different perceptions people hold of the environment. One of the conflicts which comes out of this is between those who want resources for private gain and the issues of social responsibility and public consensus (Durkin 1988:18). Due to this, there is often a need for the state to become involved in conflict resolution. The state is frequently called upon to arbitrate in conflicts and to identify and ensure a resolution. The state also has the right to restrict individual freedom in order to promote what is identified as the 'general good' (Johnston 1994:86).

For these reasons there are provisions in the RMA for pre-hearing meetings so that problems can be solved through mediation before getting into a lengthy legal process (Ali Memon pers. comm.). In New Zealand, this use of mediation to resolve disputes about the environment is recent (Durkin 1988:2) but its importance is becoming more recognised.
Mediation is a particular type of negotiation process in which a neutral party is used to communicate between the principal parties until a consensus is reached (Durkin 1988:29). Both mediation and negotiation can be used to resolve a dispute. This study has looked at areas where negotiation and mediation have been used as methods for conflict resolution as in the case of the Marine Reserve issue. There are also several areas where the use of these processes may have lead to an easier resolution of conflict, an example of this is the 'Bach Issue'. In future these process, and improved communication in general, will be of use in the areas of land tenure and Park commercialisation.

If negotiation is used there are four principles which should be followed for positive conservation-development debate. These are:
* separation of people from the problems;
* focus on interests rather than on positions;
* generation of a variety of options before deciding which to follow;
* final decision which is based on objective criteria (Norton and Roper-Lindsay 1992:24)).

If the mediation process is used it will have to satisfy four major and interrelated pre-requisites if it is to be effective. These are:
* recognition by all parties of the need to negotiate;
* each group should have enough power and influence to stop one group from taking over the mediation process;
* each group should see settlement as a matter of priority (Durkin 1988:31);
* each group should recognise the need for, and be prepared to make, reasonable compromises (Durkin 1988:32).

It is important to remain aware that dispute resolution through mediation is only possible when the parties involved recognise their dispute is one of 'right against right' (Durkin 1988:31).

1.3 Summary of Issues

Many of society's conflicts relate to how land is used (Johnston 1994:81), which in turn relates to Deutsch's concept of conflict rooted in resource
issues (Deutsch 1973:16). This relates to the conflict now facing the ATNP - conservation versus recreation - with the growing awareness that environmental stability is under threat (Johnston 1994:86) due to the exploitation of natural resources. This has lead to the twin issues of conservation and preservation becoming a source of conflict at all spatial scales (Johnston 1994:86). In this study it is being looked at on a regional scale.

Conflict between those interested in conservation and those individuals who want more recreation in National Parks, reflects different perceptions of the environment. 'Perception' is a person's 'world view'. One area in which human perception has altered in recent decades is the way we view the environment. Park states that perceptions about the natural environment are changing faster than ever before. It was these changing perceptions that lead to the development of ATNP and which were the springboard for the creation of the TIMR.

In summary it can be stated that theories of conflict, conflict resolution - in particular negotiation and mediation, and changes in perception as well as the issue of public good and individual rights in relation to land management are the basis for this study.
Abel Tasman National Park (ATNP)

2.1 Why Study Abel Tasman National Park?

The establishment and history of ATNP was selected for this study for the following reasons:

* my personal knowledge of the area, having lived in the Tasman region for over fifteen years.
* the importance of both the land and sea in this area, particularly the special environment which comes from the meeting of these two elements.
* the profound changes in land tenure which have occurred in this area over its history.
* the growing interest amongst Maori in the area and the changes which may spring from this.
* the growth of tourism in the area as New Zealand comes to depend more on tourism for economic well-being.

The over-riding reasons for choosing ATNP are its long period of human occupation and its history of major changes in land use and land management. These changes have lead to conflict and to both destructive and constructive resolutions as people’s perceptions about land management change. This makes ATNP an ideal area to review themes discussed in the Introduction.
2.2 Physical Features of Abel Tasman National Park

Abel Tasman National Park is located in the northwest corner of the South Island, thirty five kilometres west of Nelson. Its coastal boundary separates Tasman Bay from Golden Bay. This coast line stretches eighty kilometres from Wainui Bay in the north to Sandy Bay in the south and includes eleven estuarine zones and seven islands. It is composed of sandy beaches, granite rock or limestone as at Taupo Point. The National Park extends 2.41 kilometres out to sea but does not extend below mean high water line (Davidson and Preece 1990:64). It is approximately 22500 hectares (Davidson 1992:2) in area.

Granite, the dominant rock in the Park, was slowly upthrust 12 million years ago during the Rangitata orogeny (Dennis 1990:140, Davidson 1992:3) and is part of the Separation Point Batholith. This part of the Park is relatively young in comparison with the inland marble belt which began its history on the ocean floor some 500 million years ago (Dennis 1990:140). The inland boundary of the Park is marked by the Pikikiruna range.

The dissected landscapes of the park ranges from sea level to 1134 metres (Mt Evans). Numerous fresh water streams and rivers flow through the park and into estuaries and inlets along the coast.

Massive modification by humans has damaged much of the original vegetation cover. Despite this Silver, Red, Black, Mountain and Hard Beach have their niches in the park (Esler 1962:299). Small patches of Podocarp/Broadleaf forest, which used to occupy most of the river valleys up to 300 meters, still retain an understorey of nikau palms, tree ferns and supplejack (Esler 1962: 300). There are also patches of manuka, kanuka, bracken and gorse outside the forested land. There is an area of subalpine vegetation at Moa (Moor) Park (Dennis 1990:113) in a small depression high in the Park’s centre dominated by red tussock (Esler 1962:302). It is this wide range of environments in a relatively small area which makes the ATNP so attractive to recreationists and conservationists.
FIGURE 2.1: Location Map of Abel Tasman National Park
2.3 Early History of Conflict

This section outlines the history of conflict and conflict resolution along the ATNP coast line before 1855. This area is part of the Northern Te Wai Pounamu (NTWP) region which covers the north of the South Island (Barber 1995:iii). According to Barber (1995:82) the Early Period of occupation of NTWP began around 1000 AD and lasted until 1500 AD; the Middle Period extended from 1500 AD to 1769 AD; and the Late Period was from 1769 AD to 1850 AD (Barber 1995:83). The tribal history for the area comes from oral records, which must be viewed with care. This is because the number of tribal invasions in the area has affected the oral history’s survival as has the later influence of Europeans (Barber 1995:76, Challis 1978:7). These invasions were by North Island tribes displaced from their lands (Challis 1978:7). Published European descriptions of the tribal sequence in the area vary, although they have many points of similarity. The following description was collated from a variety of sources, chiefly those which seem best supported by independent evidence.

In 1937 J. D. Peart published the following sequence in Old Tasman Bay (Challis 1978:7). The earliest known tribal group were the Ngaitara, who were succeeded in the 17th century by the Ngati Tumatakokiri, believed to be the tribe involved in the clash with Abel Tasman’s crew in 1642. During the 18th century the Ngati Tumatakokiri were partly subjugated by the Ngati Apa. The latter tribe’s history is described by Barber (1995) in Culture Change in Northern Te Wai Pounamu. In the early 19th century an invasion from the southern North Island, lead by the Ngati Toa warrior-chief Te Rauparaha of Kapiti, devastated the tribes of the northern South Island (Barber 1995:75). Resident populations were killed, enslaved or displaced. This invasion has been dated variously at 1827, 1828 and 1831. Barber has chosen to date the event in the late 1820s (Barber 1995:76).

The invasion involved an alliance of lower North Island iwi who mostly shared traditional descent from the Tainui waka. The Tasman Bay area was attacked by a group under Te Puoho of Ngati Tama. The tribal groups resident along the ATNP coastline were displaced by Ngati Tama, Ngati Rarua and Te Ati Awa (Barber 1995:76).
This process of conflict and then destructive conflict resolution in the prehistory of ATNP is the start of a long period of change which was to face Maori and European populations in the area. In the past 140 years there has not been a time without conflict over land of one kind or another along the coast, although the processes for resolving it have changed.

Early conflict in the area was more than between tribes. It was also between Maori and the first European explorers. The first European to sight New Zealand was probably the Dutchman Abel Janszoon Tasman (Host 1976:14) aboard the flagship ‘Heemskerck’ and accompanied by the ‘Zeehaen’. It was on the 13th of December 1642 that the land which was to be known as New Zealand was sighted (Host 1976:15). On the 16th of December the ships anchored between the Tata Islands and Whariwharangi Beach (Dennis 1990:12), on the edge of what was to become ATNP. On the 19th of December a serious clash between the Maori occupants of the Bay and the European visitors occurred. The history of this conflict is only recorded from the European side, because the oral history of the tribe thought to be involved, the Ngati Tumatakokiri, disappeared after invasion by other Maori tribes.

The ‘Heemskerck’ and ‘Zeehaen’ sailed from the area that day, and the next known European explorers were not to reach the country for over one hundred years. Captain James Cook arrived in 1769 (Host 1976:23), but did not sail along the ATNP coastline. It was not until 1827 that Dumont d’Urville, the French explorer who spent several days charting the ATNP coastline, arrived. His descriptions give us the best early picture of the area but even this should be assessed with care because sporadic European contact occurred between the departure of Abel Tasman and the arrival of d’Urville (Barber 1995:75).

