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Abstract

In the midst of commemoration programmes for the centenary of the First World War, academic literature about and interest in the topic of commemoration has grown significantly. While studies in the UK and America focus on the use of the past and commemoration, there is little work on commemorative practice within a New Zealand context, particularly over a period of time. As museums and heritage sites increasingly look to new ways of making meaningful experiences for a diverse and changing public, this research seeks to address the gap in the literature and help to inform future management of commemoration in New Zealand.

With the sestercentennial of the 1769 arrival of the Endeavour to New Zealand coming up in 2019, this research involved case studies of the earlier bicentennial in 1969 and the planning stages of the future commemoration in both Gisborne (the site of Lieutenant James Cook’s first landing) and Wellington. The methods employed for this dissertation comprised archival and documentary research, as well as interviews with professionals involved in the sestercentennial. Using a theoretical framework based in museum and heritage studies, as well as history, sociology and cultural studies this study considers the many ways we use the past, from institutional practices to vernacular interests.

The findings revealed that in 1969 commemorations in Gisborne were a spectacle, a true performance. Depictions of Cook were everywhere and monuments were erected all around the city. From pageantry to legacy building, the 2019 focus is on educating the public and establishing meaningful legacies for the future. This dissertation concludes that commemoration should not be treated as a one-off event but rather as an ongoing practice that is shaped by the past and by social and political contexts as much as we are. I argue that the three most important, yet also most changeable, elements of commemoration are narrative, approach to management (top-down and/or bottom-up), and participation. It is common for some to want to ‘look forward’ rather than to the past to inform commemorative planning. However, I argue that more can be gained by consciously seeing the continuity and change of commemorative practice through time. By looking at commemorations in the past and plans for the future this research furthers our understanding of the practice and its role in constructing meaning.
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Introduction

The past can never be understood solely within its own terms; the present continually rewrites the meaning of the past and the memories and histories we construct about it within the context of the present.¹

It cannot be denied that we are currently experiencing what Barbara Misztal calls a ‘commemorative fever’.² It is everywhere and in every form, from the Kate Sheppard ‘cross now’ pedestrian lights to Dave Dobbyn performing for Wellington’s 150th anniversary as capital of New Zealand. Whether commemorating means mourning the dead, protesting for change, celebrating the present or getting a holiday, we participate in a constant process of constructing meaning from the past for the present. The range in commemorative activity and the people who manage it and participate suggests that commemoration is a complex practice requiring thorough research and guidance. To better understand the nature of commemoration and how heritage professionals should go about approaching it the following research question was devised for this dissertation – how and why have changing commemorative practices in New Zealand constructed meaning in different ways over time?

There has been little research into the state of commemorative practice in New Zealand, particularly over a period of time. This dissertation therefore sets out to examine the characteristics of our commemoration and how it has changed. This is done through two case studies of commemorations in New Zealand. This includes the bicentennial (200th anniversary) and sestercentennial (250th anniversary) of Lieutenant James Cook’s arrival to New Zealand in 1769. The Cook Bicentenary was officially commemorated in Gisborne in 1969. The sestercentennial will occur in 2019, thus the case study is focused on the planning of the event. In exploring the similarities and differences of management, participation, narratives and themes this study contributes to understandings of commemorative practice and management in New Zealand.

¹ Laurajane Smith, Uses of Heritage (New York: Routledge, 2006), 58.
² Barbara A. Misztal, Theories of Social Remembering (Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2003), 2.
My interest in this subject was first sparked by talk of the Gisborne-based Te Hā 1769 Sestercentennial Trust (Te Hā) and their plans for commemorating the arrival of Cook to New Zealand. I was particularly interested in their approach to commemoration, where their objectives and choice of name spoke strongly of biculturalism and struck me as markedly different from other commemorative events and anniversaries of the past. Having grown up in Gisborne, I was aware of the strong involvement and participation of the Māori community, partly an effect of them making up nearly half of the Gisborne population. I was intrigued by how this might influence the commemorations, and how it could be different to commemorations in Wellington for example. In order to understand this, a comparison against earlier Cook commemorations seemed to be the best way to highlight the direction in which our commemorative practice was going. Of course, an opportunity to go to Gisborne should never be missed.

Through research of historic, archival and documentary sources, as well as interviews in both Gisborne and Wellington, I was able to study the phenomenon of commemoration within New Zealand. This study also looks at some of the dynamics within commemoration that are particularly significant to museum and heritage studies such as meaning-making, top-down and bottom-up heritage, and representation and participation of indigenous cultures. By understanding how and why we construct meaning through commemorative practice, I further wanted to pose the question of how we should approach the management of commemoration. As a practice how can we best allow for an inclusive, diverse and meaningful experience through commemoration now and in the future?

**Literature Review**

Commemoration acts as a platform whereby individuals, communities and nations have for centuries constructed meaning from the past for present purposes. This idea is central to my research question – how and why have changing commemorative practices in New Zealand constructed meaning in different ways over time? The following literature review

---

examines more widely the work on commemoration, meaning-making and heritage discourse in order to build an analytical framework on which this research is based.

Firstly, I look at commemoration as a heritage practice and its relationship with social constructions such as memory, identity and meaning-making. Memory is a key function of commemoration and Tim Benton and Clementine Cecil discuss how recalling memories is an intangible heritage practice that creates challenges for heritage management. There have been a number of studies into commemoration which I briefly survey and identify the ways commemorative practice has been used to understand social and political contexts. Many of these works consider identity politics, nationhood and war.

In the second section I look at the forces that work to define, construct and mediate these social constructions within commemoration. As we endeavour to make meaning from the past as individuals, so too do heritage professionals strive to make meaning through activities such as commemoration. Lois H. Silverman and Rhiannon Mason discuss the increasing interest within history and museology in making meaning and the interactions between consumers and producers of meaning. This and other concepts within heritage discourse such as public history and historical consciousness are examined to explore the challenges in how we use the past in the present. This leads to a consideration of official and unofficial forms of heritage practice and management. Rodney Harrison and Laurajane Smith examine the exclusionary nature of official heritage practices while Iain Robertson and Raphael Samuel look to heritage and history that challenges top-down nationalist manifestations. I have included this to consider commemoration as an act of official heritage, and how this interacts with vernacular values in constructing meaning.

Studies of commemorative practice began in the late 1980s following an emerging body of work on memory and remembering.⁴ If commemoration is an act of remembering the past, then social memory, both public and private, is at the heart of commemorative practice. Tim Benton and Clementine Cecil discuss the meanings of memory and its implications for the study of heritage. Recalling memories is seen as an example of intangible heritage.⁵ It is a process that is highly selective, motivated and involved with peoples’ opinions and


feelings. Personal or private memory-making is about ‘encoding’ experience and making sense of the world around us. We join our incorporated memory, the habitual unthinking actions, with traditional memory and heritage through ritual such as commemoration. Much of our encoding involves turning our experience into a story and seizing on visual elements.\(^6\) This explains the use of monuments, landscaping and architecture within commemorative spaces.

The relationship between private and public memory is fluid. Collective memory consists of similar memories being shared by a number of people, either through shared experience or through the common rehearsal of stories. Often private and public memories can come together through commemoration.\(^7\) As we encounter the ‘memory boom’, Benton and Cecil consider the implications of institutionalising memory within museums and heritage sites. We are reminded that memory is “changeable, subject to many internal and external pressures and inherently difficult to interrogate.”\(^8\) This creates a challenge for the management of heritage that is closely involved with social memory.

With a far greater understanding of memory and its challenges comes further study into how we remember the past – the construction and retention (or forgetting) of certain memories. Commemoration studies not only allow for the examination of memory and remembering processes but also a range of social and political constructions. This is within many different fields, including history, communication studies, sociology, tourism, and museum and heritage studies. Elma Brenner, Meredith Cohen and Mary Franklin-Brown’s edited volume investigates commemoration in the Middle Ages, to “open windows upon the diversity and complexity of medieval culture.”\(^9\) Looking at commemoration’s role in religious practice, activity and institutions they add to understandings of medieval culture and challenge accepted ideas of the period. For David W. Lloyd, exploring commemoration of the Great War through the perspective of tourism provides an understanding of the cultural history of the time, and questions the overemphasis given to dichotomous concepts such as high and low culture, and tradition and modernity.\(^10\) This dissertation looks at commemoration in a similar vein, but through the perspective of

---

7 Benton and Cecil, 2010, 12.
8 Benton and Cecil, 2010, 41.
9 Elma Brenner, Meredith Cohen, and Mary Franklin-Brown, eds., Memory and Commemoration in Medieval Culture (Burlington and Surrey: Ashgate, 2013), 1.
heritage studies. As a practice, commemoration allows us to navigate through understandings of memory and history, and further our knowledge of societal constructs.

Barbara Misztal, in exploring the ‘age of commemorations’ discusses the three common theoretical perspectives used in the study of commemoration and memory. Although this is within a war context, it is particularly applicable to how this research will be approached. Earlier studies often looked at commemoration as a ritual staged by the modern state, influenced by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger’s *The Invention of Tradition*.¹¹ Here power relations are questioned as authoritarian regimes strive for solidarity and nationhood.¹² Other studies consider the multiplicity of invented traditions and the plurality of memories, particularly focusing on the struggle and negotiation of competing narratives. Thirdly, there has been a growing number of works investigating personal memories of war, analysing commemoration as sites of mourning and reconciliation.¹³ Misztal then discusses overcoming these polarizations between the perspectives by eliminating the divisions and recognising the complexity between the various agents. Studies are then more flexible and sensitive.¹⁴

This research uses this approach to look at commemoration within a New Zealand context. How we use the past cannot be subjected to a categorisation of objectives, but a consideration of the myriad of ways and reasons for commemorating. Thus it is accepted that within commemorative practice are national narratives, competing narratives and personal narratives all working within a particular social and political environment.

Often literature on commemoration has involved specific case studies looking at memory, identity or meaning.¹⁵ This also includes many works on war commemoration, battle sites and commemoration of the dead.¹⁶ Looking at identity politics within Great War commemorations, Shanti Sumartojo and Ben Wellings ask “How is war remembered in

¹⁴ Misztal, 2003, 128.
what is often characterized as a ‘global’ and ‘post-national’ era?” They discuss commemoration’s role in the renewal of national narratives within a context of social and political fragmentation. Keir Reeves et al.’s edited work on battlefield events examines the landscape of war as a site of commemoration, and looks at the complex relationship between management and meaning of war landscapes in the 21st century. As there are many warscapes all over the world it opens up global issues, including tourism and travel, multitudes of meanings and how this influences the management of these sites.

Studies of war commemoration has thus opened up discussion on memorials, monuments and management. Gareth Phipps’ dissertation looks at the 2004 ceremonial events surrounding the Tomb of the Unknown Warrior currently outside Wellington’s National War Memorial. He finds that meaning is constructed through the intersection of individual memory, civil remembrance and national commemorations around the memorial. At the same time there is an awareness of the inability of monuments and memorials established for nationalistic purposes to have meaning for our pluralistic and fragmented societies today. Susette Goldsmith reveals in her dissertation that in ignoring the curtilage of heritage buildings and monuments, heritage management and practice often overlooks the potential to connect people to place through interpretation. In contrast, Leonard Bell has discussed the changing values and roles placed on monuments over time, particularly looking at Auckland pioneer John Logan Campbell and One Tree Hill. He suggests that there has been an apparent lack of realisation that cultural products can generate different responses over time and are fundamental to making and negotiating social identities. He states, “Following the ‘careers’ of artefacts can suggest how difficult it is to isolate any internally coherent identity – national, regional, late colonial, postcolonial, whatever.”

National identity in particular is a common topic within other case studies of commemoration. Lyn Spillman’s comparative study examines centenaries and

---

17 Shanti Sumartojo and Ben Wellings, eds., *Nation, Memory and Great War Commemoration: Mobilizing the Past in Europe, Australia and New Zealand* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2014), 3.
18 Keir Reeves et al., eds., *Battlefield Events: Landscape, Commemoration and Heritage* (New York: Routledge, 2016).
bicentenaries in the United States and Australia. She states, “one of the best ways to compare systematically the ways we formulate our national identities is to compare what people say about their nations in very similar circumstances.”\textsuperscript{22} From this, Spillman is able to extend our understanding of how national identity has come to “structure what is thought.”\textsuperscript{23} John R. Gillis states, “The core meaning of any individual or group identity, namely, a sense of sameness over time and space, is sustained by remembering; and what is remembered is defined by the assumed identity.”\textsuperscript{24} He poses the concept that there are three phases in the history of commemoration in the Western world. The pre-national phase being prior to the late eighteenth century, the national phase beginning at the American and French revolutions through to the 1960s and the present, post-national phase.\textsuperscript{25} Commemoration has had many different purposes throughout history. From commemoration of kings and leaders to war memorials of unknown soldiers, it is a constantly changing practice, sensitive to the political climate and social context of the time.

These case studies reveal the nature of commemoration and memory, and its role in constructing meaning. Monuments and memorials can provide complex meanings and identities within a changing cultural landscape. This means that the management of heritage sites must be willing to also change in order to remain meaningful. This research accepts that national identity is an important aspect of commemoration, however it is not the only one. Therefore, the question is about constructing meaning and thus encapsulating ideas of identity politics, sense of place, and diversity. It also recognises, as Gillis demonstrates, that commemorative practice changes over time according to political and social context. However, little research has looked into the evolving nature of commemoration within New Zealand. It is intended that this research will fill this current gap in the literature by looking at a specific case study of commemoration in New Zealand to further our understanding of the practice and its management in this country.

More recently, Warwick Frost and Jennifer Laing have looked at commemorative events as a phenomenon, rather than through sole case studies. They describe commemorative events

\begin{footnotes}
\item[23] Spillman, 1997, 5.
\end{footnotes}
as “typically planned with intentions of affirming and reinforcing memories that provide a sense of identity and heritage.” They go on to discuss the meanings of commemorative events, noting, “Meanings are how people see an event, what it tells them about themselves and society.” They point out how meanings are often contested through commemorative practice and difficult to resolve.

Central to my research question is the concept of meaning and its construction. Lois Silverman was the first to discuss the meaning-making paradigm and its importance for museology. In response to our changing cultural landscape there has been an increasing desire to be more democratic, relevant and inclusive. This has resulted in a shift to embrace the notion of meaning-making to create more effective museum spaces and exhibitions. Silverman notes, “understanding the ways people make history is a critical step in understanding how meaning about the past is negotiated.”