D’Urville’s account is a good description of the local environment and its people and he is generally considered the true European discoverer of the Abel Tasman coastline (Dennis 1990:98). D’Urville’s dealings with the local Maori population were friendly and there seems not to have been conflict between them, although his visit coincided with a period of major tribal upsets. The main European impact, and the resulting conflict, was to come with the arrival of the first permanent settlers in 1855.
3

Methodology

3.1 Information Sources

The information which forms the basis of this dissertation comes from a variety of sources, as the topic has contemporary and historical aspects. This variety of sources also means that the themes of this study can be looked at from different angles.

The introductory material relating to the themes of the study comes from the wider literature. This particularly includes material from sociology and planning on the topics of conflict resolution and mediation. The data on the pre-European Maori population is from such recognised archaeological sources as Challis (1978) and Barber (1995), and from the journals of early explorers like d'Urville. The basis of Chapter Four, the early European settler's land conflicts and the recent move to recreation in Abel Tasman National Park (ATNP), also comes from secondary sources. Host's (1976) *The Enchanted Coast* was of use here, supported by the work of Dennis (1990) and Moncrieff (1965). Chapter Four also draws on information from the Abel Tasman Oral History Project (ATOHP) transcripts. The origins and usefulness of these transcripts will be considered more fully later in this chapter.

The remaining chapters draw on a variety of sources including those already mentioned, in particular the ATOHP transcripts. Secondary sources are also used, notably documents published by the Department of Conservation (DOC) which contain formalised information about ATNP and the Tonga Island Marine Reserve and articles from the *Nelson Evening Mail*. These articles are from the 1940s and like all reporting may
contain some bias from the writer a factor which needs to be kept in mind. A final source of information came from interviews with people holding key positions in relation to the Park. These people could give more recent personal views and if they worked for an organisation its most up-to-date information. This involved identifying key information holders including people from DOC in Nelson, Takaka and Motueka, as well as a representative from Abel Tasman National Park Enterprises (ATNPE). An interview was carried out with a bach owner who has a private enclave in the Park and who was not interviewed in the ATOHP. The interviews followed the format of a formal set of questions, with a dictaphone used to record the answers. Similar questions were used for each interview, and covered a range of topics to obtain opinions from different angles on each topic. These topics were chosen to illustrate the themes discussed in the introduction in the study area.

3.2 Transcript Analysis

The year 1992 was an important one for ATNP. It was the 350th anniversary of Abel Tasman's visit to New Zealand in 1742 and the 50th anniversary of the Park. Due to this DOC, which now administers the Park, decided to record conversations with people who had an intimate knowledge of the area. This survey is referred to as the Abel Tasman Oral History Project (ATOHP). These recordings add to the factual history of the area and record the emotional and spiritual relationships of the people interviewed to the area (Jones 1992: 1).

The interviews also:

* record changes that have taken place in the area.
* provide a history of the changing attitudes amongst residents.
* provide observations on the history of management in the park.

The interviews were recorded by Ian Jones of DOC in Nelson in 1991. They were not in the form of structured interviews, but were rather monologues of each person's involvement with the area over their lifetime (Jones 1992: 2).

In total, twenty eight transcripts were recorded from twenty nine individuals. These are held in unprocessed form by DOC in Nelson. The participants were mostly born in the early 1900s, so were in their late
sixties, seventies and eighties at the time. Seven of those interviewed were women, one of whom described herself as Maori, while the remaining twenty two were European males. Ten of the interviewees had lived on farms in the area, 16 had baches along the coast, one had been a member of the Park Board, and two had been rangers. Most of the interviewees had moved into or near towns in their later years and many mentioned missing the Park.

I have taken these transcripts and used them to make myself aware of, then to illustrate, the different conflicts involving the ATNP. The transcripts have been used in this dissertation in the form of quotes as a numerical content analysis would have been difficult due to the unstructured nature of the interviews. Despite this it was still possible to see repeated themes within the transcripts. Sometimes these themes were explicit while in other cases they were less explicit. Some examples of the theme which came out of the transcripts are as follows. There was strong community feeling about the removal of the baches from Park land, particularly in the way it was carried out. There was a common concern about depleting fish numbers and how this should be dealt with. There was also an interest in the future development of the Park with the growth in private enterprise and the increase in visitors, especially from overseas. Quotes from these and other important conflict areas have been used in the different chapters to illustrate how people who know the area best - its long term residents - felt about the different conflict issues and their subsequent resolution. This reliance on quotations and the verity of other, not necessarily formal sources of information, is in the humanist tradition whose concern is with reflection and understanding of the human condition rather than explanation (Unwin 1992:136). A humanist looks at the world of facts and asks, what does it mean? (Tuan 1976:276). Humanistic geography uses participant observation as a means of inquiry and gathers data which contains meanings ascribed to the world by active social subjects (Smith 1984:356). The strength of this strategy comes from the unique insight it offers into "lay" or "folk" perceptions and behaviours (Smith 1984:357).

Due to the fact that the quotes are in the vernacular they often come across as having mistakes in the written form. They have been left as spoken because they carry a more natural quality. The quotation references from
the transcripts are set out in the following manner: (Initials of Interviewee, Side of the Tape: Paragraph Number).

3.3 Compilation of Maps

The maps in this dissertation were drawn using the commuter program DesignCAD for Windows. The original maps used in this process included Infomap 273-07 Abel Tasman National Park as the base map, and a number of maps from DOC publications to show the various features. These publications are listed in the Bibliography. The 1942 Park outline came from an Official Survey Records map which is stored by DOC in Nelson.
4
The Early Communities

4.1 Maori and European Contact

It would appear strange that after the conflict between Maori and European described in section 1.4, there is not more to report. The fact is that it is difficult to find any record of the local Maori population for this period. They appear to have virtually disappeared from the ATNP coastline, and to some extent this is probably what happened. This gap in our knowledge of late 19th century Maori history in ATNP is partly due to the loss of traditions which occurred due to earlier tribal fighting. The spread of disease in the Maori community, with the arrival of European settlers, also had a serious effect on Maori society (Cobb and Duncan 1980:56).

The published records show that in the 1840s Maori still occupied numerous kainga around the ATNP coast, and these would leave similar archaeological evidence as the older sites along the coastline. Several of these kainga were surveyed out as Maori Occupation Reserves. According to two reports by Davidson (1990:64 1992:88), some of this land remained in Maori possession until the 1860s when the owners agreed to sell it to the Crown. This issue will be looked at in more detail in Chapter Seven.

A woman of Maori descent who took part in the ATOHP can remember visiting her family's land at Whiarakeke as a child in the 1920s:

Then it came down to my grandmother I suppose and then from them to us. (KMM S1:000)
She goes on to say:

In my grandmother’s will she talks about Totaranui. That did belong to us at one point . . . But that was before my time. (KMM S2:360)

Another participant in the ATOHP talks about his grandfather buying land at Wainui at the turn of the century from the Maori (NR S1:300). This suggests that Maori continued to live along the ATNP coast, even though there are few written records about this part of ATNP history.

4.2 European Settlers and the Land

In 1855, the first permanent European Settlement along the Abel Tasman National Park (ATNP) coastline occurred as sections were surveyed and auctions held (Host 1976:83). The sections were designed as farms, as can be seen by the block bought by William Gibbs, the first major landowner in the area (Dennis 1990:401). The farm was 1000 acres and extended from Wainui to Totaranui. Gibbs also held a grazing license for a further 6000 acres extending to the Awaroa River (Host 1976:88). Other large farms were also established at Awaroa (1862), Bark Bay (1870) and Whariwharangi (1897) (Department of Conservation 1995:6). Smaller sections, of about 80 acres each, were sold at a great rate in 1855 especially at Awaroa (Host 1976:103) and other farms were established at Mutton Cove, Wainui, Torrent Bay and Marahau. Today farms remain at Awaroa, Marahau and Wainui on alluvial flats adjacent to estuarine areas (Davidsion 1992:3-4).

Some land was bought for investment, as was the case of Dr Ralph Richardson who by 1858 owned over 25 000 acres in Nelson and Marlborough (Host 1976:109). Other early landuse along the ATNP coast included saw milling at Awaroa, Totaranui and Waiharakeke, boat building at Awaroa and quarrying at Tonga (Dennis 1009:54), but the main economic basis, once exploitable land resources were gone, was farming.

It was this reliance on the land that was to cause problems for the European settlers, and the burgeoning conflict was rooted in the land itself. Due to the granitic nature of the area’s geology, removal of forest led to
rapid and dangerous erosion. This sorry state was not helped by the “match-fire” method of farming once the original forest cover was cleared:

As he walked . . . he always carried a few boxes of matches with him and anything that would burn he light it. (JB S1:305)

As this quote illustrates, the farmer would keep all the woody vegetation burnt off, and in its place grass would be sown. The thin soil covering the granite was now only protected by grass and therefore susceptible to rapid erosion. Due to this the land’s capacity to support intensive farming was short-lived (Host 1976:83). The problems were caused by differences between the perceptions of farmers about the ATNP coastal strip and its ability to support land management practices that had been developed half a world away.

The basis of other local industries in resource exploitation meant that most could only survive for a limited time. The sawmills which operated at Totaranui, Waiharakeke and Awaroa were based on rimu from the hillsides and kahikatea from the valley floors. Today the forest cover of much of this land is regenerating but all large trees have been removed (Dennis 1990:54) as is evident in the following quote:

They used to cut this timber up there. I suppose you can still see if you went up that gully there, where the tramline is. (TB S2:000)

That tramline was used to carry logs down the Waiharakeke stream to the beach where the sawmill was situated (Dennis 1990:54). For the Awaroa mill, which closed at the start of World War One, bullocks were used to pull out the logs (FH S2:425).

It was at the start of the 20th century that once hopeful European settler families of 50 years earlier began to leave ATNP. Early this century the Tonga Quarry was abandoned (Dennis 1990:68) and, while ship building lasted for more than half a century at Awaroa, the timber was largely milled out by the turn of the century which meant that by 1932 a local school was no longer warranted for the much reduced community
As industry disappeared farming decreased in importance, a situation made worse by the Depression of the 1930s:

During the Depression there were four or five farmers just walked off their farms and left it. (NR S1:400)

A Mr Cameron, the last owner of a large block of land at Totaranui originally owned by Gibbs, sold to ATNP in 1948. This was due to the economic depression of the 1930s and the Second World War which had put a stop to farming. When his land was sold it had already regenerated to fern (NEM 7/5/1948, Host 1976:101). In this we can see a combination of social and environmental forces leading to the end of major farming activity on the ATNP coastline.

4.3 The Transformation to Recreation

As farmers began to move out of ATNP, holiday makers began to establish baches in sandy bays. People were attracted to going “down the bay” by the coastal landscape and the solitude. The best description of this period comes from Perrine Moncrieff’s People Came Later (1965). As she notes in her foreword, the subject of her book is a personal account of “the years between the departure of the early [European] settlers and the creation of the Tasman National Park” (Moncrieff 1965:5).

The first to enjoy the recreational potential of the near-deserted ATNP coastline were the yacht people, who used sheltered coves for anchorage, and the campers who set up their tents on beaches. At this time, demand to buy land in the area did not exist (Moncrieff 1965:6). When the Moncrieffs wanted to rent a small piece of land along the coast for a bach they discovered that land was only available in large sections. It was this which Perrine Moncrieff bought in 1936. One of the requirements of the lease was that the occupants “must annually improve the land by burning, fencing or erecting a building” (Moncrieff 1965:8), a clear reminder that the original intent for the land was farming. The Moncrieffs got around this requirement by building a bach.

Later, the popularity of the Bay as a holiday place increased and there was a rush to buy sections. Squatters’ baches sprung up along the coast and
private enclaves at Awaroa and Torrent Bay soon filled up, as illustrated in the Abel Tasman Oral History Project (ATOHP):

During the war Torrent Bay started filling up. That's when a lot of baches went up. (CM S1:530)

The big flush would be just after the war... But there were quite a few houses there by 1939. (JG S1:455)

Today the squatters' baches have virtually disappeared, as the land they were on became part of ATNP, but densely packed holiday villages have since arisen in the middle of the Park on private land. This pressure was well under way by the mid-1960s. As Moncrieff states "We have actually been asked what strings we pulled to obtain the most converted bays in Astrolabe Roadstead and, when we tell them the facts we suspect that we are not believed" (Moncrieff 1965:7).

Today ATNP is one of the more popular recreation areas in New Zealand, especially for the growing number of overseas tourists. Department of Conservation (DOC) estimates put total Park use at around 100,000 per year (Department of Conservation 1993:8) and the numbers are growing. Baches in private enclaves remain popular, and land prices for small blocks of private land are high:

Now there isn't an empty section. If you want to build now, you have to get someone to cut the back off his section... We call the north end of the beach (Torrent Bay) the ghetto. It's terrible. (JG S1:455)

It is likely that if much of the land along the coast had not been made a National Park it would now be lined with holiday homes, spoiling the very environment which people had come to enjoy. The more recent issues raised in this section relating to recreation will be discussed in Chapter Seven on Current Conflicts.
Development of the Abel Tasman National Park

5.1 Park Development

In the late 1800s, land on the Abel Tasman coast first became protected in the form of scenic reserves. The first land gazetted under this protection included Adele and Fisherman Islands in 1895 (Host 1976:80), and Bark and Sandfly Bays in 1897. The Fall River outlet came under the same protection in 1906 (Host 1976:142). Other areas, which also became scenic reserves, included eleven acres surrounding the outlet of the Torrent Bay River, twenty five acres of landing reserve opposite Tonga Island, and 267 acres forming the Rotukura Scenic Reserve between Awaroa and Totaranui (NEMc 1941:4). In 1920-21 large parts of the interior were made into forest reserves (Host 1976:142, Dennis 1990:154). This fits with Stokdijk's division of the history of National Parks in New Zealand into phases. Stokdijk's first (1887-1928) of six phases, was one of acquisition and is characterised by the gazetting of areas for National Parks and scenic reserves. It was the gazetting of scenic reserves in this period which was to provide the basis for Abel Tasman National Park (ATNP). Stokdijk's next four phases cover the period up to 1981. Phases two and three do not have parallels in ATNP as they occurred before and just after the Park was formed. The forth phase which covers the period 1952-c1973 is the time of Park ascendancy, which can certainly be related to ATNP, in fact I would also include Stokdijk's fifth phase of testing (c1973-1981) within this in terms of ATNP. Stokdijk's final phase began in 1981 with National Parks coming under the control of government agencies (Stokdijk 1988:9). I would propose that this stage ended in 1987 when DOC, a new...
government agency, took control of the National Parks so at the present time we would be in the seventh stage of the history of National Parks in New Zealand.

After the gazetting of scenic reserves this is where the matter rested until 1936, when Perrine Moncrieff, who had recently moved to Nelson from England with her family, bought 502 acres at Astrolabe Roadstead and had the area gazetted as a private scenic reserve (Host 1976:142). In 1937, the Lands Department proposed that 35,000 acres of available back country and coastal land should be set aside for scenic reserves (Dennis 1990:154). This idea was picked up by Perrine Moncrieff who was concerned about prospects for forests in the area, especially with talk of milling at Totaranui, Tonga and Torrent Bay. The idea met local resistance until she decided to push for preservation in the form of a National Park. The park idea was linked to the tercentenary of Abel Tasman’s visit in 1942 (Dennis 1990:154).

An article in the *Nelson Evening Mail* (NEM) on 28 June 1941 noted that Perrine Moncrieff had tabled a letter at the monthly meeting of the Nelson City Council (NCC) asking for Tasman National Park to be established on crown land and state forest in the Torrent Bay area. The Park would be 38,819 acres in extent and contain no private property. Moncrieff included detailed information in her letter to the council in support of the idea. One of her ideas was the need to preserve the beauty of the area, as a road would likely run along the coast from Motueka to Takaka, an idea which today would cause outrage. (One of the obligations on the park management would be to let students wishing to write their theses on subjects in the area have facilities and access.) The NCC referred the matter to the Reserves Committee for consideration and to make inquiries about restrictions on the use of National Parks by the public (NEMa 1941:4).

Two days later an editorial in the NEM supported the proposal, stressing the value of the area as a tourist attraction and noting that the land was of little use for farming (NEMb 1941:4). The Reserves Committee produced a favourable report, and the following resolution was passed by the NCC: “The Council heartily supports the proposal for the declaration of Crown lands and State Forest at Torrent Bay, Awaroa and Totaranui as a national park having the title of Tasman National Park” (NEMc 1941:4). The
Council also suggested that in time lands now privately owned or leased would be added to the Park. This was because it was believed the land was of poor quality for farming and the council regretted it had ever been opened for settlement (NEMc 1941:4).

In November 1941, the NEM contained a short article announcing that in the midst of organising the Nelson Centenary Celebrations the proposed Tasman National Park was not being overlooked. A signed petition, organised by Perrine Moncrieff, had been sent to Wellington and was handed to the Minister of Lands by Mr H. Atmore, MP for Nelson (NEMe 1941:4).

On 19 December 1942 the Act was passed authorising ATNP, the name recommended by the Geographic Board. The Queen of the Netherlands became its Patroness (Host 1976:142). The original park was 4000 hectares smaller than it is today. Most of Totaranui and the land north to Separation Point was excluded, along with Waiharakeke, the coast from Awaroa to Tonga Quarry and most of the hill country behind Torrent Bay (Dennis 1990:154). Areas in the ranges to the west were added later (Dennis 1990:155). In February 1943 the ATNP Board was appointed to control and manage the park (Department of Lands and Survey 1986:11). The role which it and later managers played will be discussed in a subsequent section of this essay.

5.2 The Public/ Private Conflict

Although the original boundaries of ATNP only included Crown land, there was early interest in extending the park to include privately owned land. This move began even before the park was formed. "In more prosperous times the board would endeavour to acquire adjustment lands which impinge upon the outskirts of the National Park" (NEMa 1941:4). This desire was to lead to serious problems in the park's development.

5.2.1 The Park Board: Local Control

ATNP was controlled by a Park Board from February 1943 until 1980, when the passing of the National Parks Act led to the Park Board being dis-
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established (Department of Lands and Survey 1986:11). ATNP was gazetted under the 1928 Public Domains, Reserves and National Parks Act which provided centralised administration and management for National Parks (Stokdijk 1988:9).