David Thelen suggests looking at similarities and differences in the ways we use the past and the changes over time to open dialogue among history-makers. Thelen states, “Dialogues can draw strength from their ability to bring diverse voices together.” By looking at the similarities and differences of commemoration and history-making in New Zealand, I hope to better our understanding of the different ways we use the past and how we might bring different ‘history-makers’ together to diversify commemoration.

Many theories of meaning-making have arisen from the concept that communication is no longer considered a linear process. Laurajane Smith sees commemoration as a form of heritage performance and challenges the idea that the audience is a passive receptor, with commemorative practice being drenched in negative and positive emotions binding collective memories. Rhiannon Mason looks at the complex nature of communication processes between heritage sites and visitors. She states that meaning-making is not fixed or absolute but contingent and variable, changing to different historical, geographical or

28 Ibid.
30 Silverman, 1993, 8.
cultural contexts. Therefore, there must be an ongoing process of exchange and dialogue rather than a one-way projection from producer to consumer.

Silverman suggests research and reflective practice in public history and how we communicate meaningfully with the public can help to create more effective ways of sharing authority for the making of meaning. Bronwyn Dalley describes public history as academic, in that it works within the conventions of history research and writing, takes place within the public sphere, and is undertaken according to the funding capacity, research priorities or agendas of another party. Public history is challenged by those who think it does not fully engage with wider historiographical debate. Dalley points out that the circumstances of public history such as tight deadlines and strict word limits, limit this engagement.

History in the public sphere is a complex process of interactions between history and memory, and facts and myths. Alexander Trapeznik and Gavin McLean reveal how the heritage sector has been slow to embrace pluralism and is increasingly marketing heritage as a commodity. In the interests of national identity, a past is created that did not exist. Heritage sites in America work particularly within these constraints. Both Eric Gable and Richard Handler, and Edward M. Bruner discuss the concept of authenticity in relation to reconstructed towns. At Colonial Williamsburg, Gable and Handler argue that the site is constrained by historical accuracy and documented facts. Bruner’s ethnography at the New Salem Historic Site reveals that there is more at play. He admits an American tradition – a national narrative of success ideology – is still commemorated, but there is also a dialogic interaction between visitors and interpretation staff. Gable and Handler are more pessimistic than Bruner, suggesting “the pursuit of an elusive authenticity

34 Silverman, 1993, 10.
remains a goal” and that these constructivist arguments only justify the use of “good myths over bad facts.”

These ideas are further explored through the concept of historical consciousness. Peter Seixas describes historical consciousness as an area in which collective memory, the writing of history, and other ways of shaping the past in the public mind merge. Kynan Gentry examines historical consciousness within colonial society in New Zealand. He notes that a preoccupation of earlier historians with ‘the nation’ and the production of high cultural forms has detached history from its context and homogenised identity. For Gentry, “the production of historical narrative and the ideas of historical and heritage consciousness offer a valuable critique of the dominant idea of ‘the nation’.” Fiona Hamilton’s article also looks at collective memory in New Zealand and explores how pioneers remembered their past and how this intersected with the memorialisation of pioneers and the ‘early days’ within the late 19th and early 20th centuries. These examples of historical consciousness consider how the past has been used in different ways in order to question how we understand and use our own past.

This leads us to a closer look at who is creating, interpreting, participating and making meaning through heritage practices such as commemorations. This section of the literature review will examine the concept of official and vernacular heritage practice and management. Rodney Harrison describes official heritage as created through a top-down approach of classifying and promoting certain places and events. The literature surrounding the topic is particularly critical of its origins and exclusionary narrative. In Smith’s Uses of Heritage, she discusses the effect of an Authorised Heritage Discourse or AHD on official heritage practices. Official registers, lists and legislature are all influenced by the AHD. The AHD is a dominant Western discourse influenced by a European past of nationalism and cultural promotion. As a result, this discourse privileges nation-building,
social consensus, time depth and grandeur. This can exclude minorities from heritage practice, produce inaccurate histories, and only serves the purpose of one particular group.

In contrast, unofficial heritage is a broad range of tangible and intangible practices that are not recognised by official forms of legislation. When Raphael Samuel questioned the typical forms of history and knowledge, recognising “the unspoken assumption that knowledge filters downwards,” he emphasised the rise in popular memory, one that was democratic and privileged the private over the public. Iain Robertson claims that the “shift towards ‘vernacular heritage’ has had an impact on heritage practice that is not always reflected in the academic literature.” This heritage from below is often community led and challenges the top-down nationalist manifestations of heritage.

Unofficial heritage is often thought to be the polar opposite of official forms of heritage, but this is not necessarily the case. Sites or objects may be considered both official and unofficial heritage. According to Harrison, “these categories are locked in a dialectical or recursive process in which each influences the definition of the other.”

John Bodnar gives a particularly good example of the two converging and interacting within commemorative space. The 1981 national memorial to Vietnam veterans divided the public, with some arguing the design lacked a sense of patriotism and glory, while others felt that the emphasis on death and mourning met their needs to express sympathy for fallen soldiers. The debate involved both official and vernacular interests. Bodnar goes on to demonstrate how the history of commemoration in Cleveland has moved from official forms to vernacular and back again. Bodnar argues that “Public memory speaks primarily about the structure of power in society.” He notes that despite the inclusion of vernacular interests in official culture, mediation is not sought at the expense of ascendency. The relationship between official and vernacular forms of heritage is central.

---

46 Smith, 2006, 11.
51 Harrison, 2013, 20.
53 Bodnar, 1994, 76.
54 Bodnar, 1994, 75.
to commemoration. As the literature suggests, the two are not polar opposites but in a recursive process.

This literature review has demonstrated the many facets of commemoration that are at work within the public sphere. What is apparent is how fluid and changeable the social constructs of commemoration can be. Private and public social memory, identities, meanings, and official and vernacular forms of heritage are in a constant state of change. Forms of heritage management and historical enquiry are therefore having to face the challenges posed by a changing society that demand meaningful experiences. This study of commemoration over time highlights these issues, demonstrating the relationship between social and cultural constructs and the forces that define and mediate them in order to construct meaning.

To answer the posed research question, how and why have changing commemorative practices in New Zealand constructed meaning in different ways over time, I intend to use the following ideas to build a theoretical framework. Gentry and Hamilton look to early historical consciousness and the place of social memory in creating identities and meaning. As Hamilton states, “historians of social memory explore how the enunciation and negotiation of memory in the public arena provide collective meanings and identities for societies.” My intention is to work from this perspective, analysing historical narratives and memories in order to understand the construction of meaning through time. Misztal and Thelen both suggest that looking at commemoration should involve examining the many different ways we use the past. This study therefore explores organisation and participation as part of the process of constructing meaning within New Zealand commemorations. This is intended to give an overall perspective of how we have used the past and how we plan on using the past in the future.

**Methodology**

The literature suggests that commemoration involves the combination of social constructions such as memory, identity and meaning-making, and that which defines and mediates those constructions through systems of practice and management. For heritage

professionals in national and local governments, museums, and historic sites it is essential to understand the nature of commemoration and its history in order to better inform future management. This study therefore looks at the practice of commemoration to investigate how it is managed and enacted to construct meaning specifically in New Zealand. Using case study methodology, this dissertation sets out to answer the research question how and why have changing commemorative practices in New Zealand constructed meaning in different ways over time?

To closely study commemorative practice in New Zealand, I have focused on one specific event in history that is about to have its 250th anniversary in 2019. The arrival of Cook in 1769 is a significant historic event in New Zealand. It marks the first interactions on Aotearoa soil of both Māori and European people thus beginning a long history of cultural exchange. In 1969 the arrival of Lieutenant Cook was commemorated in the Cook Bicentenary. Nearly 50 years on, its sestercentennial is currently being planned around the country. The commemorations of 1969 and 2019 were treated as case studies within which I employed a range of research methodologies to obtain a broad understanding of the practice and management of commemorative activity in New Zealand. The research included historical, documentary and archival research, and interviews.

A multiple case study analysis was chosen not only for comparison of 1969 and 2019 but also to better understand the phenomenon of commemoration in different environments. The two commemorations provide the opportunity to look at commemorative practice in the past, in the present and in the future. Drawing cross-case conclusions can demonstrate similarities and differences in commemorative practice over time, as well as the changes occurring within the practice of meaning-making and within the heritage industry. By looking at two cases over a 50-year period, I am able to explore details of changes and responses as well as a general understanding of commemoration as a heritage practice. As Robert E. Stake suggests, "We seek to understand better how this whole...operates in different situations."  

The research question, composed of how and why questions, requires an in-depth description of a social phenomenon. According to Robert K. Yin, “A case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon (the “case”) in depth and

57 Stake, 2006, vi.
within its real-world context.” There have been many commemorative events related to New Zealand history and nationhood. In defining the case, units of analysis must be devised in order to stay within feasible limits. I had intended on examining a number of other commemorations as case studies, such as the 1940 New Zealand Centennial, the 1990 sesquicentennial of the Treaty of Waitangi, the 2012 Transit of Venus, and the recent centenary of World War I. As significant commemorative events, they are important in describing and understanding what commemoration looks like in New Zealand. However, this would have far exceeded the scope of this dissertation and I have briefly mentioned them as context to the two case studies that I eventually chose.

The commemoration of Cook’s voyage and landing, along with the commemorations stated above, are state-sanctioned events largely organised by governing bodies or institutions. They are marked on certain days of the year and are officially recognised by the New Zealand Government as days of significance to the nation. As they are closely linked to notions of national and cultural identity, these commemorations are involved in a process of constructing meaning and this is why I have focused on these particular events.

For the case studies, I examined local and central government involvement as well as public events, exhibitions, community projects and tangible artefacts. As Martyn Denscombe suggests, “The aim is to illuminate the general by looking at the particular.” I chose these features to help direct the research and aid in the comparison of the two case studies. They were also indicative of management and participation in New Zealand commemorations. This allowed me to look at official and unofficial heritage practice, regional and national dynamics, and Māori and Pākehā representation and participation.

To analyse each commemoration I used a range of primary documents to discover what Lyn Spillman calls the ‘symbolic repertoire’ (the themes, symbols, meanings and values) throughout the commemorations to answer my research question. Many were records from official organisers such as steering committees and trusts. From the literature, official heritage is seen to demonstrate traditional patterns of domination, excluding minorities, and being biased in practice. For this research, official heritage is defined as the management of heritage by governing bodies and institutions such as government.

---

councils, museums and trusts. Looking at official commemorative practice and management and how it has changed over time, I was able to observe the role held by the government and those in the heritage industry. In particular, whether that role enforces from a top-down position or if they play a more mediating role in commemorative management.

An ideal approach would have involved an extensive analysis of the vernacular forms of commemoration or unofficial heritage practices that may have taken place at either event. This would have been a valuable addition to the research, as it would help to fully understand the role of heritage practice and management in constructing meaning through commemoration. Gaining perspectives on heritage within the community and its role as social action creates an interesting counter point to the discussion of official commemoration and the extent to which it engages with the public. However, it is difficult to research this kind of practice as it is community-based, and not likely to have been recorded. To this end, I still endeavoured to find any critique or opposition from other groups that may add another dimension to the research, as well as mentioning the community events I was able to find that were included in the official programmes. While this was not as extensive, it gives a general idea of the social atmosphere and changing reception of commemorative activity over time.

A good case study relies on as many sources of evidence as possible. As the 1969 case has already occurred it was not possible to carry out any direct observations or participant-observations. I therefore relied on archival research for the past commemoration. Gary McCulloch suggests that archives “can provide potent evidence of continuity and change in ideals and in practices.” This involved consulting the Gisborne Archives, the monthly pictorial serial Gisborne Photo News, Archives New Zealand and the National Library/Alexander Turnbull Library to find information about the 1969 bicentennial commemorations. Newspapers, photographs and ephemeral material such as programmes, promotional material, records of events, and newsletters provided a lot of information about past commemorations. I was able to gather the ways in which the commemorative activities were organised and marketed, who they were targeted at, and established what the aims, objectives and themes of the commemorations were.

---

Documentary analysis involved looking at reports, meeting minutes, council minutes, speeches and official documentation relating to the commemorative events. According to McCulloch, using committee minutes and papers can “reveal a great deal about the discussion of the issues…and help to take the educational and social researcher behind the scenes to what are in many cases frank and open commentaries.”\(^{64}\) Documentary sources can also give the researcher a number of perspectives on a problem or topic.\(^{65}\) However, documents can have significant limitations. Official documents of a particular institution can cast that organisation in a favourable light, undermining criticism or alternatives to issues.\(^{66}\) For these reasons, McCulloch states that documents “need to be read critically and analysed rather than being taken at face value.”\(^{67}\) It was necessary to take note of who was present, the interests represented, the date and the venue to understand the full context of the sources.

Most of my research used documentary sources for official dates, activities, and names of trusts or committees, avoiding making conclusions about certain groups or individuals from the information. Rather, I gave the facts of what a committee, group or individual organised and analysed what was missing from the programmes in order to provide less biased readings of the material. This was for both the 1969 and 2019 commemorative planning.

For the 2019 commemorations, qualitative research in the form of interviews complemented the information gathered from documentary sources and therefore provided a wider picture of the context around the planning for the future event. As Michael Quinn Patton states, “We interview people to find out from them those things we cannot directly observe.”\(^{68}\) I interviewed four professionals involved with planning for the sestercentennial. This included two members from the Te Hā Trust in Gisborne, the Director of the Tairāwhiti Museum and a Senior Adviser from the Ministry for Culture and Heritage based in Wellington. Involvement and current challenges being faced concerning the commemoration plans were discussed. I also sought to gain an understanding of the interviewees’ perspective on commemoration within an historic context, particularly
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\(^{64}\) McCulloch, 2004, 62.
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asking about their thoughts on 1969 and other commemorations. It is worth mentioning here that I interviewed the two members of Te Hā together. This allowed them to discuss the trust and its objectives fully. It is possible that this situation limited them from sharing some personal thoughts, or influenced what was discussed. However, they seemed comfortable to talk in front of each other and I felt that their contribution to the study was better focused on their shared work with Te Hā rather than their personal motives or opinions (although the two are not entirely exclusive).

I used Patton’s general interview guide approach where a list of questions was established beforehand, given to the interviewee prior to the meeting and explored during the interview. This method was flexible in that questions could be omitted or added and ensured flow of conversation. As I intended to interview a range of people from different areas there was the opportunity to tailor the interview questions depending on each participant’s involvement in the commemorative events. It also allowed the participants to elaborate on certain topics. The interviews were undertaken in both Gisborne and Wellington and usually lasted just under an hour.

**Chapter Outline**

The first chapter provides a brief overview of important historic events in New Zealand that we still commemorate today including the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi and the First World War. I have chosen events that are recognised nationwide, although they may not necessarily be commemorated by everyone. A brief description of the historic events, why they are considered important and how we have commemorated them in the past is included. An understanding of commemoration in New Zealand provides context to the arrival of Lieutenant Cook and the subsequent commemorations that will be examined in the following chapters.

Chapter Two gives the case study of the Cook Bicentenary of 1969. Firstly, the organisation and participation of the commemorations is discussed. This is followed by an explanation of the events, exhibitions, and memorials and memorabilia. The themes that appeared to stand out the most from the findings are given.

---
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Chapter Three then provides some information on commemorative activity that has occurred between 1969 and the present. This includes a brief description of the Transit of Venus commemorations at Ūawa Tolaga Bay and its part in the upcoming sestercentennial, as well as information about the Te Hā Sestercentennial 1769 Trust. The main findings from the interviews are provided including the current planning, themes and challenges for 2019. The chapter is concluded with a comparison of the 1969 and the 2019 commemorations where I discuss the differences and similarities.
Chapter One

Commemoration in New Zealand: From national spirit to wet t-shirts

Introduction

As the literature suggests, when we look at commemorative practice over a period of time, it is possible to understand the different ways we interpret and use the past in these processes of meaning-making. The following chapter will provide some background to public commemoration in New Zealand. Aside from the events of 1769, there are two other significant national commemorations that I have chosen to focus on: the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 and the First World War of 1914-1919. I discuss the reasons for their importance in New Zealand and also the context which they provide for examining the arrival of Lieutenant James Cook and subsequent commemorations. A brief consideration of how these particular events have been commemorated in the past and more recently reveals social and political changes in New Zealand and how this has influenced our commemorative practice. This is intended to give a wider context to Chapter Two and Chapter Three covering the case studies of the 1969 and 2019 commemorations.

Commemorative practice can occur on many different levels, whether it be personal, local or national. However, for the purposes of this research I am focusing on commemoration that is recognised by the state and has considerable meaning to New Zealand as a nation. There are currently two national holidays in New Zealand that observe the anniversary of an important historic event. This is Waitangi Day—New Zealand’s national day—and Anzac Day.

The Treaty of Waitangi

European presence in New Zealand was sporadic up until the 1830s, consisting largely of missionaries and traders. However, Britain’s concerns for the growing number of British

---

1 Although the First World War ended in 1918, the Ministry for Culture and Heritage’s commemorative programme includes significant dates following the war including peace settlement and repatriation of 1919.

2 Labour Day is also a public holiday in New Zealand that commemorates the right to an eight-hour working day. However, celebrations ceased by the 1920s and is now just a holiday for many. (http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/politics/labour-day)
subjects in New Zealand, colonisation plans from the private firm the New Zealand Company, and ongoing tribal wars led to the need for intervention. The British Government sent naval officer William Hobson to establish a British colony in 1839. Hobson was instructed to negotiate the voluntary transfer of Māori sovereignty to the Crown, a process that was rushed and had little input from others. A Māori version of the Treaty was prepared by the missionary Henry Williams and his son Edward overnight, with the whole document completed within four days.

On February 5, 1840 both versions of the Treaty were presented to a gathering of northern chiefs at Waitangi. The document was problematic in a number of ways, particularly where the Māori version did not correspond with the English one, meaning that many signed the Treaty under misconceptions. For example, the word ‘sovereignty’ was translated by Williams as ‘kawanatanga’. More literally however this word means governorship, taking on a different meaning to sovereignty. Details such as these would become the centre of debate for the next 175 years. On that day, there was much discussion among the chiefs and on February 6, 45 of them signed the Treaty. Subsequent signatures were obtained at 50 other locations around New Zealand. The Treaty of Waitangi, as it came to be known, would, as Michael King suggests, “turn out to be the most contentious and problematic ingredient in New Zealand’s national life.”

**Waitangi Day**


6 King, 2012, 162-64.

7 King, 2012, 156-57.
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100 years with pride and pageantry. The New Zealand Centennial was a highly choreographed and organised event intended to celebrate New Zealand’s progress and achievements and create a national spirit.\textsuperscript{10} A grand centennial exhibition designed by architect Edmund Anscombe\textsuperscript{11} was built at Rongotai in Wellington. It included a 47m high tower, a number of exhibits and a large amusement park, entertaining more than 2.6 million visitors over the six months that it was open.\textsuperscript{12}

Despite its close association with the Treaty, Jock Phillips notes that “few of the Pakeha population saw the centennial year primarily as a commemoration of the Treaty of Waitangi; and even fewer as an opportunity to consider the obligations imposed by that treaty.”\textsuperscript{13} However, Māori involvement was encouraged and used by some as an opportunity to voice grievances. Sir Āpirana Ngata, Māori politician, lawyer and Ngāti Porou leader,\textsuperscript{14} raised concerns that it was not a celebration for everyone, and some tribal leaders from Waikato refused to attend events citing the lack of recognition given to Treaty claims.\textsuperscript{15} For Māori, the Treaty itself, along with Māori autonomy, rights and identity, were central to centennial commemorations.

Ngata, with politician and Ngā Puhi leader, Taurekareka Henare, strived to promote the symbolic importance of the Treaty.\textsuperscript{16} They proposed the building of a whare rūnanga alongside the Busby residence at Waitangi, which opened on February 6, 1940. Not only was Ngata’s intention to represent the symbolic relationship of the treaty but also to present a unified Māori identity and tradition.\textsuperscript{17} Ngata had the whare whakairo built slightly differently to his usual design of the time, as Damian Skinner notes, “due to the particular status of this whare whakairo as a monument or museum, rather than a marae

\textsuperscript{11} Edmund Anscombe (1874-1948) was also instigator and architect of Dunedin’s New Zealand & South Seas International Exhibition in 1925.
\textsuperscript{14} Ngata represented ‘the native race’ on the National Centennial Committee and was a member of the National Maori Centennial Committee. He was also on the Dominion Museum’s Board of Trustees.
\textsuperscript{17} Renwick, 2004, 16.
setting.” Te Tiriti o Waitangi Whare Rūnanga thus stood for something much more than just a commemorative project, but a way for Māori to explore ideas of cultural and political identity.

The centennial events also played a role in the revival of Māori arts and crafts. The movement began to take shape in the 1920s, when the School of Maori Arts and Crafts proposed by Ngata was established in Rotorua. ‘Nga taonga o te Maoritanga’, as Ngata called it, were intended to help uplift Māori cultural aspirations and identity. At the Centennial Exhibition more Māori involvement in displaying arts and crafts meant that they were able to “present a counter view to assimilation, one which resisted their being consigned to the past or barred from the present,” as Conal McCarthy notes. The exhibition provided Māori with a place and time to put forward their social and political agenda. Māori Member of Parliament Eruera Tirikatene stated in his Centennial Exhibition closing speech, “I would also make a humble application to both Maori and Pakeha to lend a hand in giving to the Maori an opportunity to regain and to conquer that art and craft, which is regarded to-day as so rare and beautiful.”

Annual commemorations of the Treaty of Waitangi began in 1947 and were attended regularly by the navy, with the governor-general and members of parliament representing the Crown. In 1960 the Waitangi Day Act proclaimed that February 6 was a ‘national day of thanksgiving’ and it eventually became a public holiday in 1974. Confrontation and protest became common at Waitangi Day commemorations particularly from the 1970s onwards. As Patrick A. McAllister suggests it “provided a regular opportunity to draw attention to the Crown’s failure to adhere to the Treaty and for voicing grievances relating to breaches of the Treaty.”

21 McCarthy, 2007, 89.
as well as international recognition of indigenous rights, gave power to social activism and protests.26

Another driving force behind Waitangi commemorations came in 1985 when the Waitangi Tribunal, set up in 1975, extended its consideration of alleged breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi to 1840.27 With major claims and settlements being made, there was far more interest in the Treaty and historic events and this fostered some resentment towards the Crown and government. In the 1990s, protest had escalated so much that the government withdrew from officially participating in Waitangi commemorations.28

It was during this time that New Zealand marked the 150th anniversary of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1990. The 1990 Commission that was established in 1988, identified dates throughout the year and formed an impressive programme of events for all New Zealanders.29 A re-enactment of the signing took place on Waitangi Day and involved 22 waka carved for the commemorations by iwi from around the country. Around 60,000 visitors attended the event.30 Claudia Orange describes the re-enactment as a “gala occasion, marked by a spirit of openness and hope for the future.”31 The sesquicentenary was focused on promoting national identity, with the Treaty presented as the nation’s founding document.32

Although the media characterised the events as a celebration rather than a commemoration, there was still unrest and hostility amongst some Māori. During Queen Elizabeth II’s visit to Waitangi in February for the sesquicentennial commemorations, a wet t-shirt was thrown by one of the Māori protesters gathered at the Treaty grounds.33 The Anglican Bishop of Aotearoa, Whakahuihui Vercoe also voiced his opinions, saying “I want to remind our partners that you have marginalised us. You have not honoured the Treaty. We have not honoured each other in the promises we made on this sacred ground.”34

27 King, 2012, 487.
32 Orange, 2004, 199.
34 Orange, 2011, 249.
More recently Waitangi Day has been thrust into the political scene once again. On February 4, 2016 the controversial Trans-Pacific Partnership deal (TPP) was officially signed in Auckland, two days before Waitangi Day. Some Māori took issue with the signing, pointing out that it did not meet obligations to Māori and conflicted with the Treaty. In response, many of the iwi in the Auckland area refused to participate in the TPP ceremonies. New Zealand Prime Minister John Key did not attend Waitangi commemorations at Te Tii marae, this being the first time since becoming the National Party leader in 2007. It seems that Waitangi Day continues to be a platform on which to debate, discuss and question past and current politics and identities.

New Zealand and the First World War

Another significant commemorative event in New Zealand’s history that has had a lot of coverage recently is the First World War. When heir to the Austro-Hungarian throne Archduke Franz Ferdinand was assassinated, eventually sending the major European powers into war, New Zealand found itself inevitably involved. On August 5, 1914 the New Zealand Governor Lord Liverpool stood outside Parliament in Wellington and read the telegram sent from King George V of England declaring that Britain was at war with Germany. As a Dominion of Britain, New Zealand was still very much tied to the ‘motherland’ and thus were now also at war with Germany.

In early April of 1915, New Zealand soldiers in Egypt were sent along with Australians, British and French, to the Greek Island Lemnos to prepare an invasion of the Gallipoli Peninsula. The Australian and New Zealand Army Corps (ANZAC) were to provide almost half of the Mediterranean Expeditionary Force of 75,000. Upon landing at Gallipoli on April 25 it was discovered that the British had underestimated the Ottoman forces.


39 Fenton et al., 2013, 18.
forces and the battles that ensued were chaotic with heavy casualties.\textsuperscript{40} The Gallipoli campaign lasted eight months and resulted in little success, with New Zealand losing 2779 men.\textsuperscript{41}

**Anzac Day**

The 25\textsuperscript{th} of April has been a day of commemoration ever since 1915. After news reached New Zealand of the landings at Gallipoli, a half-day holiday was declared for government offices and stories of New Zealand heroism were distributed.\textsuperscript{42} From early on returned servicemen held an important role in the day’s ceremonies and in response to the Returned Services’ Association’s (RSA) request, April 25 was declared a public holiday in 1920.\textsuperscript{43} For many years it was a day of national pride as well as a public expression of grief for those lost at Gallipoli.

During the 1960s and 1970s Anzac Day was used for peace and women’s rights protest movements and was increasingly regarded as a time to discuss war-related issues. A growing focus on national identity occurred in the 1980s and 1990s, where many felt that the events of the First World War were the foundation of a distinct New Zealand identity. Later historians such as James Belich questioned these claims, considering the strong relationship New Zealand maintained with Britain during and after the war. Belich states, “Better Britonism, dominionism did assert a strong New Zealand—or Australian—collective identity, but in neither case was it independent nationalism. The 18,000 Christs had not died in a cause that could be easily or directly related to separate New Zealand national interests.”\textsuperscript{44}

More recently Anzac Day has been commemorated by a growing number of people, particularly young people. In 2015, Anzac Day commemorations in the main city centres saw turnouts in the 20,000s, the highest it has ever been.\textsuperscript{45} It has become a day to

\textsuperscript{40} Fenton et al., 2013, 19.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid.
remember all New Zealanders killed in war and to honour returned servicemen and women. It is common to have a dawn service where veterans, serving personnel, local dignitaries and the public gather at war memorials. The national anthem and hymns are sung, wreaths are laid and the last post is played. These Anzac Day rituals are still very similar to 100 years ago.

The First World War centenary was recognised by the government as a significant commemoration for 2014-2019. The official commemorative programme was launched by former Arts, Culture and Heritage Minister Christopher Finlayson in 2013. The programme, labelled WW100, includes a range of events and activities, as well as a theme for each year of commemoration. It is intended to offer “every New Zealander the chance to consider the impact of the First World War” and “an opportunity to better understand our past and how it still shapes us today. For recent immigrants it is a chance to find out more about your new home and its history.”

Although official ceremonies have been similar to earlier commemorations, there are some features of the centenary commemorations that have been decidedly different. There has been more attention paid to alternative histories including the Māori battalion, nurses, and conscientious objectors. The heroic New Zealand soldier narrative has been diversified and challenged to a certain extent by stories of overseas riots, military arrests, and venereal disease. There has also been extensive development in the digitisation of First World War archival records, photographs, objects and diaries over the last decade. This information has been made available online to the public, encouraging people to get involved in family research and community projects.

**Overview: Commemoration in New Zealand**

This brief discussion of national commemoration in New Zealand not only highlights its changeable nature over time but also provides a context in which to examine the commemoration of Cook’s arrival in this country. These commemorative days are all similar. They each are closely tied to concepts of national identity and nation-building, and
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have strong influence from the government, institutions and authorities. Over time the ways in which they have constructed meaning has changed in response to the social and political environment.

Waitangi Day commemorations show the complexities of a bicultural agenda, where Crown-Māori and, more generally, Pākehā-Māori relations are brought to the fore. Looking at past commemorations of the Treaty emphasises the hostility felt at such occasions by some in the Māori community. Though Māori involvement was encouraged and many took the opportunity to promote Treaty understanding, there has been difficulty in finding appropriate ways to deal with these conflicts in commemorative practice. It is a similar story for the sestercentennial of the arrival of the Endeavour, in which some Māori do not see it as a celebration but rather an event that had devastating effects on their people. Commemorative practice in New Zealand has become increasingly aware of the negative impacts caused by events in our history and the need to reconcile differences particularly between Māori and Pākehā New Zealanders.