The Park Board had wide powers and could control all uses and activities in the area (NEMc 1941:4). It included members from Nelson, Takaka and Motueka who already held key positions in the community. The first chairman, Mr Wilkinson, was the Nelson Commissioner for Crown Lands, while other members included the chairman of the Waimea and Takaka County Councils, the Mayors of Motueka and Nelson, the MPs for Motueka and Southern Maori, and the Conservator of State Forests. Other individuals on the Board were Mr Thos Houller, Mr F. G Gibbs and Mrs Perrine Moncrieff of Nelson (NEMf 1943). Because members of the Park Board were well known in the community, people felt they could easily be approached about anything to do with ATNP. A later member of the Park Board said:

I wouldn’t got to town on one occasion when someone wouldn’t buttonhole me and say “what about this” or “what about that”. (TL S3:455)

In the early days the Park Board members were local people from different walks of life. If you had problems you rang the ... local person on the board and you got results. (VH S4:000)

According to its first chairman, the role of the Board was as follows:

The board has been selected as trustees to protect and improve this most historical area for the benefit of this and future generations and by a careful planning of policy to make the park more popular and accessible to the general public without in any way destroying its scenic beauty.

(NEMf 1943)

The original Park Board lacked fixed revenue, and the required money came from subscriptions, donations and grazing leases. No member of the Park Board was paid for service. The Park was tended by Honorary
rangers, chiefly residents who held land adjacent to the Park, and members of the public who frequently visited the Park.

In the first three decades of its history, private individuals in the area hardly noticed its existence:

When the Park came into being it didn’t make any difference, except we wondered what they might do with people’s land. (ISS2:115)

The advent of the Park didn’t really worry us very much because we were a small community of freehold land. (MS S2:510)

Due to a lack of tracks prior to the 1960s (Dennis 1990:155), and the small numbers of visitors using the Park, there was little to make local residents aware that they were surrounded by a National Park. Those who were aware of the Park’s existence evidently gave their support to the Park Board:

In those days when I was on the Park Board there was a tremendous amount of goodwill and cooperation from the local public. (TL S3:455)

This cooperative feeling was to change in the 1970s and 1980s as use of the Park by outsiders increased with improved tracks and a new form of management to control the Park, that of the Department of Lands and Survey

5.2.2 “Bureaucracy Gone Mad”

It was a sad episode that never should have happened. Bureaucracy went mad there for a period of time. (MS S3:000)

The 1980 National Parks Act meant that “administrative control and management of the Parks was transferred to a government agency” (Stokdijk 1988:10). ATNP now had its policy set by the Nelson /Marlborough National Parks and Reserves Board, while the Department of Lands and Survey was responsible for implementation of this policy and administration of the park (Department of Lands and Survey 1986:11).
As management of ATNP was formalised, the local community began to feel that they were no longer part of the process of management. This led to negative opinions about Park managers, which situation was inflamed by the ‘Bach issue’ which developed at this time.

When ATNP was gazetted, some of the land included within the Park had private baches located on it. Some bach owners were squatting on land to which they had never obtained legal rights, whereas other bach owners had rented their plots from land owners who had sold land to the park after 1942. During the management period of the Park Board this problem was generally ignored:

... they didn’t worry us for quite some time. (VM S1:015)

It wasn’t until later on that we got eviction orders and that sort of thing. (VM S1:090)

With a new government agency in control the issue had to be faced. The policy regarding this issue appeared in the Draft Plan published in October 1983 (Department of Lands and Survey 1986:3). In the Abel Tasman National Park Management Plan (1986), based on this draft, the following statement appears:

PRIVATE BACHES
Policy
To have no private baches within the park.

(Department of Lands and Survey 1986:71)

Because the Park was for general public use, private accommodation was deemed incompatible and insupportable in terms of the policies and legislation relating to public land. The Park managers’ rigid policy on this matter was to lead to bitter conflict with residents. Submissions to the proposed ‘Private Bach Policy’, in the 1986 Management Plan mostly
supported retention of baches. These submissions came from affected bach owners and other private individuals. The Commission for the Environment supported the Management Plan's proposal for dealing with the bach problem (Department of Lands and Survey 1986:74-79). Because of purchase agreements when land was sold to the Park, some bach owners were allowed to retain baches on Park land. The permitted occupation period was restricted and all such agreements ended with the death of the occupier, meaning baches could not be sold. One reaction to this problem was:

My friends do say that when I die they are going to have me stuffed and put in the corner with a battery so I can raise my hand. (RW S2:200)

After a long period of wrangling, unlicensed baches owned by squatters were removed during 1986/87 (Department of Lands and Survey 1995:11). One squatter responded by blowing up his bach:

... they said if you don't pull it down we're going to pull it down. So I stripped everything out of it so I put a few plugs and cords around it and lowered it to the ground. (VM S1:455)

Much of the anger surrounding this issue was due to the fact that during the Park's earlier history bach owners had played an important role in caring for the area:

I have to say that they made one serious and selfish error in the management of the Park and that is... destroying the baches that were there. The people were all good workers, helpful, report things and look after things. (MH S4:190)

Another issue which caused much anger in the community was the way Perrine Moncrieff was treated in relation to the bach problem. Moncrieff supported the squatters against eviction, and as her bach was on the boundary of the park she insisted on being seen as a squatter. Because Moncrieff had a high profile in the community, and had helped to found
the Park, many people were unhappy at the treatment she received from the new government agency:

     I was always disappointed with the treatment she got, as she could be regarded as the founder of the Park. (TL S2:215)

It was widely believed that the Moncrieff Private Scenic Reserve would eventually become part of the Park, but on Moncrieff's death it was willed to her lawyer and relation, Richard Fowler. Today this land is not legally part of the Park, although tracks cross it and many people travel them every day. The land did, however, become protected as a Conservation Covenant on 13 June 1995, under Section 77 of the Reserves Act 1977.

The conflict issue which arose in ATNP in relation to the baches was resolved, but the processes of resolution left a legacy of bitter feelings in the community and in this way can be compared to the bach problem which arose at Taylor's Mistake on Banks Peninsula, Canterbury.

5.2.3 Taylor's Mistake

There have been baches at Taylor's Mistake since the turn of the century. They are located on public land beside a legal road. The local authorities have been trying to remove or control them since 1911. A decision of the Christchurch City Council in 1976 led to the removal of several baches, and the rest were ordered to be removed by 1986. Despite recent attempts to resolve the issue, the baches remain.

A new approach was decided upon to resolve the conflict; this was mediation. In 1991, a meeting was held with representatives of all key organisations: the Christchurch City Council, the Canterbury Regional Council, DOC, the Taylor's Mistake Association representing bach owners and the Taylor's Mistake Ratepayers Association representing the permanent residents of Taylor's Mistake. The process of mediation was compromised when the Taylor's Mistake Residents' Association decided not to become involved in a process which was contrary to their view that all baches should go. Despite this problem it was decided to continue
mediation. This took almost a year, with 13 meetings of the 14 member working party (Lawn 1993:15).

Eventually a solution was reached that suited all who had taken part in the mediation process, although members of the Taylor’s Mistake Residents Association were not happy with the proposed solution involving as it did the removal of baches which most affected scenic and recreational values of the public space, while baches with most historical and heritage value, and which had less visual impact on the public space, were retained. A new zone for the displaced baches was created and, in compensation, 70 hectares of land in the valleys and hills surrounding Taylor’s Mistake owned by the Taylor’s Mistake Association, were given to the City Council for a new recreation reserve (Lawn 1993:16).

Resolution of the bach issue in ATNP and at Taylor’s Mistake lead to residual feelings in those communities which would later affect the outcome of conflict resolution in seemingly unrelated cases.

5.2.4 Perceived Pressure on Private Land.

With the development of ATNP, people in private enclaves felt pressure -- real or imaginary, weak or strong -- to have their land included within the Park. In the Abel Tasman Oral History Project (ATOHP) community concern about the use of the Public Works Act was mentioned several times and the following quotation illustrates the uncertainty surrounding this matter:

It was a great shame the farm went out of the family. . . The park made it very difficult. I think they threatened him more or less under the Public Works Act. I’m not sure on what point.

(JBS2:360)

DOC’s view is that land which was available, or desired, was bought by the Department of Lands and Survey on behalf of the Nelson/Marlborough Parks and Reserves Board, generally at market value (Allen White, pers. comm.).
The 1986 Management Plan attempted to deal with problems which arose out of close proximity of private land to the park. A submission from the Commission for the Environment suggested that additional comments on adjoining land, and its value to the Park, be included in the Management Plan. This suggestion was not taken up in the final plan as it was "not politic to comment on other lands" (Department of Lands and Survey 1986:76).

Policies were put in place to deal with problems that could arise out of having privately and publicly owned land adjoining.

**NATIONAL PARKS ENVIRONS**

**Policy**

To liaise with adjoining landowners and local authorities to ensure that conflicts in adjoining land use and the possibility of compromising park values are minimised.

(Department of Lands and Survey 1986:54)

Under the Implementation section of this policy there was the suggestion that, in an effort to avoid conflict, "as land becomes available it will be acquired to achieve natural boundaries" (Department of Lands and Survey 1986:54). While the Park managers may have seen this as a sensible suggestion, it was taken as a threat by private landowners. In fact, since 1986 the Park's growth has been limited (Department of Conservation 1995:7).

### 5.2.5 Today's Managers: the Department of Conservation

In April 1987 the administrative re-organisation which affected 'who ran what' in New Zealand lead to the development of DOC from sections of the Lands and Survey Department, Wildlife Service and the New Zealand Forest Service (Department of Conservation 1995:7). ATNP is now administered by DOC staff in Nelson, with day-to-day management carried out by staff in the Takaka and Motueka Field Centres. The
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existence of two field centres which manage half the Park each has lead to some conflict in management styles. An example of this is in the area of the standards of facilities within the Park. The prime role of the Nelson office is, however, to ensure that both field centres head in the same direction (Braggins Interview: June 1995).