It is also evident that, more recently, traditional narratives have been challenged during commemoration. New stories are told, or at least the old ones are diversified, in order to move away from overarching, usually Eurocentric narratives. This has occurred in both the story of the signing of the Treaty, once thought of as “the fairest treaty ever made by Europeans with a native race,” and for WW100 in which the brave soldier in battle is joined by the many others with stories to tell. A similar shift has occurred with stories of Captain Cook following more critical perspectives of historians wanting to challenge the idolisation of Cook by many in the past. Commemorative events have given some the opportunity to question old narratives and start articulating new ones.

The WW100 commemorative programme also gives an indication of commemorative practice in New Zealand today. The scope of events and activities is endless, from re-enactments, theatre performances and television series to publications, lectures, exhibitions, memorial parks and heritage trails. It has had significant funding from the government and the Lottery Grants Board, which allocated more than $25 million to


support the community’s involvement. This national event is likely to be the most demanding commemorative programme the government has worked on, extending over five years, and will surely have an influence on commemorative practice now and in the future.

The arrival of Lieutenant Cook

Another significant event in New Zealand’s history that is commemorated by the nation is the arrival of the *Endeavour* and the interactions between European and Māori peoples in 1769. It was to be the beginning of a long history of cultural exchange. Captain of the *Endeavour*, James Cook was born in Yorkshire, England. His father was a farm labourer and his mother, a local woman. In 1755 he joined the Royal Navy at the age of 27, fought in the Seven Years’ War, and began a successful career surveying and making astronomical observations. At the time, the only knowledge of New Zealand was from Dutch explorer Abel Tasman’s earlier voyage up the western coastline in 1642. The Royal Society of London was an influential group of wealthy patrons and scientists that was established in the 17th century. Their strong interest in maritime exploration and astronomy led to their commission of a South Pacific expedition.

The Transit of Venus was set to occur in 1769 and the society felt that Britain should play a leading role in its observations. They were granted £4000 by King George III and promptly chose the newly commissioned Lieutenant Cook as the commander of the ship *Endeavour*. Cook was joined by the Royal Society member Joseph Banks, a wealthy young botanist, and his entourage of artists and scientists who would be incremental in documenting the flora and fauna of New Zealand. Cook was given a set of instructions which included observing the Transit in Tahiti and to search for what was widely believed to be a great undiscovered southern continent. The *Endeavour* arrived in Tahiti on April

---

13, and the transit was observed in June.\textsuperscript{56} Here they met Tupaia, a leading arioi, born to a high ranking Ra’iatean family. Arioi was an exclusive society of priests, voyagers, warriors, orators and famed lovers.\textsuperscript{57} Tupaia was an experienced voyager and had an extensive knowledge of the islands in the Pacific. He became very close to Cook and Banks, and with an increasingly volatile situation occurring in Tahiti, decided to set off with Cook and his crew in July, accompanied by his young servant, Taiato.\textsuperscript{58}

On October 6, 1769 the surgeon’s boy Nicholas Young sighted land and Cook anchored at Tūranganui-a-Kiwa on the East Coast of the North Island of New Zealand. Locals thought the ship was the sacred island Waikawa, coming into the harbour, others thought it was a great bird.\textsuperscript{59} A couple of days later a group including Cook and Banks came ashore to collect plants near the Tūranganui river. Some boys from the ship were confronted by four Māori warriors and shots were fired. Te Maro of Ngāti Oneone was killed and Cook’s party left beads and nails on his body in reconciliation. This was not the only unsuccessful interaction, another on the famous rock Te Toka-a-Taiau resulted in the death of a chief from the Rongowhakaata tribe Te Rākau.\textsuperscript{60} Four more men were wounded after resisting capture by Cook’s crew. These losses occurred in a situation of confusion and chaos, with neither party understanding the other. Cook left the bay not long after, and named it Poverty Bay “because it afforded us no one thing we wanted.”\textsuperscript{61}

Cook would go on to explore further up the East Coast at Ūawa and Anaura Bay, then to Whitianga (Mercury Bay), the Bay of Islands, down to Meretoto (Ship Cove) and back up towards Cape Turnagain eventually ascertaining that the Southern Continent was a myth, or at least that New Zealand was not it.\textsuperscript{62} On March 31, 1770 they sailed into the Tasman Sea towards ‘New Holland’ (Australia). Cook went on to captain another two voyages of the Pacific in 1772-75 and 1776-79, and was killed in an incident with islanders in Hawaii in February 1779.\textsuperscript{63} Over the three voyages Cook spent a total of 328 days off and on the

\textsuperscript{56} Salmond, 2004, 64.
\textsuperscript{57} Salmond, 2004, 37.
\textsuperscript{58} Salmond, 2004, 94-96.
\textsuperscript{60} Salmond, 2004, 115-17.
New Zealand coast. Substantial cultural exchange took place, particularly between Tupaia and the locals. It also resulted in the introduction of metal, vegetables, European firepower and venereal disease to the Pacific.  

**Leading up to commemorations of 1769**

There has been extensive research into the events of 1769 by New Zealand scholars since the middle of the 21st century. In particular, John Cawte Beaglehole’s edited volumes of Cook’s journals and his biography of the Captain were a significant contribution to scholarly material on the events. Beaglehole was born in Wellington in 1901. He spent three years as an assistant lecturer of history at Victoria University College (now Victoria University of Wellington) and completed his MA thesis on Governor William Hobson before setting off for London. There he finished his doctoral dissertation on British colonial policy and returned to New Zealand with a tutoring position in Dunedin. Beaglehole would return to Victoria University to become lecturer, and later professor despite earlier reservations about his “dangerous radicalism.”

During the New Zealand Centennial, Beaglehole worked closely with Under-Secretary of Internal Affairs, J.W. Heenan, and was appointed historical adviser and typographical adviser for the centennial publications. It was this work that seemed to instil some notions of national identity in him, as he claimed it gave him a sense of what it was to be a New Zealander. Later in 1949-50 while on leave in London Beaglehole would begin editing the journals of Cook on his three voyages and Joseph Banks’ *Endeavour* journal. Each volume appeared in 1955, 1961 and 1967, with Banks’ journal published in 1962. Until that point the Cook journals had never been printed as Cook had written them. Earlier work was often edited for public consumption and included additional observations. Beaglehole wrote that Admiral Wharton, whose edition was published in 1893, was ‘an awful prude’.

---
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According to his son and biographer Tim Beaglehole, Beaglehole’s four published volumes “displayed his superb gifts as an historian and editor and provided the foundation for a new generation of Cook studies.”

Scholarly work related to Cook would often draw on the journals as a starting point. In the 1990s, historian and anthropologist Dame Anne Salmond published a series of books chronicling the exchanges between Māori and Europeans. Her work was particularly ground-breaking for moving away from only telling the European side of the story and including Polynesians as historical agents. As she states, “This book tries to avoid the trap of Cyclops, with his one-eyed vision.”

This opened up a lot of discussion surrounding the events of 1769 and forced many to rethink their ideas about New Zealand’s history.

Conclusion

This chapter has briefly looked at past commemorations in New Zealand in order to provide an overview of how commemorative activity has changed over time. Looking at Waitangi Day and Anzac Day provides an understanding of our national commemorations and the way in which we use them to construct meaning. Waitangi Day demonstrates the use of commemoration as a site of debate, discussion and protest, particularly regarding Māori rights, identity and relations. The growing involvement and participation of Māori has resulted in commemorative practice and management becoming more bicultural and conscientious. Anzac Day commemorations have also embraced alternative views and histories. The narratives of each historic event has been contested and rewritten over the years in response to the changing social and political climate in New Zealand. This suggests that commemoration is not a fixed event in time but an evolving practice.

Not only is the practice of commemoration made clear through this analysis but many of the themes and changes evident through these events offer a context to examine the commemoration of Cook’s arrival. Waitangi Day and Anzac Day commemorations highlight the move from a Eurocentric narrative, the growing involvement of Māori, and the close relationship with national identity and nation-building. The next two chapters will look more closely at the changes that have occurred over a period of almost 50 years in the commemoration of Cook’s arrival.
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Chapter Two

Cook Bicentenary 1969: “Spectacle, pageantry and parade were the order of the week”

Introduction

200 years after the *Endeavour* anchored at Poverty Bay, commemorations around New Zealand were set in order for the Cook Bicentenary of 1969. Central government chose the city of Gisborne as the centre of official celebrations. The following chapter is a case study of these events. It will first outline how the commemorations were organised in both Gisborne and Wellington, looking at committees and the relationship between the regions, as well as participation of the public. A summary of the events, exhibitions and monuments gives an idea of the commemorative practices that took place for the bicentenary. This will lead to a discussion of the main themes of the commemorations.

Organisation

Similar to today, central government took on a leading role in the implementation of national commemorations in the 1960s. In 1965, Cabinet established the Cook Bicentennial Steering Committee “to examine various proposals put forward for the celebration of the Cook Bicentenary.” An Interdepartmental Working Committee headed by Internal Affairs was set up in 1968 to carry out the work of the Steering Committee. Government’s involvement in the 1969 commemorations was mainly on a local level. Regional councils were encouraged to hold events and schools were advised to study Cook at the time of commemoration.

The government made five main contributions towards the Cook Bicentennial. This included national celebrations at Gisborne, a national memorial to Cook, subsidies for memorials in areas of landing sites, an exhibition at the Dominion Museum in Wellington, and the establishment of the Captain James Cook Research Fellowship. Priority was firstly given to the national celebrations, which were organised in association with local

---

events in Gisborne. Besides this, the government’s focus was on local initiatives, organisation and financial responsibility. Direction and advice was given to local authorities of the landing sites and the main centres of Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch and Dunedin.4

The government nominated Gisborne as the centre of official celebrations for the Cook Bicentenary. Local interest had already been firmly established at this point. At the time, newspapers claimed the landing to be the biggest historical event in New Zealand and that 1969 would be an occasion to remember.5 The bicentenary was considered a significant event for the region, particularly for tourism and future development of the area. A Gisborne Bicentenary Steering Committee was formed in 1966.6 The group represented local bodies and the delegates of interested organisations, and was chaired by the mayor of Gisborne, Harry Heaton Barker.7 The committee arranged all local commemorative events and activities. They also acted as negotiators with central government.

This relationship proved to be strained at times. Newspapers from around 1967 and 1968 show the concern building amongst those in Gisborne wanting to move forward with plans for the Cook bicentenary. Many felt that there was a lack of liaison and support from central government. The Gisborne Herald stated, “While there was no excuse for local inactivity, it was fair to comment that progress was to some extent restricted by the absence of a lead from the Government.” Their concerns were heard in Wellington and it was mostly down to the difficult economic situation of the time that the plans could not be brought up with the Minister. A 1968 cartoon from the Marlborough Express (Fig. 2.1) illustrates feelings about the chaotic last minute planning, suggesting little confidence in the plans for 1969.

---
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The official 1969 week of commemoration in Gisborne, known as Cook Week, was scheduled for October 3 – 12. The city also designated early February 1969 to January 1970 as Cook Year. Central government chose October 9, the day that Cook set foot on New Zealand land 200 years earlier, to be the day of national celebrations. This became Cook National Day where non-essential state servants in Gisborne had the day off and primary and secondary schools were encouraged to mark the anniversary by studying Cook and his voyages.

**Participation**

As the events were conducted at a national level, there was participation of official parties and delegates, particularly from the New Zealand Government. The large naval presence in Gisborne added to the sense of formality and authority. There was also delegation from the Royal Society as well as the Art Galleries and Museums Association of New Zealand (AGMANZ, now Museums Aotearoa). This gives the impression that a top-down approach was taken to manage the commemorations of 1969. In this sense, those with authority

---

determined what was being commemorated and where and how the public commemorated it.

However, despite the considerable organisation taking place at a higher level of management, there were many aspects of the bicentenary that were approached from the bottom-up. Small clubs and communities were involved in the events and put on their own activities. The Gisborne Folk Music Club put on a folk festival that included square dancing and a public concert, and the Canoe and Tramping Club took people on a historic excursion to Young Nick’s Head.\(^\text{11}\) While it was a chance for some to reflect on their histories, others enjoyed getting into the celebratory spirit – the Cook Bicentenary was inspiration to hair stylist, Cathy Hall, who paraded her two-coloured creation called the “Bicentenary Fountain” at the Hairdressers’ Cabaret that year (Fig 2.2).\(^\text{12}\) These vernacular forms of practice encouraged the participation of a diverse group of people in the community by offering a range of different activities. This demonstrates that often commemorative activity involves both official and unofficial heritage practices at national and local levels.

It was recommended that organising committees “encourage and facilitate increased participation by Maori groups in local celebrations or in other events marking the Bicentenary.”\(^\text{13}\) Although it is unclear how the committee implemented this, it is evident that there was Māori participation in the Gisborne commemorations. A Māori ceremonial welcome and entertainment by the Waihirere Māori Concert Party were included in the official state function. Māori groups in the community also participated in the parade by entering Māori themed floats (Fig 2.3).\(^\text{14}\)

\(^{11}\) *Gisborne Photo News*, December 3, 1969; Cook Week Programme, 1969.


\(^{13}\) Headquarters New Zealand Defence Force, Ceremonials & Celebrations: General: Cook Bi-Centenary 1969-70, R17230378, Archives New Zealand, Wellington.

\(^{14}\) Cook Week Programme, 1969.
Events

On Friday October 3, 1969 Cook Week kicked off with the Cook Bicentennial relay starting at Government House in Wellington. The Gisborne Harrier Club left with a goodwill message from the governor-general and presented it to the Gisborne Mayor at the Gisborne Council Chambers two days later. The annual Poverty Bay A&P Show also opened on Friday, including the show highlight – a Miss Hereford Heifer 1969 Contest (Fig 2.4). Commemorations for Cook seemed to have enticed the celebration of other significant anniversaries as it is noted that 1969 marks the centenary of the introduction of the Hereford breed to New Zealand.

Other events over the course of the week included international wrestling, a Māori concert, a Christian blessing of the fishing fleet, naval ships anchoring in the bay, a retailers’ “Sellabration” street market day, unveiling of memorials, balls, air pageants and a community act of worship. Activities took place all over Gisborne and involved a range of clubs and individuals. Some of these included a Cook Bicentennial Poultry and Aviary Show, rugby games, garden competitions, a yacht race, and the Gisborne Choral Society presented a history in music from Cook’s day.

---

16 Cook Week Programme, 1969.
17 Schedule of Activities, 1969.
The day of national celebrations was held in Gisborne on Thursday, October 9. This was a highly organised event and involved many official figures. The morning began with a naval ceremony at the Captain Cook Monument near Kaiti Beach. Platoons of 60 officers and sailors represented the ships’ companies that visited Gisborne. New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada and the United States were all represented at the ceremony. A Public Civic Ceremony at Endeavour Park welcoming the official visitors followed this. The very military style ceremony included the Royal Guard, 7th Battalion RNZ Infantry Regiment, a fly-past by the RNZAF and military bands to welcome the Prime Minister Keith Holyoake, the Governor-General Sir Arthur Porritt, and their wives.\textsuperscript{18}

The parade of 100 floats that came next added some fun to the proceedings. Travelling through the main city centre was a range of floats entered by local clubs, groups and individuals. It began with a Māori float described as ‘The Original People’ and entered by the Māori Community. As well as this was a float with a meeting house and canoe entered by the Māori peoples of Tokomaru Bay, Ruatoria and Chaffey’s Transport. The Cook floats followed, with the \textit{Endeavour}, Young Nick, Cook and the Māori, and one for Banks and Solander. Many floats harked back to the “pioneering” days, including buggies, wagonettes, gigs and pit sawing. Others reflected on their own histories – the Fire Brigade had a 1769 fire pump float, as well as a hand fire pump from 1869. Wattie’s Canneries did a ‘Preparation of Food thro’ the Years’ and Melbourne Cash went for ‘Clothing from Maori to Space Age’.\textsuperscript{19} This ‘Then and Now’ concept was a recurring one for many of the floats in the parade. They were a celebration of both the past and the present, highlighting how far society had come and promoting the successes of civilisation – or at the very least, the successes of local business. Displaying the evolution of technology, transport and clothing emphasised achievement and progress for the region as well as the nation.

\textsuperscript{18} Cook Week Programme, 1969.

\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Gisborne Photo News}, November 5, 1969; Cook Week Programme, 1969.
After a Civic Luncheon at the YMCA building, the official government function of commemoration took place at Rugby Park. This began with the arrival of the Prime Minister and his wife. The governor-general then received the Māori ceremonial welcome involving a wero (challenge), haka and pōwhiri. The Prime Minister and governor-general, as well as the leader of the opposition, Norman Kirk, and Māori representative, Hanara Tangiawha Te Ohaki Reedy (Arnold Reedy) gave addresses.20 Schoolchildren sang the national anthem as well as two Māori songs and two in English. Entertainment by the Waihirere Māori Concert Party followed. Each military band performed then there was an aerobatic display by the RNZAF. That evening included the Ceremony of Beating the Retreat by the combined bands and corps of drums, and then a fireworks display. The programme states, “This function is expected to be one of the largest pyrotechnic exhibitions the nation has seen.”21

Cook Week finished on Sunday October 12 with a community act of worship, which included a re-enactment of the coming of the first missionaries to the East Coast. Hymns were in an assortment of both English and Māori. On the day, Reverend R.E. Bullen noted,
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20 Reedy (1903-1971) was a Ngāti Porou leader, farmer and soldier. He was unanimously elected by the Tairawhiti District Maori Council to be spokesman for the Māori people at the bicentenary celebrations (Maraki Tautahi Orongo Reedy and Miria Hine Tapu Te Arikik Walker, “Reedy, Hanara Tangiawha Te Ohaki,” in The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography. Volume Five, 1941-1960, ed. Claudia Orange (Auckland and Wellington: Auckland University Press/Department of Internal Affairs, 2000), 435-36).

21 Cook Week Programme, 1969.
“This historical re-enactment recalls for us the rich heritage of our land and people and those who made possible the good life we enjoy in this community.”

Exhibitions

There were a series of different exhibitions put on during Cook Week celebrations in Gisborne. The Gisborne Museum and Art Gallery (now the Tairāwhiti Museum and Art Gallery) hosted a collection of works by artist Frank Davis, who also led a ‘Happening’ with “Art display, folk music, poetry and readings on the Maori.” A photographic exhibition above a store in town included views of places that Cook set off on his voyages, such as Whitby and Yorkshire, and some historical subjects related to Cook. A marine exhibition by the Gisborne Underwater Club, a naval chart-making exhibition and a floral festival exhibition were also officially opened over the week.

The Museums Association of New Zealand sponsored and assembled an exhibition of Polynesian Art for the Cook Bicentenary. A letter from the convener of their Cook Bicentenary Committee, Roger Duff, gives an outline of how the exhibition would be arranged. It included 40 artefacts from New Zealand, Tonga and Tahiti that were collected by Swedish scientists on Cook’s first and second voyages. Duff anticipated that it “will probably represent the most choice assemblage of early Polynesian Art ever collected in one place at one time.” The exhibition could not be held at the Museum and Art Gallery because of the lack of fireproofing, so it was opened in the HB Williams Memorial Library on Monday October 6. The artefacts were to be displayed in a “Three Voyage presentation” and shown under glass. It was arranged and sent as a “do it yourself kit set”

---

22 Cook Week Programme, 1969.
23 Ibid. Frank Davis was Head of the Art Department at Palmerston North Teachers College (now Massey College of Education) from 1968 until his death in 1983, and a supporter of contemporary Māori art. In the 1970s, he produced an historical account of Māori art practice and a commentary of the development of contemporary Māori art for the school curriculum. See Frank Davis, *Maori Art & Artists* [Filmstrip] (Wellington: The Visual Production Unit, Department of Education, 1980). See also, Skinner, 2008.
24 Cook Week Programme, 1969.
26 Letter from Roger Duff (AGMANZ) to Mr W. Hudson, Gisborne District Council Archives, Gisborne.
27 Cook Week Programme, 1969.
along with display labels and artefact numbers. A Display Specialist from the Queen Elizabeth Arts Council was sent to Gisborne to set it up. This was not an uncommon practice in New Zealand museums at the time. New display techniques influenced by international discourse began to emerge here in the 1950s. Museums were seen as education centres and the display of artefacts was didactic, systematic and ethnographic.

This was particularly the case at the Dominion Museum in Wellington. The National Art Gallery and Dominion Museum was built on Buckle Street in Wellington in 1936 to house New Zealand’s national treasures. Once it reopened in 1949 following its closure during the Second World War, the museum took on a formal ethnographic style of display. Objects were placed within a specific narrative and glass cases lined the walls in a planned sequence. Central government decided to finance an exhibition for the bicentenary to be held at the Dominion Museum. The Prime Minister officially opened the National Cook Bicentennial Exhibition on October 3, 1969. The space was covered in 33 square metres of laid wooden ship’s decking, and a loud speaker played 18th century music and seabird calls. The exhibition included maps, photographs, paintings, navigation instruments, medals, dioramas, relief models and Māori artefacts. Most of the sections were about Cook’s life, his voyages and natural history. There were personal objects and furniture supposedly belonging to Cook, a cannon from the Endeavour gifted by the Australian Government, and a 1:24 scale model of the Endeavour presented to the Prime Minister by the British High Commissioner. It was estimated that 170,000 people visited the exhibition over the ten months that it was open.

The formal ethnographic style of the exhibition in Wellington and the “kit set” sponsored by AGMANZ are a stark contrast to the local activities and exhibitions happening within the Gisborne community. Events such as the planned evening with Frank Davis, well-known for supporting contemporary Māori art, suggests that there was some activity that was not just concerned with promoting traditional Māori culture. Other exhibitions used a

28 Letter from Roger Duff, 1968.
29 McCarthy, 2007, 104.
31 McCarthy, 2007, 106.
range of display techniques in a more informal setting. The Business and Professional Women’s Club’s Banks and Solander outdoors exhibition included exhibits arranged on the grass, a simulated swamp and waterfall, and a small model of a Māori pā. This was all surrounded by plants and trees.\textsuperscript{34}

**Memorials and memorabilia**

Over Cook Week memorials were unveiled and commemorative objects produced to mark the bicentenary. A national memorial proposal was put forward as one of the five contributions made by the Government. This was to be erected on Parliament Grounds in Wellington not only because of its national significance, but to also avoid rivalry between the landing sites.\textsuperscript{35} Construction of the new parliamentary buildings put the proposed memorial on hold and a bronze plaque was instead unveiled by Queen Elizabeth II in 1970. The Cook Bicentenary Plaque was placed in front of the Beehive in a granite surround and features a portrait of Cook. Another proposal for the national monument was made in 1979, however with little finance available and questions about whether the location was appropriate, the proposal was dropped and no further progress was made on the Cook Memorial after 1982.\textsuperscript{36}

There was plenty of discussion centred on a Cook memorial in Gisborne as well, despite the fact that the 1906 Cook Monument at the landing site already existed (now the Cook Landing Site National Historic Reserve).\textsuperscript{37} The area bore little resemblance to the shore that Cook landed on, with a landscape altered by the development of the wharf and shipping port, reclamation of the banks and commercial development. American journalist and author, Tony Horwitz noted on his visit in 1996, “The only way Cook could land here today would be by forklift or helicopter.”\textsuperscript{38} A Captain Cook Memorial Park was thus

\textsuperscript{34} *Gisborne Photo News*, September 10, 1969.
\textsuperscript{36} Ministry for Culture and Heritage, Report (2015), 14.
\textsuperscript{37} In 1902 a committee was formed to raise funds for a memorial at the exact place Cook first landed. Sir James Carroll unveiled the Cook Monument in October 1906 in front of 5000 people. At the time it was around 24m from the sea, but due to reclamation of the land by 1959 it was 76m. A case was put forward by the Historic Places Trust to save the site which was successfully negotiated in 1966. By 1990 the Cook Landing Site became a National Historic Reserve and has since been managed by the Department of Conservation (Michael Spedding, *The Turanganui River: A Brief History* (Gisborne: Department of Conservation, 2006), 29).
\textsuperscript{38} Tony Horwitz, *Into the Blue: Boldly Going Where Captain Cook Has Gone Before* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 2000), 113.
proposed on Kaiti Hill, overlooking the bay and landing site of Cook and his men. It was also suggested that an observatory be built on the hill as well. Many, including the Gisborne Mayor, felt that the national memorial should be in Gisborne and completely funded by the Government. This was not agreed to, although the Government gave subsidies to all memorials at landing sites around New Zealand.  

After several different proposals and a lot of public feedback on the Kaiti Hill Cook Memorial Park, it was agreed that a statue of Cook surrounded by a brick plaza overlooking the bay would be appropriate. The Auckland-based Captain Cook Breweries had imported a marble statue from Italy in the 1890s in order to cast a bronze copy and display it on their site. They offered £1000 to the city of Gisborne to have another bronze cast made for the bicentenary. The monument was unveiled on October 10, 1969 by the Governor-General at its site on Kaiti Hill. Although the statue was well received, people noted that he was wearing an Italian navy uniform and that it did not resemble Cook at all. “Crook Cook” still stands on Kaiti Hill today, although a Historic Places Trust plaque underneath it points out the mistake. A more accurate depiction of Cook was also erected near Waikanae Beach in 2000.

Other memorials unveiled in Gisborne during Cook Week included a statue of the surgeon boy on the Endeavour, Nicholas Young at the new Young Nick’s Playground. This was later moved to the mouth of Tūranganui River where he now points towards Young Nick’s Head/Te Kurī-a-Pāoa. A carved totem pole was gifted by the Canadian Government and presented to the Prime Minister by the High Commissioner for Canada at Alfred Cox Park.

Along with the monuments and memorials there were also a number of objects produced especially for the occasion. The New Zealand Post Office (now New Zealand Post) issued four bicentenary themed stamps designed by English-born artist Dame Eileen Mayo.

They featured a profile portrait of Cook and the transit of Venus, Sir Joseph Banks and the *Endeavour*, Dr Daniel Solander with the native plant matata, and Queen Elizabeth II along with Cook’s 1769 chart of New Zealand.\textsuperscript{44}

The Royal Numismatic Society of New Zealand had James Berry design a Cook Bicentenary Medal that included a profile portrait of Cook in uniform and a representation of the Pacific basin.\textsuperscript{45} On the reverse was the *Endeavour* with Māori figures surrounded by bush in the foreground. The medal also gives details of the ship’s number of men, weight, length and beam in the legend.\textsuperscript{46} Berry was also commissioned to design the $1 commemorative coin for the bicentenary. This had a portrait of Cook, his 1769 chart and the *Endeavour* on it. A 50c coin was also struck with ‘Cook Bi-Centenary 1769-1969’ around the edge.\textsuperscript{47} A commemorative plate was made for the Cook Bicentenary in Gisborne. It depicts the Gisborne coat of arms with ‘City of Gisborne’ above and ‘Endeavour / Cook Bicentenary 1769 – 1969’ beneath (Fig 2.6).\textsuperscript{48}

**Themes**

**Spectacle and celebration**

The *Gisborne Photo News* reported, “Spectacle, pageantry and parade were the order of the week in which Gisborne became the focus of the whole country on the occasion of the Cook Bicentenary Celebrations.”\textsuperscript{49} It is evident that the 1969 commemorations,
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\textsuperscript{45} Reginald George James Berry (1906-1979) was a commercial artist and stamp and coin designer. Much of his work was for commemorations, including the 1940 centennial. During his lifetime, Berry produced more than 1,000 designs for stamps, coins and medals (J. R. Tye, “Berry, Reginald George James,” in *The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography. Volume Four, 1921-1940*, ed. Claudia Orange (Auckland and Wellington: Auckland University Press/Department of Internal Affairs, 1998), 54-55).


\textsuperscript{47} Ministry for Culture and Heritage, Report (2015), 18.


\textsuperscript{49} *Gisborne Photo News*, November 5, 1969.
particularly in Gisborne, were of a celebratory nature, used to exhibit the very best aspects of the present day. Parades, marches and fireworks were used as a display of achievement and progress. Many of the parade floats, such as the ‘From Cook to Boeing 737’ float, represented progress over time, celebrating how far we had come in the last 200 years. The fireworks display was not only considered the best seen in New Zealand, but also “an occasion to be remembered for its brilliance and spectacle.”