Another problem for DOC, which was evident in the ATOHP, is that in the public's eye there is blurring between the Lands and Survey Department and DOC. Both are seen as government departments, and this led to the negative feelings which arose in the bach issue, affecting the public's view of DOC. While the ATOHP showed some positive feelings towards DOC, a more common feeling was that because it involves a government department the management of ATNP 'lacks soul'.

I think now that the public feels that it is just another government department and there will be no public input ... The Park runs efficiently, the tracks are good, but I think that unless it is watched it will grow so far away from the public that they will lose all interest. (TL S3:455)

With the ATNP Management Plan Review discussion document due for release this year it will be interesting to see if the local community has become more deeply involved in the decision making process as they become used to dealing with government agencies, as opposed to the informal process that the older respondents in the ATOHP were used too.
6

The Marine Issue

6.1 Introduction

In November 1993, the Tonga Island Marine Reserve (TIMR) off the shores of Abel Tasman National Park (ATNP) was created. This was the first legislation to offer substantial protection for marine life in the area, despite concern for the marine environment having existed for some time. Up until then limited protection had occurred in the following forms:

* Separation Point was closed to trawling, Danish seining and dredging;
* The landward side of a line between Foul Point and Fisherman Island was closed to commercial scallop or oyster fishing;
* Totaranui to Awaroa Head, Bolder Point to Adele Island and Guilbert Point to Tokongawha Point are rahui (Department of Conservation 1993:89).

To date conflict over the marine problem has been limited because mediation and public consultation resolved cooperatively. This view is supported by Seaton (1993:61), who states that a marine reserve process, with particular emphasis on participation and conflict management, will allow the complex range of values and concerns inherent in the process to be resolved.
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6.2 The Importance of the Sea

Residents of the Abel Tasman National Park (ATNP) coastline have tended to place as much value on the sea as on the land. It formed the most important access route to land areas for the original Maori populations, as well as for European explorers and the early settlers for whom access by land was difficult. This led to the sea becoming a 'highway' to break the isolation of the ATNP coast.

For the early European settlers eking out an existence from their farms, the bounty of the sea came as a welcome addition to, and sometimes formed the bulk of, their diet as it had for earlier Maori populations. Boat building was a main economic activity for many, and many boats plied the ATNP coastline (Dennis 1990:62). The recreation seekers who followed the farmers were usually attracted to the area by the beaches and the area’s recreation potential in the form of fishing and boating.

In later times, recreational fishers were joined by commercial fishers and trawlers. One of the main issues which arose in the Abel Tasman Oral History Project (ATOHP) was concern about the decline in the area’s marine species. This was mentioned in some form in nearly all the interviews. The following two quotations illustrate this concern:

Of course we have noticed the fishing drop back and back and now there’s virtually no fish around here. (VM S1:135)

There has been a tremendous loss in the fishing side of things. (MH S3:410)

Most of the concern was based on the activities of trawlers and their dredging techniques. One interviewee referred to this as "the rape of the Bay." He describes how the trawlers,

... came from the Bluff, they came from Auckland, from everywhere, and they tore that coastline to pieces. (VG S1:355)

Another interviewee supported that assertion:
... the fishing close in to the shore for scallops and the like has just torn the place to pieces. (VH S2:020)

Another point of conflict was the advent of the motorised speed boat in the 1950s:

Speed boats have been the downfall of the area... because they are so noisy. It’s upset the whole cycle of the area. (VH S1:560)

The increasing number of yachts have also been of concern:

Yachts are a bit unpopular... in the way they treat the coast. They throw rubbish over the side in plastic bags and it just floats ashore on the beach. (JB S4:000)

This concern is illustrated by the following quote:

The boating I think is causing more damage to the park than the people are. (MH S4:475)

This is because of the large amount of sewerage and rubbish which comes from boats.

As the people who knew the coast well became more aware of the changes taking place, they began to see them as negative. There was growing support for the idea of a marine reserve. The problem was to decide where it should be situated and this is a matter which normally causes serious problems in the marine reservation process. It is at this stage the NIMBY (not in my back yard) syndrome often comes to light (Seaton 1993:19) and it was to be no different in the case of the ATNP marine reserve.

6.3 Tonga Island Marine Reserve (TIMR)

In response to public concern, the Department of Conservation (DOC) began to look at whether there was support for a marine reserve in the ATNP area. The 1971 Marine Reserve Act states that marine reserves are legitimate parts of a coast set aside;
...for the purpose of preserving as marine reserves for the scientific study of marine life, areas of New Zealand that contain underwater scenery, natural features, or marine life, of such distinctive quality or so typical, or beautiful, or unique, that their continued preservation is in the national interest...

(Section 3 (1) Marine Reserve Act 1971, DOC 1992:19)

In 1989/90 an ATNP user survey was carried out on track and boat users in the Park area. A main objective of both surveys was to gauge support for a marine reserve (Department of Conservation 1993:3). The surveyed population consisted of people over 15 years of age who had visited ATNP over the 12 months from the 1 December 1989 to 30 November 1990. In terms of track usage, support for a marine reserve was 88.8 percent, with only 6.8 percent against the proposal. This support was probably partly due to the fact that 91.4 percent of track users did not participate in fishing activities, although 16.4 percent did collect shellfish (Department of Conservation 1993:38). The number of boat users who supported a marine reserve was over 75 percent (Department of Conservation 1993:65). This support for a Marine Reserve was echoed in the ATOHP, as the following examples show:

It should be completely closed because it's a nursery, this bay. It should be left alone. (V M S1:135)

I think the marine reserve idea is a great idea. (MH S4:450)

Some respondents were more cautious in their support for the proposal:

I'm all in favour of a marine reserve, but I'm not in favour of a total marine reserve. (RW S2:105)

The support which showed in the ATOHP and the User Survey led to DOC releasing a Discussion Paper on the ATNP marine reserve in July of 1992 (Department of Conservation 1992). The aim of this document was to provide "information about the Abel Tasman National Park and its coast, and outline why the Department is considering marine reserves in the
area" (Department of Conservation 1992:3) It was also the first step in an on-going process of consultation with the public. It contained six different options for a marine reserve and the public were asked to indicate the extent of their support or their opposition to each option. They were also given the chance to suggest other areas they would like to see reserved.

Before that Discussion Paper was released, Davidson (1992) investigated the ecology of the ATNP coast for DOC. The report concluded that protection of the ecology of the area through a marine reserve would be beneficial as "the ecology of the Abel Tasman coastline is detrimentally affected by extractive practices" (Davidson 1992:100). The report also stated that a marine reserve alongside the park should include, where practical, the following:

(1) an estuary, beach, sandbar, island, headland and bay,
(2) a full range of intertidal and subtidal substrates,
(3) a full range of shore exposure types,
(4) as many biologically important areas as possible, and
(5) representative examples of granite and limestone substrates.

(Davidson 1992:101)

The findings of the Discussion Paper were printed in a Summary of Submissions (Taylor 1992). In total, 1008 individual and 26 group submissions were received. There was "overwhelming support for a marine reserve somewhere on the Abel Tasman coast" (Taylor 1992:101), with 98 percent of the individual submissions stating they would support a 'no-take' marine reserve. Out of this group 2 percent said their support was conditional and only 2 percent rejected the proposal outright. Of the 26 group submissions only one did not support the creation of a marine reserve (Taylor 1992:101).

When it came to a choice between the six options, greatest support was given to Option One (Wainui Inlet to Separation Point) at 75 percent, followed by Option Four (Abel Head to Mosquito Bay) at 65 percent. Options One and Four raised least opposition at 10 percent each (Taylor 1992:23, Department of Conservation 1992: 26 and 29).
FIGURE 6.2: Maps of Marine Reserve Options
In May 1993 the application to gazette the Tonga Marine Reserve went ahead. The proposed reserve was very similar to that outlined in Option Four, the major difference being that the northern boundary had been extended to Awaroa Head, an idea which had been recommended in a number of submissions. There were two major reasons why Option One was chosen over Option Four. Option One received a relatively high level of opposition from recreational fishers as the proposed area was of the more popular fishing sites along the coast. This is related to the idea that people do not mind marine reserves "as long as they are not in my backyard" (Wynyard 1995:30). The site Option One was next to a former Maori Occupational Reserve, and local iwi were unwilling to support a marine reserve there at the time (Department of Conservation 1993:8).

The application for a marine reserve was accepted, and in November 1993 the TIMR came into being. It extends 12 kilometres along the coast and consists of approximately 1835 hectares, with the seaward boundary 1 nautical mile from high water mark (Department of Conservation 1993:2 and 3). The official process took only two years to complete. Community support was strong and conflict between interested parties had been avoided. This has not always been the case in the formation of marine reserves.