The commemorations were an opportunity for Gisborne to promote its growth and progress and showcase the region. In the official souvenir book for the bicentenary, the story of Cook is given and then it moves on to ‘Gisborne Today’, a place of industrial development and civic pride. Its positive attitude extends to the “tolerance and understanding” from a long association in the area between Māori and Pākehā, reinforcing the myth of good race relations. The bicentenary was a significant event for Gisborne and letters to the Minister requesting the national memorial be built in the city suggests that many felt it was an appropriate opportunity to boost the city’s economy and place within the nation.

The city produced a number of commemorative monuments and memorabilia as a way of remembering the occasion, while also signifying itself as a site of national importance. They were intended to be seen by future generations as a visual display of history, achievement and celebration. Choosing a children’s playground as the site of the Young Nick statue is evident that those organising the event wanted to instil in children a sense of the region’s history and significance. The Cook statue on Kaiti Hill overlooking Poverty Bay and the city places the physical landscape of Gisborne in the centre of the story. The commemorative plate has the Gisborne coat of arms to remind people of where the official bicentenary was held. Gisborne itself became the visual spectacle, meant to make a lasting impression on those around the nation and later generations.

Cook Week was intended to bring fanfare and pageantry to the city. Flower festivals and fireworks were a feast for the eyes, while other events were performative spectacles. The naval parades of uniformed men and bands marching in time provided the official entertainment. There was also the re-enactment of missionaries coming to the East Coast and a recreated scientific expedition of the South-west Pacific that added historic

---

50 Cook Week Programme, 1969.
52 Ibid.
Meaning is constructed in these commemorations through visual displays of celebration, achievement and progress. The spectacle element of the events and activities provided an experience in 1969 that was supposed to be positive, encouraging and memorable for those at the time and for future generations.

**Emphasis on Cook**

Another feature apparent in the commemorations of 1969 is the emphasis given to Captain Cook. He was portrayed as a skilled navigator and intelligent leader. His career “From unlettered farm boy to renowned explorer” was an important part of the narrative. His simple upbringing and success through hard work acted as the archetypal figure for many New Zealanders. He represented highly regarded values of the time, the souvenir book pointing out his ability to combine “careful organisation with daring conception.” Cook’s story was distributed to the masses, helped along by John C. Beaglehole’s work on his journals prior to the commemorations.

There is a sense of idolisation of James Cook, centring many of the commemorations around him as an individual. Representations of Cook are a recurring feature of the commemorations. His face features on stamps, medals and coins. A float with a giant head resembling Cook travelled down the main street of Gisborne. Use of his name in The Cook Bicentenary, Cook Week and Cook National Day demonstrates his central role for the bicentenary. At the national exhibition in Wellington, Cook was the main focus. The introduction stated, “The Exhibition you are to see concerns the story of James Cook and New Zealand.” Even the Dominion Museum’s old diorama of a fortified pā was titled ‘A Maori Pa in Cook’s day’.

From this, it is fair to say that the commemorations of 1969 were largely European focused. The Māori narrative appears absent in these representations, or otherwise as a historic ‘prequel’ to events. There is little depiction of the historic or modern Māori
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54 Logan and Logan, 1969, 18.
55 Ibid.
56 Beaglehole’s edited volumes are as follows: *The Voyage of the Endeavour, 1768-1777* (1955); *The Voyage of the Resolution and Adventure, 1772-1775* (1961); and *The Voyage of the Resolution and Discovery, 1776-1780* (1967). He also edited *The Endeavour Journal of Joseph Banks 1768-1771* (1962).
perspective during Cook Week activities. The use of Cook, Solander and Banks on the post stamp designs suggest that the key figures of the story were the European discoverers. The narrative is largely based on the idea that Cook and his men arrived and set foot on New Zealand land in 1769 and the rest is history.

This is not to say that Māori and Pacific stories did not feature at all. There were many traditional Polynesian and Māori objects exhibited. However, in many ways these were closely tied to Cook, such as displaying traditional items found on his voyages and a section of the national exhibition called ‘Maori culture as seen by Cook’. Māori inclusion is based on Cook’s experience and his views of them, and to an extent, the views of Māori in 1969. The post war period saw the beginning of a recolonial effort to integrate Māori into a Pākehā society, largely in response to the growing Māori population and their rapid urbanisation. Official publications of the time emphasised harmonious race relations, with Māori typically represented in traditional dress. However, by the end of the 1960s there was a growing awareness of national and cultural identity as processes of decolonisation began. This was particularly true for Māori as they negotiated their identity within a time of rapid social change. This resulted in an increase in activism and political and cultural self-assertion, particularly among young Māori.

This was not just about how Pākehā viewed Māori but also how Māori were represented and to a certain degree, how some wanted to be represented. The withdrawal of the school bulletin Washday at the Pa in 1964, “one of the country’s most notable controversies concerning the visual representation of Maori,” according to Brian McDonnell, is a good example of these tensions evident during the 1960s. The bicentenary also played its part in these dynamics of identity construction and representation. Considering the floats and Māori performances, they were a people of cultural tradition, the ‘Original People’ of this land. Māori represented the ‘before Cook’ era, while modern Māori identity was characterised by how well it had assimilated into Pākehā society. As the souvenir book
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59 Belich, 2001, 477. In 1966, 62% of the Māori population was urban, up from 17% 30 years earlier (Belich, 2001, 471).
60 Belich, 2001, 475.
61 Washday at the Pa was a collection of photographs taken by Dutch-born photographer Ans Westra of a Māori family on the East Coast. It was intended to be issued to New Zealand primary schools but was withdrawn by the Minister of Education, Arthur Kinsella, following complaints, particularly from the Māori Women’s Welfare League, that it gave the wrong impression of contemporary Māori life (Brian McDonnell, “Washday at the Pa (1964): History of a Controversy,” Journal of New Zealand & Pacific Studies 1(2) (2013): 132).
exclaims, “The Maoris today . . . traditional arts are fostered in the young – they are happily integrated in the European way of life.”

Conclusion

When Cook Week began in October 1969, the Gisborne Harrier Club were in Wellington receiving the governor-general’s goodwill message, Prime Minister Keith Holyoake was opening the National Cook Bicentennial Exhibition at the Dominion Museum, Pastoral Princess Janet Craigie was crowning Miss Hereford Heifer in Gisborne, and Frank Davis’ contemporary art exhibition “Face to Face” was hung at the Gisborne Museum and Art Gallery. It was a week of festivities and celebrations that ranged from formal national functions to community activities. This was in many ways influenced by the involvement of both central and local government. National significance and identity was promoted by the New Zealand Government through the funding and participation in official activity. Local events and memorials on the other hand were far more concerned with advertising the importance of the region and its achievements. However, without the support and financial contribution from the government many of the local council’s aspirations would not have been met. Reliance went both ways. Central government needed the involvement of the landing sites, considering their importance in historic events, and local initiatives would certainly have helped to disperse the workload and funding.

This can be extended to community participation and organisation also, which helped to make the commemorations diverse and accessible. Māori participation in particular was evident and likely helped by the relatively high Māori population in Gisborne and the East Coast at the time. An interest from central government in the involvement of Māori suggests that it was a significant part of the commemoration. Yet, indicative of its time, the myth of racial harmony was still prominent, traditional Māori culture was more visible than contemporary Māori life and a Cook-centric narrative was distributed. This demonstrates the ongoing input of authorities both local and national, and the influence of a social and political agenda on commemorative practice.

---

63 In 1966, the Māori population of the East Coast (including the urban area of Gisborne) was 30%, the highest out of all the regions in New Zealand (Ian Pool, Te Iwi Maori: A New Zealand Population Past, Present & Projected (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1991), 158).
Despite the differences apparent at an organisational level, the commemorations were all very similar in tone and theme. The events were celebratory, promotional and performative. Many acknowledged the past, mostly in an effort to celebrate the present, and promoting achievement and progress was a priority. Meaning was constructed through pageantry and performance, where the festivals, competitions, and parades were all for entertainment and posterity. It was an occasion to remember. Speaking to people in Gisborne nearly 50 years later, it seems that the events have been remembered, but not just for its festivity and spectacle.
Chapter Three
The 2019 Sestercentennial Commemorations: Building meaningful legacies

Introduction

This chapter looks at the upcoming commemoration planning for the 250th anniversary of the 1769 events. Since the 1969 bicentennial, the Transit of Venus that occurred in 2004 and 2012 in Ūawa Tolaga Bay has been an influential event for commemorations, particularly in the Tairāwhiti region. Similar themes and organisation can be seen in the plans for 2019. The Te Hā 1769 Sestercentennial Trust plays a leading role in the planning and coordination of 2019 commemorations along with the New Zealand Government. Findings from the interviews that were conducted with four professionals from these organisations as well as the Tairāwhiti Museum give insight into the current planning for the commemorations, as well as themes and challenges. The final section of this chapter looks at the similarities and differences between the 1969 and 2019 events.

The Transit of Venus

Following the 200th anniversary in 1969 very little attention was given to the events of 1769 on a national scale. It was not until December 1995 that a replica of the Endeavour began its tour of New Zealand and caused controversy in the Gisborne region. Negative associations held by some Māori of the events of October 1769 led to strong opposition from Gisborne iwi towards the arrival of the ship in the area.1 Kaumatua council chairman Taranaki Paratene stated, “These issues are still very much in the minds of our kaumatua, though 225 years have passed.” Despite this, the ship entered Poverty Bay in January 1996. Tensions were rife over the six weeks that the Endeavour replica toured the North Island. A New Zealand Herald article notes, “the Australian crew began to realise that the hakas were real challenges and not cultural shows put on for their entertainment.”

---

By 2004 a more positive relationship with history was beginning to establish further up the East Coast at Ūawa Tolaga Bay, home to the iwi Te Aitanga-a-Hauiti. This community had a special connection to Cook and Tupaia, who arrived in the bay after departing Tūranganui and participated in a peaceful practice of cultural exchange. This particular year was marked by the first of two transits of Venus. A transit occurs when a small body passes in front of a large one. During a transit of Venus, the planet can be seen from Earth travelling across the face of the sun. This will happen in pairs that are eight years apart and occur about every 120 years. Observing the transit was once an important exercise in discovering the distance of Earth from the Sun and thus the size of the solar system. It was also a point of national pride and competition as countries around Europe raced to catch the 1769 transit. That year the Royal Society in London sent Lieutenant James Cook to observe the Transit of Venus in Tahiti.

2004 and 2012 were our most recent transits and considered significant not only because no one alive today will ever see another one, but also because the event coincided with Cook’s arrival in New Zealand in 1769. In the lead up to the 2004 transit the Royal Society of New Zealand held a film competition in schools. Tolaga Bay Area School was one of the winning groups with its film titled “Te Ara Tapu o Ngā Tipuna – the Footsteps of our Ancestors.” Three Year 10 students and a senior teacher were sent to the UK in May 2004 to observe the transit and visit key sites connected with Cook and his scientists. It attracted a lot of media attention and was such a success that a steering committee was formed who planned a forum and celebrations in Ūawa Tolaga Bay and Gisborne for 2012. Dr Wayne Ngata, a representative of the steering committee stated, “The underpinning theme for us was acknowledging our dual heritage, and looking to our shared futures.”

---

5 Head, 2007, 8.
6 Head, 2007, 8-10.
7 Donald, 2012, 83.
9 Ibid.
The Te Hā Sestercentennial 1769 Trust

In many ways the 2019 commemoration plans are riding off the back of the success of the Transit of Venus events in Ūawa Tolaga Bay. The 250th anniversary of the arrival of James Cook’s ship *Endeavour* in New Zealand 1769 is listed as a Tier 1 event authorised by the government in 2014.\(^{10}\) Its commemorations policy, agreed upon in 2009/10 and updated in 2014, was “in recognition of the need for a co-ordinated approach between agencies to mark particularly important events and anniversaries, and to ensure better forward planning for these big events.”\(^{11}\) Tier 1 events are chosen for having a significant impact on the nation as a whole or on the pattern of New Zealand life. The government announced that Gisborne/Tairāwhiti is where the national commemorations will begin.\(^{12}\)

Iwi and members of the wider Gisborne community had already begun planning for the 2019 commemorations before this research started. The Te Hā 1769 Sestercentennial Trust (Te Hā) was formed in October 2013. Earlier that year brainstorming workshops were held involving iwi, organisations and individuals. From these the community chose members to be a part of a steering group, from which the 11 members of the trust were elected.\(^{13}\) These included the Mayor of Gisborne Meng Foon, Professor of Māori Studies and Anthropology at the University of Auckland Dame Anne Salmond, senior iwi members, Māori and European historians, educators, a sea captain and an architect.\(^{14}\) The Governor-General of New Zealand, Sir Jerry Mateparae, officially launched the charitable trust in Gisborne on June 12, 2014.\(^{15}\) The Māori words Te Hā stands for the sharing of breath, referring to the breath that is shared between two people through hongi, the traditional Māori greeting of pressing noses.\(^{16}\)

The Te Hā Trust’s role is to coordinate and lead the planning and execution of events associated with the commemoration. Their strategic vision is “Dual Heritage – Shared

---
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\(^{13}\) Jennie Harré Hindmarsh and Te Aturangi Nepia-Clamp, interview by author, Gisborne, September 22, 2015.
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Future. He rae ki te rae, he ihu ki te ihu, te hau ka rere, te hā ka tau. A meeting of peoples, a mixing of cultures, a blending of heritage, a sharing of future.”

Dual Heritage – Shared Future was first used at the Transit of Venus events. The Te Hā mission is:

- to engage and inspire communities to understand and share the stories of our unique place and people that shaped our nation
- to commemorate the 250th Anniversary of the first formal meetings between Māori and European
- to create legacies to enhance the wellbeing of future generations.

Te Hā’s 2014 Strategic Plan lists a range of goals set for the 2019 commemorations. Focus is on voyaging traditions—both Polynesian and European, education, and establishing legacies. There is particular mention of engaging and collaborating with youth, iwi, and the arts, culture and heritage sector. The trust has established that educating the community and strengthening local understanding of the events is a main priority for the 2019 commemorations. While there are significant aims to contribute to the region’s prosperity, the scope of the programme also includes national and international interests.

To deliver on these goals, the trust has identified three phases for the next six years—The Lead Up, The 250th Anniversary Events, and The Legacies.

Findings from the interviews

In September and October of 2015 I conducted interviews with four professionals that were involved with the sestercentennial planning in Gisborne and in Wellington. The first was with two members of the Te Hā 1769 Sestercentennial Trust, Dr Jennie Harré Hindmarsh and Te Aturangi Nepia-Clamp. Both were foundation trustees of Te Hā. Dr Harré Hindmarsh has a background in education and social work and was director of National Services Te Paerangi for seven years. She has become increasingly involved with local trusts and her role in Te Hā has involved coordination between local and national planning, resourcing, education, and convenor of the arts and heritage group within the trust. Nepia-Clamp, of Ngāti Porou, Rongowhakaata and Ngāti Kahungunu descent, is a...
carving artist with interests and skills in sea voyaging, canoe building and project management. He is currently chairman of the Tūranganui Voyaging Trust and leading Te Hā’s voyaging, education and science group.

My next interview was with the Director of the Tairāwhiti Museum in Gisborne, Eloise Wallace. The Tairāwhiti Museum (formerly the Gisborne Museum and Arts Centre) was established in the 1950s and is one of the few museums in New Zealand with strong Māori representation in governance. Today the museum has 40,000+ visitors a year, 80% of which are local and has recently been undergoing building extensions and redevelopment. Their vision is “to become an integral part of the community of the Tairawhiti through building strong and enduring relationships with community groups.” Wallace is from Auckland with a background in history, geography, museum studies, management and tourism. At the time of the interview, she had been director at the Tairāwhiti Museum for 6 months.

The final interview took place in Wellington with Debbie Stowe-Hunt, Senior Advisor of Commemorations and Projects at the Ministry for Culture and Heritage (MCH). This new role was established in March 2015. MCH administers the government’s commemoration policy and also services the Interdepartmental Steering Committee for Commemorations (ISCC). The ISCC is the group that submitted the list of events and anniversaries to Cabinet, and categorised them into Tier 1 and Tier 2 events, which Cabinet approved in 2010. Stowe-Hunt is part of the Heritage Operations team, which works closely with the Heritage Policy team within MCH.

Current planning for the sestercentennial

Although the sestercentennial is still three years away, planning has been rigorous and enthusiastic. In each interview it is apparent that work progresses at different levels of involvement, whether that be local or national, community-based or higher policy driven

operations. Working together through these levels as well as across different sectors is an important aim for many in order to achieve successful outcomes.

For Te Hā, planning has been ongoing since 2013, although the district has been working towards 2019 for decades. Trust members can be expected to put in one to two days a week of unpaid work for the sestercentennial. This has resulted in the establishment of ambitious and well-organised projects for the region, such as the Tairāwhiti Navigations Project. Between 2015-2019 the area’s landmark places will be enhanced and a heritage trail with features related to New Zealand’s navigational past will be created.26 At the time of the interview, Nepia-Clamp was working towards securing a waka hourua (double canoe) for the region. Its purpose was to educate people about voyaging history, seamanship skills and vocational life skills. Bringing together voyaging traditions and educating people through these kinds of projects were a high priority for the trust.27

Te Hā has not only been working at a local level towards 2019 but at a national level as well. Dr Harré Hindmarsh has been working with the Ministry of Education in order to have the stories of 1769 added to the national school curriculum. In particular, the story of Tupaia and his significance in the arrival of the Endeavour has been a focus for the narrative. Much of the trust’s work has been to educate the community and the nation about what happened in 1769 and to present different perspectives.28 On an international scale there has been work to forge ongoing relationships, particularly with voyaging societies in Europe and the Pacific. Te Hā is also exploring the potential for achieving UNESCO World Heritage status for the Tairāwhiti region. Sir Neil Cossons, an international authority on cultural heritage landscapes stated, “This is one of the great voyaging stories of the world.”29

Although Tairāwhiti Museum director Wallace has been working closely with Te Hā and attending their meetings, her interests lie with the museum and engaging with the community. This involves thinking about new exhibition programmes, renewing permanent exhibitions, and the potential for bringing taonga back to Gisborne. The board is aware of the importance of the upcoming commemorations and on taking the role of director Wallace was asked about her thoughts regarding 2019. Educating and engaging

27 Harré Hindmarsh and Nepia-Clamp interview.
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young people by actively teaching the stories of 1769 and working in schools has already begun for the Tairāwhiti Museum. Te Hā and the museum organised an arts forum that was held in October 2015 where the arts community was given the opportunity to get together and discuss an action plan for the sestercentennial. The museum is focused on smaller scale events as they give the community the opportunity to voice opinions and share local knowledge.30

In Wellington, Stowe-Hunt has been involved with the sestercentennial on a national and international level. Stakeholder engagement and planning has been a focus. In mid-2015 the MCH had a student from the Museum and Heritage Studies programme at Victoria University of Wellington undertake a project in order to produce a report on the 1969 bicentennial files. This was a helpful document that established how the government was involved, what the programme was like and what kind of issues arose through the planning.31

Some of the ongoing responsibilities at MCH has included working with the five main landing sites around New Zealand – the Tairāwhiti, Mercury Bay, Bay of Islands, Ship Cove, and Dusky Sound, as well as museums and international organisations. It was important that the MCH was ensuring wide community buy-in and engagement. For Stowe-Hunt, maintaining a relationship with the landing sites and groups such as Te Hā involves making sure that everyone has equal access to information, updates and that there is consistence across the board. At the same time, a role for the main centres has to be ensured as well.32

Themes

In order to establish some of the main themes that emerge from my analysis of the sestercentennial planning, I gathered some of the ideas that were most important to the interviewees regarding the 2019 events and commemoration in general. These themes arose on multiple occasions in the interviews and show a shared understanding of where the focus lies for the sestercentennial. These were selected due to their difference to earlier
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commemorations, in particular the 1969 bicentenary. A focus on educating New Zealanders about the 1769 stories and accepting multiple interpretations was important. In order for this to be successful the involvement and participation of communities, small groups and individuals is a priority and shows interest in a bottom-up approach to heritage. Other themes such as creating meaningful legacies and promoting the region and New Zealand on the world map demonstrates that many are thinking beyond 2019.

New narratives

Some words used to describe past commemorative activity for the 1769 events included Cook-centric and monocultural. The histories and stories being told this time around include different perspectives, multiple interpretations and introduce characters not previously celebrated. Tupaea and Polynesian voyaging are particular interests for the sestercentennial, moving the focus away from Cook. The Tahitian navigator was a renowned figure up the East Coast, as he was better equipped to interact with the locals. This was particularly true at Ūawa Tolaga Bay where many of the children born after his visit were given his name. His role in interactions with Māori and navigating the Pacific was a significant one. Despite this, and a long history of scholarly contribution to the field of Polynesian navigation, it has taken a back seat in the past commemorations of Cook. Nepia-Clamp recalls the Cook bicentenary and how at school they were taught about the great European navigators, while his Polynesian ancestors were “nothing but accidental drifters.” It is now Te Ha’s focus to tell these stories to a broader public.

The Māori warriors from the Ngāti Oneone and Rongowhakaata tribes that were killed in those first days of contact will also be remembered. As Nepia-Clamp emphasises, the “warts and all concept” will be the focus of narratives in 2019. With the support of iwi, educating the community and the nation about these stories is a step towards addressing past wrongs, moving on and bringing people together. Since 1969 there has been far more work on museum collections, more documentation, and better knowledge of ephemera and taonga, which means they are better prepared to tell new stories for the
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Museums can act as safe spaces for people to start thinking about 1769 and to deal with the complexity of the events. They can also provide a platform for community input and discussion.

**Participation**

From the beginning of the planning phase, community input has been a priority for the sestercentennial. A newspaper feature from Te Hā in the *Gisborne Herald* calls it a “Flax roots beginning.” The trust was formed as a result of a community hui that included people from around the Tairāwhiti region with a range of backgrounds and interests. Hui, forums and meetings were all mentioned in the interviews, many seeing them as opportunities to get people in the same room, to engage groups and individuals in planning and to gather information from the wider community. It is hoped that navies and canoe societies will come together around the Sustainable Oceans conference. The arts forum in October 2015 was also intended to bring people together to discuss plans.

Māori also have a strong involvement in the sestercentennial with Te Hā being co-planned and co-led by Māori and non-Māori, differing from past commemorations. The trust is also guided in decision-making by a group made up of iwi and hapū representatives. Iwi from the Tairāwhiti area including Ngāti Oneone, Rongowhakaata, Ngai Tāmanuhiri and Te Aitanga-a-Hauiti have all agreed to be involved in plans for the sestercentennial. Each want to establish their role in the sestercentennial and promote their individual stories from the 1769 events, and discuss this with Te Hā. The use of the term Te Hā, thought up by a Rongowhakaata kaumatua, and the whakatauki suggest the significant role that the Māori community plays in the concept and planning of the sestercentennial. Being community-based and creating opportunities for smaller or minority groups suggests that the inclusion of unofficial heritage and a bottom-up approach is prioritised over total control from larger institutions.

---
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There is also the concept of a Māori commemorative practice to be considered here. By drawing on their own Māori culture and traditions surrounding the use of the past, commemoration takes on new rituals and meanings. As discussed in Chapter One, Sir Āpirana Ngata endeavoured to include Māori traditions in centennial commemorations of 1940. This integration of Māori ritual has continued throughout the 20th century in an effort to include a Māori voice and be more bicultural. However, it seems that now Māori commemorative practice is a far stronger force in its own right, rather than an aspect added into already existing commemorative programmes.

**Meaningful legacies**

Establishing legacies with a sense of pride and ownership of New Zealand’s dual heritage and shared future is one of Te Hā’s principal objectives. It was also mentioned by all the interviewees. This theme is about thinking beyond the 2019 events and considering future generations. Rather than erecting monuments and statues, the sestercentennial is about creating opportunities and educating people. The Tairāwhiti Museum is working towards becoming more accessible both online and in the gallery in order to support meaningful learning. Te Hā have also been advocating for the inclusion of the 1769 events to the New Zealand national school curriculum.

The Treaty settlements era is expected to have ended by the time the sestercentennial commemorations will begin. Many believe this creates a significant opportunity for New Zealand in reflecting on this fact and moving forward. The idea of reconciliation is important. There is a lot of talk in the interviews of emotions still being raw and people being in different spaces about the events of 1769. The sestercentennial is seen as a way of helping New Zealand to move forward as a nation. Establishing legacies is about changing lives and communities. Te Hā believes that by creating these meaningful legacies we are able to enhance our economic, cultural, ecological and social wellbeing.

---
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Promotion

Aside from legacies, tourism and promotion is another theme from my interviews that looked beyond 2019. This included both local and national promotion of the Tairāwhiti region, and international recognition for New Zealand. Many see the sestercentennial as an opportunity to display the uniqueness and significance of Gisborne and the Tairāwhiti region. Te Hā calls the 1769 events the “conception of the nation” giving it a national importance that possibly trumps other commemorations focused on national identity making. It is recognised that each landing site has its own unique story to tell. A key focus is to tell the region’s story as part of the nation’s story, and showcase the district.\(^{48}\) Local identities are just as important as national ones in the upcoming commemorations. Gisborne is seen to have a leading role, being the first landing site, and is expected to influence what happens around the country.\(^{49}\) This has already begun as other sites begin taking their own initiative with the guidance of Te Hā.

Stowe-Hunt at MCH, believes that the commemorations also have the possibility of enhancing New Zealand’s image internationally. The application for World Heritage status indicates the view that the event is worthy of international recognition. Commemorating the 1769 events also brings in a range of interests such as maritime heritage, cartography, botany, astronomy, culture, and art. This means that there are a number of different stakeholders some of which are international. The Royal Society in London, the Captain Cook Society, museums in the UK, navies, voyaging societies and universities are just some of the current international stakeholders.\(^{50}\)

Challenges

In the interviews, I asked what the greatest challenges were in planning for the sestercentennial. When we use the past for present purposes and seek to construct meaning through practices such as commemoration it is important that heritage institutions are able to meet these demands. By gaining information about the challenges involved with commemoration it is possible to understand its function and purpose better, and can help to guide future planning. Their answers revealed that securing appropriate funds was a

\(^{48}\) Harré Hindmarsh and Nepia-Clamp interview.  
\(^{49}\) Wallace interview.  
\(^{50}\) Stowe-Hunt interview.
significant obstacle. This in part caused some regional/national tension, though much of this was more about the best way to plan commemorative activity both locally and nationally. Another challenge was how to engage with a broad and diverse audience and make the commemorations meaningful.

Funding

Securing funds and resourcing for the commemoration plans was a priority and source of frustration for many. In order to achieve successful outcomes, a large injection of funds was required, particularly in Gisborne. Ambitious plans and big projects mean that Te Hā is dependent on external resourcing from the central government. So far they have been relying on local support from the council and other trusts. An interesting point that arose was the need for clarity about what the Tier 1 status meant in terms of funding. Commissions set up and funded for past commemorations, and the extent of the WW100 commemorative programme are leading some to question when the government will step in for 2019. Dr Harré Hindmarsh states that the trust is “Increasingly feeling like we’re going to have to find ways to get on with it and be even more creative and innovative.”51

At the Ministry for Culture and Heritage there is ongoing work to establish what the Tier 1 and 2 categories mean operationally for them and what the central government’s role will be in 2019. This is an emerging area for the ministry, as government is involved with mostly military commemorations. Cook’s arrival is one of only three non-military related commemorations leading up to 2020. Working with the different regions and communities is helping it to establish central government’s role. In a financially constrained environment, the MCH also has other commemorations to keep in mind, including ongoing WW100 events and the 125th anniversary of women’s suffrage in 2018.52

Regional and national tensions

Funding issues have caused some tension between the regions and central government, as seen above. However, other concerns are also arising both in Gisborne and Wellington. In Gisborne it is felt that communities and regions are better equipped for the planning and
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organising of the sestercentennial, but need the support and recognition from central government. Harré Hindmarsh and Nepia-Clamp mention the slow responses and little decision-making made by the government and it is apparent that communication has become a priority for everyone.\textsuperscript{53} While Te Hā has an overseeing role in events, many groups and small institutions have to be independent. What becomes important is making sure all these projects and events come together successfully towards 2019. It is particularly important when there are different landing sites also wanting to be a part of the national commemorations.

For Stowe-Hunt, it is important to ensure that local stories are told while also giving a broader national and international importance to the programme. This involves working with everyone and making sure that all programmes complement each other and there is consistency throughout the country. There is also the challenge of creating meaningful events for the main centres, which have less direct connection with the \textit{Endeavour}.\textsuperscript{54} The challenge of ensuring regional and national significance for 2019 is reliant on skilled communication, which is proving to be a challenge for those in Gisborne and Wellington.