6.4 Tonga Island Marine Reserve in Comparison

The methods DOC used to gauge and win community support for the TIMR were different from those used in recent times to set up other marine reserves in the northern South Island. Andrew Baxter, Senior Conservation Officer Marine Protection at DOC in Nelson, summarised the different techniques used for conflict resolution in relation to marine reserves in an interview. There is need for different approaches in different locations, depending on the situation. This fits within DOC's formal guidelines for the establishment of marine reserves. The guidelines suggest that the public should be involved in the initial site selection as occurred for the TIMR. But on occasion DOC may itself desire protection of specific sites, with the public not involved in their selection (Seaton 1993:10). Baxter offered a comparison between the techniques used at ATNP, as already discussed, and those at Westhaven (Golden Bay) and French Pass/d'Urville (Baxter Interview: June 1995).
FIGURE 6.3: Map of Tonga Island Marine Reserve
In 1988, DOC went to the Westhaven community with an 'open book' proposal to set up a marine reserve in the area. The community then asked for a more formal proposal, but when this was presented some members of the community felt they had not been given the chance to play a role in the decision making process. This problem was exacerbated by the fact that the Golden Bay community contains two markedly different social groups: 'Greenies', and original farming families. A solution was reached in Westhaven when a Steering Committee comprising key community members from both social groups was set up. From then on DOC communicated with this Committee. The solution was partly wildlife management and partly Marine Reserve, but it took six years to achieve in comparison to the two for the TIMR (Baxter Interview: June 1995).

In French Pass/d'Urville the notion to set up a marine reserve was proposed by the French Pass Residents Association, DOC's role being one of support rather than control. This has led to a satisfactory conclusion, which probably would not have happened if the matter had been approached in the same manner as occurred at Weshaven (Baxter Interview: June 1995). The comparison of these two methods of management, and that used for TIMR, is an illustration of how conflict can be resolved if good mediation occurs. They can also be seen in comparison to the recent North Taranaki Marine Reserve proposal, which after three years of conflict charged debate looks as if it may become the first DOC sponsored marine reserve proposal to be withdrawn. This is due to the 993 submissions, out of 1021, that did not support the proposal and this can be linked to the failure of the mediation process (Wynyard 1995:30).

6.5 The Foreshore Debate

The boundary of ATNP is the high water mark so, with the exception of the area covered by the TIMR, the foreshore environment is not protected. The *Abel Tasman National Park Management Plan* (1986) indicated the concerns of park managers about this issue (Department of Conservation 1986:36).
At that time, the foreshore was administered by the Ministry of Transport under the Harbours Act 1950 (Department of Conservation 1986:26). Under that Act, there is provision for a Grant of Control to be given to park management to protect the foreshore (Department of Conservation 1986:36).

In November 1986, Grant of Control was given to the managers of the park (Davidson 1992:99) and this continued when DOC took over in 1987. The passing of the Resource Management Act (RMA) in 1990 lead to the replacement of the 1950 Harbours Act and the end of the Grant of Control. The foreshore then fell under the control of the redundant regional authority, which in this instance was the Tasman District Council (Department of Conservation 1995:9). Transitional provisions allowed the Grant of Control to remain with DOC until July 1992, when local authority by-laws were established (Department of Conservation 1995:9, Davidson 1992:98). At present there is debate between DOC and the Tasman District Council over who should control the foreshore area of ATNP. The National Parks Act 1980 allows the foreshore to be included in the park, and DOC is proposing that at least the key areas be included. This would enable the foreshore to be managed in the same way as the rest of the park and, according to DOC, would mean the end of ecologically unsound impacts which occur at present (Department of Conservation 1995:22). There is also strong support from tourist operators in the area for DOC to regain control of this foreshore area (Motueka-Golden Bay News 1995:3)
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Current Conflicts and Prospects for the Development of Abel Tasman National Park

7.1 Introduction

In 1995 Abel Tasman National Park (ATNP) is faced with a new set of conflicts which need to be resolved. These issues are rooted in how people see prospects for the Park. There is today a strong emphasis on tourism as a basis for our economy. Particularly important to tourism in New Zealand is the natural beauty of the landscape. Overseas visitors come to see and experience an environment they feel is no longer available in their parts of the world. For ATNP this brings to the forefront the debate about the purpose of its formation. The basis of this debate goes back to differences between conservation and recreation, with tourism firmly entrenched in this issue. New Zealand society in general agrees that natural environments are “good places” (Bignell and Smith 1983:17) with some people seeing natural environments as good places to pursue recreational activities while others seeing the natural environment primarily as good places in which to study and observe nature. Ultimately both groups want natural environments available for their purposes, so a coalition must be forged. The potential is there for conflict and this may become even more evident as areas of natural environment decrease (Bignell and Smith 1983:18).

Another part of this debate is over the development and growth of private enterprise around the Park. The surge in use of conservation land has
created philosophical and physical management challenges for the Department of Conservation (DOC). The temptation for some people in DOC is to see tourism ventures on conservation land as the solution to funding problems (Sage 1995:21). According to Sage (1995:22) although concession fees bring money to DOC they need to be increased, as do rental charges for the use of land, otherwise the increased commercial activity will not actually increase conservation funding significantly. She also believes that there is little point to tourism if it does not provide monetary benefits to balance the impacts of noise, crowding, pollution and disturbance. It is widely assumed that visitor dissatisfaction with the natural experience will sound warning bells before ecological damage occurs, but without ongoing monitoring of visitor impact ecological damage will not necessarily be identified. This problem is compounded by the fact that the type of visitor changes in response to environmental changes (Sage 1995:28). Sage believes the tourism boom will require increased vigilance as the demise of ill-conceived developments ultimately benefits both nature and the tourism industry, just as their inception could destroy what people have tried to preserve or come to enjoy (Sage 1995:30).

The above issues are firmly intertwined which makes their resolution difficult. Despite this, a break down will be attempted in the following sections. But it is important to recognise that the issues are interrelated. Another issue of the present, and probably into the future, is that of Maori land claims. There is considerable uncertainty about land tenure. These conflicts are part of the Public/Private debate, which is the overriding theme of this dissertation and will now be looked at further.

### 7.2 The Changing Role of Conservation and Tourism

In the past, Tourism was seen as a useful ally of conservation. Development of National Parks has been seen as a way of getting greater areas of land for recreation use and a chance to develop tourism-related employment (Sage 1995:21). Today, the perception of tourism is different. For a growing percentage of the population, tourism and conservation are not so much seen as working together as being in conflict. This is a worldwide problem and arises from the environmental effects of tourism:
It’s good for our tourist trade and that sort of thing but I think the number of people they are putting in there at one time is polluting it badly and I don’t think they’ve got the facilities to handle it. (VM S2:130).

Nationally and locally, it has become a recurring theme (Norton and Roper-Lindsay 1992:20). Many developers feel that they have the unquestionable right to develop, while many conservationists believe that conservation must come first and that tourism and commercial recreation are not compatible with conservation (Norton and Roper-Lindsay 1992:23). These different feelings are evident in a report to the Ministry of Commerce by Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu, in which it was argued that one of the issues “which hampers [DOC’s] ability to achieve optimal effectiveness and efficiency” is that it is “largely dominated by scientists and ecologists” so has an organisational culture which inhibits revenue earning (Sage 1995:23). If these two value judgements co-exist resolution of the problem will be difficult to reach.

The solution which Norton and Roper-Lindsay propose consists of three interrelated steps:

* The first requires a change in attitude. This applies to both conservationists and developers. Conservationists must accept that people want to use and enjoy our National Parks and, in some cases, this will require letting some development take place. In return, developers need to treat the environment in which they are carrying out a development with care and remain aware that not all development proposals will be compatible with conservation values at every site (Norton and Roper-Lindsay 1992:23).

* The second is for developers to consider conservation issues at the start of a development.

* The third requires the adoption of a realistic planning approach to nature conservation (Norton and Roper-Lindsay 1992:24).

In summary, Norton and Roper-Lindsay (1992:25) believe that a more pragmatic approach to development on conservation land must be
attained. They believe that getting more people into conservation areas, due to new developments will result in the transformation of personal values for these people. This will lead them to having a more ecological view of life, although conservationists have doubts about this conclusion.

The idea that conservation and recreation are in conflict has developed as people’s opinions on what conservation is have changed. This point is recognised by Durkin (1988:18), who states that the ambiguities of conservation are “compounded because the term ‘conservation’ is subject to changes in emphasis over time”. Because of this, the term ‘conservation’ is vaguely defined. Different meanings are attached to it, depending on the views of the individuals or groups involved in appraising and laying claim to resources (Durkin 1988:17). In some contexts, conservation is seen as “the efficient and non-wasteful use of natural resources”, while in others it is seen as “any form of environmental protection” (Johnston 1994:87).

Another aspect of this change is growth in tourism. According to some sources it is now the world’s largest industry (Johnston 1994:634, Sage 1995:23). In 1989, 5.9% of New Zealand’s Gross Domestic Product came from tourism (Norton and Roper-Lindsay 1992:20) and in 1995 1.3 million tourists will visit New Zealand. The New Zealand Tourism Board aims to increase this to 3 million by 2004 (Sage 1995:21). According to The Dictionary of Human Geography, “the most serious impact of tourism is undoubtedly on the environment, whether in the form of pollution, loss of habitat or erosion” (Johnston 1994:635). This could be due to the fact that tourism can be seen as a mass migration of people who collide with cultures and environments different from their own (Sage 1995:26). These two points of view illustrate how the conflict between conservation and tourism has developed.

7.3 Tourism and Recreation

Growth in tourism has meant that recreation-based activities have also had to increase to keep up with demand. This increase has tended to be in rural recreation areas and has led to landuse conflicts, particularly in
public land and in relation to the compatibility of recreation with other landuses (Johnston 1994:504).

Tourism and commercial recreation encompass two main groups of people. These include:

- the people who own and manage the facilities and want to profit from the natural environment;
- their clients - the visitors or tourists who pay for the use of the natural environment.

For both groups, the quality of the natural environment is important, but their acceptable standard, will vary and could also be different from that required by the Department of Conservation (Norton and Roper-Lindsay 1992:21).

The *Abel Tasman National Park Management Plan Review* (Department of Conservation 1995:4) states that the primary emphasis of the Park’s management should be on the preservation of those natural values the area was set aside to preserve. Due to public pressure on the coastal area, and the need to intervene in the natural recovery process, the emphasis of management has been on controlling use and enjoyment of the area by the public. Despite this, the present Management Plan (1986) is scarcely forward thinking in terms of recreation management, an issue that is being looked at in the Management Plan Review (1995).

### 7.4 Foreign Tourists

As visitor numbers have increased so has the proportion of overseas visitors. In Easter 1995, the author stayed at Awaroa Hut and, with the exception of her group (3), the rest of the trampers (20) were overseas visitors. This change in the origins of trampers is a recent development:

> We see especially now Germans and Swiss people. But when the track was first put through we saw Kiwis who were walking it.  
> (RWS1:500)

Initially they were good keen Kiwis. We didn’t really see overseas visitors until the last few years. That’s an eighties phenomena.  
(MH S3:215)
You certainly see people from every part of the world down here. You don’t hear as much English spoken as you do their language. A lot of Germans and Swiss, and a lot from Scandinavia, Sweden and Denmark. And also a lot of Canadians. Its interesting though to think that people from the other side of the world are enjoying our piece of dirt so much. And they all love it. (JM S4:040)

Although the number of overseas tourists has increased, the increase is not as great as perceived by the community:

After the Kiwis came the Germans ... now of course 95% would be foreigners. (VM S2:130)

In fact New Zealanders on the tracks still outnumber foreign tourists. A breakdown of the 1994/95 season showed that 53% of Park users came from within New Zealand (Motueka-Golden Bay News 1995:3). Although at certain times of the year there are groups of foreigners who, for obvious reasons, are more visible (Braggins Interview, June 1995).

7.5 Overall Effects of Growth in Visitor Numbers

The increasing number of visitors means that over the busy summer period (November to March) huts and campsites on the Coast Track are at, or exceed, their designed capacity. In the Abel Tasman National Park User Survey Report 1989/90, 40% of walkers perceived that some part of their trip was overcrowded and that this diminished their overall experience. In terms of what part of their trip was overcrowded, 31.4% said that the huts were, and a further 17.2% felt the same way about campsites. Overseas visitors are especially affected by this as their expectations are usually high and many think that New Zealand National Parks are uncrowded. For them, the number of trampers comes as a surprise (Department of Conservation 1993:40). This increased popularity could be partly due to the fact that in 1990 the Coast Track became part of the Great Walks System. At the same time, the Inland Track remains less well known (Department of Conservation 1995:9) although around 1200 people now use it. There is also growing pressure on Harwood’s Hole (Department of Conservation 1995:14). Another reason for the growth in
visitor numbers is that there has been an upsurge in more active forms of tourism, especially commercial tourists. Guided walking is just one of these activities (Norton and Roper-Lindsay 1992:21).

Commercial tourism has led to a number of concessions in ATNP. The main concessions are ‘Guided Walks’ and overnight stays by kayakers (Department of Conservation 1995:11). Three groups, including Abel Tasman National Park Enterprises (ATNPE) who use their own accommodation and one commercial operator who uses the huts on the Inland Track, provide the guided walks (Department of Conservation 1995:23). There are also many operators, including charter and tour boats and kayak hire businesses, which operate along the coast of ATNP. There are now about 18 transport operators, up from one in 1996. (Department of Conservation 1995:11). The better known include ATNPE, Water-Taxi Charter Kaiteriteri, Abel Tasman Seafaris and the summer-operation ‘Spirit of Golden Bay.’ Recently DOC has proposed that some of these operators either become honorary officers for the Marine Reserve, as they are often in the area, or that they receive sufficient training and documentation to act as court witnesses if they see people infringing the rules of the Tonga Island Marine Reserve (TIMR) (Motueka-Golden Bay News 1995:3).

Numbers of kayakers are growing along with the kayak business. In 1990 614 hut passes (3% of total hut passes) were issued to kayakers. By 1994, this had grown to 4187 (18% of total hut passes) (Department of Conservation 1995:13). Kayakers have been pinpointed as a cause for concern. Due to their mobility they are putting pressure on camping spots not used by trampers (Department of Conservation 1995:20). A present bach owner in the Park mentioned the risk factors involved. Due to rapid changes in weather, inexperienced kayakers using the commercial operations have been caught out. He has helped a number of kayakers to safety (Whitwell Interview, June 1995).

Sage believes that defensive strategies need to be put in place to stop major increases in user numbers. This could be done by limiting the number of concessions and their areas of operation within the Park. Other methods include reducing publicity and diverting users to other areas. She believes that these measures are better than increasing hut capacity, and that quotas
and a booking system are a more equitable way of regulating popular tracks than increased hut charges (Sage 1995:29).

More commercial developments are being established by Park managers. In 1992, a large car park was developed on conservation land at the Marahu entrance to the park, along with a cafe, shelter and information kiosk. Recent developments have occurred in private enclaves in the Park. Awaroa has the “Awaroa Homestead Lodge” and the “Awaroa Lodge and Cafe”. This development was predicted by one participant in the Abel Tasman Oral History Project (ATOHP):

I thought at one stage someone might have moved into Awaroa and bought a block of land there and started something up. (VM S2:130)

An accommodation lodge has also been established at Torrent Bay (Department of Conservation 1995:11).

These developments may become more important because no more huts are going to be provided on the Coast Track, despite growing numbers of users. This means that in the future the number of people staying in huts will have to be limited, and one way to achieve this is through a booking system. This option was discussed in a recent issues of the Motueka-Golden Bay News, which was reporting on a meeting between tourist operators and DOC (Motueka-Golden Bay News 1995:3).

I think that the more development you do the more you spoil the natural beauty . . . when you get to the stage that the facilities don’t cope, that’s when you start restricting entry . . . You have to book. (TL S2:300)

Another approach could be to remove the huts altogether, an idea which may cause surprise even though the high level of sea-based transport in, out of and along the Park borders makes this a viable proposition. A third approach would be to allow private organisations to take over the running of existing huts and the Coast Track.

This suggestion for ATNP is one which management circles are now considering. The suggestion is to separate the commercial/visitor management and conservation functions of DOC and to establish an
agency based on revenue generation. But the application of such a model leads to revenue generation becoming a top priority (Sage 1995:25). Staff would then move to tourist management rather than working on habitat and species protection (Sage 1995:26).

A fourth approach would be to place all accommodation structures for trampers using the Track on private land, as is the case at Awaroa and Torrent Bay. Present National Park policy and Park Management plans show a strong preference for accommodation and associated buildings located outside parks (Sage 1995:28). This could also include complete or partial removal of camping in the Park. These options are being considered in detail for the next Management Plan (1996).

Because the Coast Track is on granite, it has a very high physical carrying capacity so problems come less from people walking the track than from where people are going to stay overnight. (Department of Conservation 1995:19). The Coastal Track also has a psychological carrying capacity, as people who use it do so for the solitude. Peter Braggins, Conservation Officer at the Motueka Field Centre, believes the time is near when DOC will have to limit access (Braggins Interview, June 1995).

### 7.6 Eco-tourism and Abel Tasman National Park Enterprises.

#### 7.6.1 Eco-tourism

A solution to the problems of more traditional tourism may be a change in emphasis to eco-tourism. Any tourist activity which professes to be eco-tourism must comply with two conditions. The first is that the operation should not degrade the environment. The second is that it should contain an educational element. This means that participants will learn about the natural environment as they experience it. It is important for the term eco-tourism not to be a whitewash and that operators who use it follow the above conditions (Relph 1995:31).

There are good reasons to develop an eco-tourism approach. It is more likely to mean that the operator has a genuine concern about the environment. As most tend to be small locally based operators their
profits are more likely to remain in the community. The eco-tourist tends to stay longer so this will also increase the monetary gain for New Zealand. Eco-tourism also appears to cost less to promote. From this eco-tourism may appear as the perfect answer but it has problems and we must remain aware that it is all too easy to “love the environment to death” (Relph 1995:31).

7.6.2 Abel Tasman National Park Enterprises (ATNPE)

The oldest commercial operator in the ATNP region is ATNPE which is owned by the Wilson family and has been operating as a business for twenty years. It began as a limited ferry service but in recent times has grown to include many other operations in the Park area, including guided walks and private accommodation:

John Wilson has been part of the opening up from the sea and from the land with his trips, which is good. (MH S4:410)

ATNPE are looking to change their tourism focus as they believe the Park has a resource policy of eco-tourism. According to Jenny Carter, who is in charge of Personal and Marketing at ATNPE, the emphasis is going to be more on quality than quantity. The market they want to focus on would be both smaller and its numbers limited. The guided walks will have a maximum of twenty people at a time. Although large numbers of people will be taken in by boat, they will not enter the Park so their effect on its environments will be limited; their experience would also be more environmentally based. An advertising pamphlet for the 1994/95 season has the title “Guided Walks - Eco-Tours”. A desire was expressed to work with DOC so that it could become more of a learning experience for the tourist in the Park (Carter Interview, June 1995).