\textit{Making meaning and engaging with communities}

Wallace states that for the Tairāwhiti Museum it is important to engage with different audiences, provide broad and meaningful stories, and uphold bicultural practice.\textsuperscript{55} She believes that people in the community often do not have the confidence to tell the stories, although they are willing. The challenge for the museum is to make sure that people have a safe space to learn these stories and to plan proper legacy projects. It is the bigger projects that involve a lot more work, such as repatriation, that people want to see happening. The build up to 2019 is also really important, and keeping the momentum going is a priority.\textsuperscript{56} Creating meaningful events is a way to get the community behind the commemorations and keep enthusiasm up.

At the MCH, a question often asked is why is it important today? Establishing the relevance and demonstrating it is a challenge for the ministry. With the centenary of the
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First World War, almost everyone could find a connection through their family to the events. The arrival of the *Endeavour* seems to be far more removed and may not have meaning for everyone in New Zealand, particularly in the metropolitan centres.\(^{57}\) Engaging all communities in the events and making meaning is challenging but also creates opportunities. This is a point made by all the interviewees. There are opportunities to be creative, to get communities involved and to establish new ways of making meaningful experiences.

**1969 and 2019: From pageantry to legacy building**

*Differences*

It is evident that there are some major differences between the Cook Bicentenary and the upcoming sestercentennial. In many ways, those involved are actively seeking to create different experiences from past commemorations. Historic Places Tairawhiti Inc. chair and Te Hā trustee, James Blackburne, stated, “At the bicentenary of Cook’s landing in 1969, we gained the Cook Plaza, a few coins, two statues – the Crook Cook on Kaiti Hill and Young Nick – a totem pole, model boats in the main street and a park renamed *Endeavour* Park from its original of Heipipi. We hope that the lasting legacy from the sestercentennial in 2019 is better than that.”\(^{58}\)

Emphasis has shifted from the pageantry and performance of the bicentennial to legacy building and education in 2019. Where monuments and statues were once erected for posterity, now community projects and meaningful learning experiences are the focus of events. The spectacle nature of 1969, with parades, fireworks and concerts directed attention to the present. The same was accomplished with the floats that celebrated progress and achievement. While there were some aspects that looked to future generations, for example the Young Nick’s Playground, most of the focus lay in celebrating the present. For the sestercentennial planning, working towards future legacies is the main priority. There is less talk about seeing how far we have come since 1769, and
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more about understanding those events and “moving forward.” The past is used to reconcile and strengthen communities, not to set a standard on which to compare.

Another change in commemorations of the 1769 events is the shift in focus away from Captain Cook and the Eurocentric dimension. This is not to say that Cook will not be recognised, but in comparison to 1969, the sestercentennial planning shows a very different approach. The Tahitian navigator, Tupai’a’s story will be told. His role was just as significant as Cook’s or his scientists, and yet in 1969 his name was barely mentioned. Polynesian voyaging will be a part of the programme alongside the European ships and navies. Iwi have voiced their opinions about wanting their stories told. The Māori warriors who were killed in Tūranganui will be remembered. Māori representation and involvement has been a great priority over the course of the sestercentennial planning. This means that the work of Te Hā and other groups involved in the commemorations has moved away from solely Western ideas. The use of te reo Māori in publications, for example, demonstrates community input and willingness to approach the commemorations in new ways. The new programme is more culturally diverse, accessible and inclusive, ultimately distancing itself from the Eurocentric commemorations of the past.

**Similarities**

Despite these differences, there are some aspects of commemorative practice that have lasted almost 50 years on. Not all of these are to be expected either. Although there was a definite Eurocentric feel to the bicentenary, Māori involvement was not entirely absent and there were events and floats to prove their participation. It seems that small communities and groups had their role to play in 1969 despite the very official management occurring. This bottom-up approach, though at a smaller scale, was a significant part of the bicentenary programme in Gisborne. Many individuals, small businesses and groups got involved and used the commemorations for their own purposes. For 2019, this same approach is being prioritised rather than complete control from central government. Projects are taking place in the communities and people are encouraged to participate and give their opinions. These in turn are influencing higher levels of management and policy.

The management and organisation of commemorations have also remained similar between the bicentenary and sestercentennial through steering committees and government. This has inevitably led to tensions between local and central government in
both cases. In 1969, there was a lot of discussion surrounding the national memorial to Cook, in particular where it would be and who would pay for it. Those in Gisborne were getting frustrated with the slow and unsatisfactory responses from government. Similar communication issues are happening in the planning phases for 2019. Questions about decision making and what certain roles entail have arisen, making it difficult for regions and government to work together.

**Conclusion**

When I asked the interviewees whether the 1969 commemorations informed their planning, those in Gisborne spoke of how research was not necessary since many in the community still remembered it and talked about it. Often it was a case of not informing decisions but confirming them. Memories of 1969 captured not only the fun and pageantry of the events, but also highlighted what was wrong with the commemorations. The thing that is most apparent about the upcoming sestercentennial is how it will be different. New narratives, encouraging participation and building meaningful legacies are ways in which commemorative practice is being planned and managed for 2019. This is not just a response to the inadequacy of 1969 celebrations but a response to the changing social and political climate in New Zealand. The performance and spectacle of 1969 was what was expected. Today, education, diversity and reconciliation are important. The sestercentennial planning is geared to making a difference and involving all communities and individuals in local, national and international events.
Conclusion

James Liu et al. stated that “The facts of history are the bare bones of nationhood: it is in the fleshing out of facts into narratives of meaning that a people are forged.”¹ There is no doubt that nationhood is a significant part of our commemorative activity, but what this dissertation sets out to do is look at how we are fleshing out these facts to create narratives of meaning. Commemoration is a staple part of New Zealand life. For some it involves rituals, symbols and community. For others it is a day off work. Commemorating an event has never been a simple affair. There are supporters and objectors, debates, celebrations and mourning. As Laurajane Smith suggests, “the doing of commemorative events or performances engenders strong emotions as collective memories and identities are either maintained and transmitted to younger generations or contested and remade and through which traditional values and relations of power may be rehearsed and retained.”²

Narratives of meaning can thus be constructed through commemoration. This dissertation posed the question how and why have changing commemorative practices in New Zealand constructed meaning in different ways over time? By looking briefly at significant national commemorations in New Zealand, such as Waitangi Day and Anzac Day over the last century, a context was provided for the following chapters. Chapter Two and Three discussed the main findings from the case studies of the 1969 Cook Bicentenary and the 2019 Sestercentennial. A number of themes emerged from the research, as well as an understanding of the organisation and participation involved. This was then further discussed through a comparison of the two commemorations where both differences and similarities were found.

This research explored past commemorations and plans for future commemorations in order to build an understanding of the practice within New Zealand. However, as the sestercentennial has not happened yet, I was unable to carry out any analysis of its success. This limits the potential of this dissertation to make any solid conclusions about the change that is taking place. It does however lend itself to further research of the sestercentennial in the future to provide insight into how we enact and manage commemoration.
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This study of the commemoration of the arrival of Cook in New Zealand also contributes to current academic literature by demonstrating the vastly different ways in which we have constructed meaning in the past and how we might endeavour to in the future. In particular, it has looked at commemoration within a New Zealand context to highlight those features of our society that influence practice and management such as biculturalism, post-colonialism, and central and local government dynamics. Exploring two separate commemorations also furthered understanding of how commemorative practice changes over time.

From pageantry to legacy building, the commemorations have changed significantly over the almost 50 years. There are three elements from the case studies that exemplify the most change and which are all influenced to some degree by governing bodies and institutions. They are narrative, approach to management, and participation. These are by no means simple clear cut aspects that have shown obvious development from 1969 to 2019. Some elements may have been contested in the past, or are only variations of the same thing. While I emphasise the change that has taken place, it is also important to remember that today’s commemorations still exhibit similarities despite the time that has passed.

By narrative I mean the way in which historic events and stories are told. In 1969 the main narrative was Cook-centric and focused on a European story of science and discovery. Cook was considered such a prominent character in the celebrations his face was on everything. Banks and Solander were given due recognition as well. The narrative was also positive in tone, citing a racial harmony that supposedly continued into the modern day. It seemed that the more morbid historic facts of the 1769 event were inconsequential to the celebrations taking place in 1969. As a result, the bicentenary was about creating spectacle and pageantry that celebrated the achievements and progress made over 200 years. 1969 was very much a performance, one that would be remembered by future generations through the array of monuments and memorials scattered about the city.

The sestercentennial narrative moves away from this kind of storytelling. The “warts and all” concept discussed in Nepia-Clamp and Harré Hindmarsh’s interview embraces those parts of the story neglected in 1969. Stories of Tupaia and Polynesian navigation will be more prominent. Addressing the complexity of the historic events in an act of reconciliation seems to be a significant part of the 2019 commemorations. The planned events are therefore less about present performances and more about legacy building and
education. Constructing meaning for the sestercentennial means creating opportunities for future generations and a lasting impact on how we understand our past and identity. In this sense it is particularly future focused and looks to more intangible forms of heritage to make meaning rather than monuments or statues. If this is the case, what can we expect will be the lasting impression of the sestercentennial post-2019? Moving away from tangible memory triggers suggests that commemorative practice and its function is rapidly changing and it is necessary to reconsider how we approach its management.

Approaches to management involves both central and local government, as well as museums and communities. In 1969 there was a definite official presence, with the New Zealand Government highly involved in planning. Committees and councils also played a significant role in managing the events. The naval ceremonies and dignitary functions alongside national exhibitions of formally arranged artefacts gives the impression of higher level management defining and constructing meaning at the commemorations. This would suggest that the bicentenary was managed through a top-down approach and in many ways this was apparent in the research, particularly when compared to today where the official planning from central government, at least at this stage, is not so commanding or public. It is open to community input and perhaps sees itself in more of a mediating role.

However, bottom-up approaches to management also occurred in 1969 with the presence of more vernacular forms of commemorative practice in Gisborne, and much of this was encouraged by government. For the sestercentennial this kind of heritage practice has become more of a focus for planners. Getting the community to participate and contribute to projects in different kinds of ways is important. Managing commemorative activities in a creative and innovative way means that more people can be involved and legacies can be made. It seems that the dynamics between official and unofficial management and practice has always been present but emphasis has changed according to power relations within society, much as John Bodnar discussed. As central government’s role in commemoration becomes decentralised as a result of less time and funding, it appears that more authority is given to regional communities and so we see shifts in commemorative practice reflecting these changes in power relations.

Participation encouraged by planners is another aspect that has changed since the bicentenary. Those participating in events are very similar between the two commemorations, however the way people are involved has changed, particularly as a
result of the approaches to managing commemorative activity. The Māori community played a very important role in the bicentenary and were involved in kapa haka performances and made floats for the parade. Yet the extent to which they were able to participate in management and planning was limited. The sestercentennial has been focused on involving all iwi in planning, and many are using it as an opportunity to be heard and to address grievances. This suggests a growing Māori commemorative practice that warrants further study into its own ways of making meaning from the past and its progress over time. The inclusion of more Māori stories and use of te reo Māori suggests the changing attitudes to race relations in New Zealand and the growing number of Māori at higher levels of management within trusts, committees and institutions.

By understanding these three elements it is possible to ascertain the nature of commemoration. It is changeable and easily influenced by power relations and social values. We construct meaning through heritage practices in order to deal with our present needs. Commemoration is therefore not just an event but an ongoing practice that evolves through processes of definition and construction. Within the context of museum and heritage studies, commemoration should be seen as a practice not unlike exhibition practice or collection practice. McCarthy discusses practice as not only methods and ways of doing things but also as social action and performance. He states that “The turn to practice, then, allows scholars/practitioners to be more attentive to the complex organisational interplay of things, people and organisations with their constantly changing networks of social and material agency.” By considering commemoration as a practice, it is possible to manage commemoration to achieve certain outcomes and remain relevant. The challenge then becomes how to manage commemorations for successful outcomes. What are successful outcomes? From the perspective of the new museology it is commemoration that is democratic and inclusive thus creating meaningful experiences for everyone.

This dissertation argues that in order to do this it is important to consider those elements of commemoration that change and shift the most over time. Narratives, unofficial and official forms of management and practice, and participation are a crucial part of commemoration and shape the planning and events. For the upcoming sestercentennial

---

these aspects are intentionally diverging from 1969 commemorative practice in order to be relevant and meet present needs.

However, I would equally argue that ‘being different’ and thereby distancing oneself from the past should not be the only goal in managing commemoration. It is common for some to want to ‘look forward’ rather than to the past to inform planning. An historical and more reflective analysis of the continuity and change of commemorative practice is necessary, in particular looking at the similarities and differences in how we interpret and use the past over time. As David Thelen suggests, “Only then can we create new dialogues among all history makers.”

If we look to the past for present purposes within commemoration, should we not also look to the past to better our commemorative practice?

It is evident that current planning is aware of 1969, largely through collective memory, yet not engaging with it to the full extent. If collective memory tends to be emotive, as Smith discusses, then this suggests that our memories of past commemorations are not always aware of the full picture. This tendency to distance the sestercentennial plans from earlier commemorations can result in the ‘forgetting’ of certain aspects of our past in favour of ‘looking forward’. For example, the participation of Māori communities in the parade of floats reflects interesting ideas about identity representation and a Māori political and social agenda. However, these histories can get lost in the midst of creating legacies and righting past wrongs.

It is easy to see 1969 as being Eurocentric and top-down, where future commemorations are more diverse and community-driven. Yet there was strong Māori involvement, readily available scholarship on Polynesian navigation and an array of community events for the bicentenary. In light of this information, is it possible that we remember negative aspects of past commemorations in order to validate current practices? Instead, there should be a thorough and reflective analysis into changing narratives, approaches to management and participation of commemorative practice and in particular, an understanding that it is part of a process and what we create today will be rewritten again in the future. As for the sestercentennial, it will be interesting to see if it achieves its objectives and how it will affect future commemorations. Will being different be enough?

---

5 Smith, 2006, 70.
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Appendix A: Interview Questions

Interview Questions

Interviews will be semi-structured and flexible to allow for flow of conversation. Questions are intended to be used as prompts. Some questions may not be applicable to all participants. Time: 1hr

- Introduce yourself: name, where you are from, your background, what you do
- What is your involvement with the upcoming 2019 commemorations of the first meetings?
- Why do you think it is important to commemorate the first meetings?
- Have you used research from the 1969 bicentennial to inform decisions about the sestercentennial?
- Are there certain aspects of the sestercentennial that will be different to past or present commemorations?
- What do you think are the greatest challenges faced in planning for the sestercentennial?