ATNPE will continue to see foreign tourists as an important part of its market and will promote its facilities overseas.

I met a lot of Germans when they started to appear and I asked why so many here. He said it was promoted right through Germany and he said you don’t have to be fit for it. (MH S3:215)
Carter believes the problem is that tourism does not sit well with the New Zealand culture. At present 40% of the ATNPE market remains domestic. Carter believes that if the local population does not become more interested in tourism the market will force further development. The people attracted will be from overseas, chiefly Japanese and Germans. She believes that this kind of development is fine so long as the local community is happy to become another Queenstown (Carter Interview June 1995).

7.7 Private Enterprise

From a commercial perspective ATNPE does not desire the development of other private enterprises in relation to the Park. Carter's view on this was interesting. As a European coming into the New Zealand culture she has developed a theory which she calls the "kiwi fruit attitude". It reflects the fact that New Zealanders tend to leap on to a new development and the numbers lead to its collapse. She can see the same thing happening in National Parks. If the number of people entering ATNP continues to increase, it will destroy the very thing people have come to enjoy. Carter believes that DOC will have to deal with this problem as there is a tendency for commercial operators to be there only in the summer months. As their focus is largely on monetary gain they tend to cause more negative effects on the environment than operators who have invested in the area's natural environment (Carter Interview, June 1995). This view was supported by a bach owner in the Park. He sees no harm in commercial activity as long as it is controlled and that amateur operators do not get into the area. He also expressed a desire that commercial activities not be overseas controlled (Whitwell Interview, June 1995).

Peter Braggins sees private enterprise as playing an important role in the Park and believes it can probably be even more important in future. This is particularly the case in the setting up of accommodation outside the Park through the use of the private enclaves at key locations in the edge of the Park. He also believes that private enterprise has made the Park a boating and kayaking experience, as well as a tramping one (Braggins Interview, June 1995).
Nigel Mountfort, Conservation Officer at the Takaka Field Centre, has mixed feelings about the commercialisation of the Park. He believes it leads to promotion overseas, which can result in overuse. There tend to be many backpackers put through for only a small amount of money. This has social implications because backpackers tend to stick together. Mountfort also believes that commercialisation has a tendency to price New Zealanders out of the market. (Mountfort Interview, April 1995).

7.8 The Issue of Maori Land Claims

The issue of Maori land claims is one that all New Zealanders are aware of. This is a sensitive issue in the ATNP area. Due to Maori Occupation Reserves along the ATNP coastline questions are being asked about wider land tenure rights. It seems that there may be the intention to register claims with the Waitangi Commission but the issue is still cloudy. In future I believe this matter will be an area of conflict. For this reason channels need to remain open between the participants so that any conflict can be speedily and effectively resolved.

7.9 A Summary of Future Issues

In future the following issues will require work if ATNP is to prosper:
* There needs to be reconciliation between conservation and tourism.
* The development of commercial recreation has to be implemented with care if the Park is not to be affected.
* DOC has to decide how they are going to deal with visitor numbers; will they bow to commercial operators or look for internal solutions?
* Land tenure needs to be resolved.
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Conclusions

8.1 A Return to the Themes of Study

The themes of this dissertation are rooted in the process of change. Change in human values and beliefs leads to conflict which, according to sociologists, is a necessary part of the functions which bind communities together. This positive function of conflict is accompanied by its more negative attributes. For this reason there is a need for conflict to be resolved. In the past, resolution of conflict was based on domination and resulted in "winners" and "losers". Today the challenge of conflict resolution has been picked up by planners and the new processes are based on negotiation and mediation. The Resource Management Act 1991 was established and its basis is on resolving conflict before it reaches the legal stage; this is part of a new focus in New Zealand which looks to resolve long standing issues.

This is particularly applicable in the area of land tenure, especially in relation to the public and private ownership of land. The importance of having areas of public land, especially for conservation purposes is long established in this country. The formation of the likes of National Parks has lead to conflict with private land owners in these areas. The authorities which run these areas of public land are not always held in high esteem by the general public and this can result in further conflict between private individuals and the public establishment.

These themes are considered through the study of changing land and marine management practices due to changes in the human perception of
the environment in Abel Tasman National Park (ATNP) over the past 140 years.

8.2 Land Management Practices and Prospects for Abel Tasman National Park

This study opened with a brief overview of the indigenous tribes of the area then moved to, first, the discoveries by Europeans then the arrival of the European settlers from 1855 onwards. The land management techniques they applied were of their European culture and had developed in a very different environment. The pattern of land tenure consisted of private blocks of land and the economy focused on the exploitation of sea and land resources. Due to this type of resource management, and the limited physical carrying capacity of the land, the environment was rapidly impoverished and areas of the coastline were progressively abandoned.

The next wave of people to settle on the Abel Tasman coast were interested in the area’s recreation potential. In this respect their interest was enjoyment of the environment rather than its management. While land remained privately owned, the size of each parcel was diminishing. As the numbers of people coming into the area increased there was a growing feeling in the local and wider Nelson Province communities that a new form land management should be established if a boom and bust cycle of human occupation was to be avoided. Perrine Moncrieff was a key player in this new development and was behind the suggestion that a National Park was the way to avoid this problem. ATNP was established in 1942, when just under 20 000 acres of land on the Abel Tasman coast came under public ownership, with a land management regime based on conservation.

What might appear to be a resolution of the problems at the time gave rise to a rash of issues - - some old, some new - - in relation to land management practices. Establishment of the Park lead to conflict over public and private rights, largely due to the location of private baches on what had recently become public land. As the Park become more popular the question of land management again came to the forefront, with
questions about the marine environment. This led to the establishment of the Tonga Island Marine Reserve (TIMR). Over the years the Park has been managed by a succession of different agencies and this has led to conflict between these agencies and the general public. But the major issue is how to manage the large numbers of people using the Park as conservation and recreation interests clash.

In 1995 it was estimated that 100,000 people will walk in ATNP. Decisions have to be taken now over how such a large number of people can be controlled. The Park managers have several options. As it was decided not to provide more huts on the Coast Track, these options include putting in a booking system as has been done on the Milford and Routeburn Tracks, although on these tracks the facilities are owned by private organisations but the land is administrated by the Department of Conservation (DOC). This approach could also be applied to ATNP. It could involve private enterprise taking over the huts and the track or separation of DOC into a commercial/visitor arm, which would administer the tracks, and a conservation arm. A third approach would be to remove the huts altogether authorising, only day access. This would be feasible due to good water-based access to most parts of the Park. This proposal could also include placement of accommodation facilities in private enclaves within the Park as a fourth option. Whatever the decision, it will be of major significance to land and marine management in ATNP.

8.3 Application of Lessons from Abel Tasman National Park to the Wider Arena.

In this study, issues relating to changing land management practices have been considered for a single area. These issues are also important elsewhere in many different areas of New Zealand. As the country revisits unresolved issues, particularly in relation to land, the lessons from ATNP could have wider application.

It is important that change is accepted, even embraced, as society comes to realise that change is a necessary part of its progression. At the same time, the conflict which comes from social change should be grasped and new techniques for its resolution adopted. The pivotal importance of public
and community participation comes into play here. Areas of concern to communities need to be addressed so that people can move ahead with confidence. In no place is this more important than in relation to land management and land tenure. The balance between individual rights to land and the greater public good in relation to land access must be addressed nationally. One area where this applies is in the development of environmental recreation and tourism. A balance has to be struck between the use of public land, such as National Parks, for recreation and tourism purposes and its conservation. Finding the balance between these different land management practices will be a continuing problem for New Zealand society.

FIGURE 8.1: The Role of Negotiation and Mediation in Decision Making
The same applies to the marine environment. As marine life is depleted, there will be mounting pressure for its protection. This has led to the gazetting of 13 Marine Reserves around the New Zealand coast. They have been established since 1975, with all but three since December 1991 (Wynyard 1995:31). As marine life in these areas recovers there will be pressure to open the reserves to commercial exploitation. How this will be dealt with is also an issue for future generations to resolve.

The resolution of conflict relating to terrestrial and marine management decisions has relied on personal domination and legal decisions. Recently there has been growth in negotiation and mediation to solve environmental problems. In future this will be even more important as negotiation and mediation allow problems to be publicly expressed and discussed. Decisions made by this process leave participants more satisfied than was the case when the old adversarial techniques are applied. A decision making process based on mediation and negotiation is shown in Figure 8.1.

Negotiation and mediation will play important roles in recognising past issues in relation to land tenure, the methods employed ensuring that decisions about public and private land do not leave major standing issues unaddressed.

If conflict resolution is to be successful in New Zealand, particularly in relation to resource management, its future lies in negotiation, mediation and further public involvement in the decision making process.
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Appendix A

Personal Communication

* Assoc. Prof. P. Ali Memon, Department of Geography, Otago University.

* Alen White, Manager, Department of Conservation, Nelson.
Appendix B

Interviewees

* Andrew Baxter, Senior Conservation Officer Marine Protection, Department of Conservation, Nelson.

* Peter Braggins, Conservation Officer, Department of Conservation, Motueka.


* Nigel Mountfort, Conservation Officer, Department of Conservation, Takaka.

* Maldon Whitwell, Bach Owner in Abel Tasman National Park, Motueka.