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Abstract

I suggest that this thesis is a compost pile from Wairarapa that slowly turns over harmful but potentially fertile tales of arcadia. I narrate this thesis drawing on the fleshly stories of ten Pākehā (colonial settler) women “of the land’ and the ethico-onto-epistemology of Donna Haraway’s compost making. Composting is Haraway’s (2016) latest feminist call to trouble and queer the self-contained secular humanism of Western\(^1\) modernity. Uprooting the Western separation of ‘nature’ from culture, Haraway’s philosophy provides an earthly foundation in which to compost arcadia. Arcadia is an antique ‘nature’ myth that has been enmeshed in the process of Western world making from Classical Greece to the European ‘Age of Discovery’. Arcadia was used by the British to colonise Aotearoa New Zealand\(^2\) in the nineteenth century. As a Pākehā, I have been compelled to explore this myth because of the way it has seeped into transcendent understandings of land for descendants of colonial settlers like myself.

Commonly known as a rural paradise, arcadia was a strategy for ‘normalising’ and ‘naturalising’ European occupancy in New Zealand (Evans, 2007; Fairburn, 1989). British arcadianism arrived on the shores of New Zealand, Victorian and romantic. Therefore, in this thesis I posit that through both settler and romantic ideals, Pākehā continue to use arcadianism to relate to land. For example, presently in Aotearoa there is a populist national debate that has, broadly speaking, pitted farmers and environmentalists against each other. Sparked by recent situations such as the ‘dairy boom’ and the decline in New Zealand’s water quality, tensions have mounted between those wanting to increase agricultural production and those who believe more environmental preservation is needed. After pondering such issues I realised these positions both express contrasting sides to the New Zealand arcadian narrative: A settler arcadia that promulgates the establishment of a small family farm and a romantic arcadia that envisions a pristine ‘natural’ paradise.

---

\(^1\) I capitalise ‘West(ern)’ to present it as a political proper noun and to distinguish it from the geographical determiner ‘west(ern)’.

\(^2\) Which will be henceforth known as such, Aotearoa, or New Zealand.
I worked through these issues on, in, and with, the ground of Wairarapa with Pākehā women who were engaged in various kinds of rural land practice. Using a critical autoethnographic voice and the idea of geography as ‘earth writing’ I draw on creative qualitative modes, visual approaches and ethnographic adventures to form fulsome stories that compost arcadia. The figure of Pan, the deity of the actual place of Arcadia, helps me with this composting project. Pan is a human-goat hybrid, queer trouble maker, and, as a trickster, has invoked in me my critical autoethnographic, fictional voice.

My encounters with women and Pan showed me fertile ways in which Pākehā have inherited the histories of arcadia and how these histories are corporeally significant and fruitfully challenge the separation of ‘nature’ and culture. Such meaningful matter or matters have, in turn, provided verdant ways to discuss Pākehā becoming and response-ability. Through the material stories of trees, pasture, hills, mountains, waterways, animals and family, compostable arcadies emerged, yielding, what I call in this thesis, landhome making. Landhome making queers the essentialising qualities of ‘homeland’ and ‘homemaker’ but most importantly relates the significance of land in the making of home for the women of this thesis. Landhome making is about exploring, through everyday practice, what it means to be Pākehā for participants and myself that — resultantly — contributes to wider national discussions on how Pākehā might ‘become with’ land (Haraway, 2008; 2016; Newton, 2009).
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---

3 This dramatis personae is intended to briefly introduce some of the more frequently appearing main characters in this thesis-story.
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Chapter 1. Making arcadian compost

Scene one: On clear winter days in Wairarapa I like to climb to the Rocky Lookout. To get there entails a drive from Masterton to Mount Holdsworth Carpark, the most popular entrance way to the Tararua Forest Park on the eastern side. From there it is a gentle slog up through ferns and some nice beech areas. Usually accompanying me are kererū swooping, grey warblers singing “throatfuls of heartache” (Wright, 2004, p.33), piwakawaka playing, tūī melodiously calling. Up past the tree line where mānuka and alpine grasses grow is where you can find the Lookout that provides views of Wairarapa. To the west is the expanse of the Tararua Ranges with Mitre Peak snowclad. To the east is the broad floodplains now mostly farming country, and in the far distance, hill country.

Scene two: Driving back from my walks in the ‘bush’ I cannot contain the joy I feel, in early spring, at the sight of ewes languidly resting on the grass or grazing on the lush stems whilst newly formed lambs jump, frolic and chase each other. From the road the mothers and their babes (with soft white ears and small cloven hooves) are splendidly framed by a snow-peaked mountainous backdrop.

These kinds of scenes have been selling Aotearoa/New Zealand agriculture and tourism since the nineteenth century and have, in turn, also become dominant symbols of what it means to be a (Pākehā) New Zealander (Belich, 1996; 2001; Evans, 2007; Stephenson, Abbott, & Ruru, 2010). These views are what I call in this thesis, arcadian. Derived from the actual place of Arcadia in Greece, arcadia became a literary and poetic description of paradise (Belich, 1996; 2001; Evans, 2007; Fairburn, 1989; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). Although, interpreted, translated, located and mutated, arcadia has come to mean many things since it was first popularised about two and half thousand years ago. Simon Schama (1995) traces this history in Europe pointing to how the Roman poet Virgil (70 BCE-19 BCE) famously wrote of arcadia as a pastoral ideal that proceeded to become the central text with which dominant arcadies today are derived (see also Fairburn, 1989; Ruff, 2015). A ‘pastoral’ arcadia is light and cultivated but arcadia can also be a dark ‘wilderness’, like the forest in the Tararua Ranges (Evans, 2007; Fairburn, 1989; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995).
Both ‘pastoral’ and ‘wilderness’ arcadies have been inherited by what counts as Pākehā in this thesis. I follow Avril Bell’s (1999; 2004; 2014; 2017a; 2017b; 2018) lead here, and define Pākehā as those who are descended from colonial settlers and who are still colonial settler subjects still lacking, as a culture, an ability to take our obligations to Māori seriously. I am Pākehā and have inherited arcadian mythologies. I am a colonial settler and one who lusts after land, at times, rapaciously. I am seduced by ‘pastoralism-as-farming’ and ‘wilderness-as-dramatic-scenery’ that forms what James Belich (2001, p. 84) describes as a quintessential arcadian ‘scene’: Sheep or cows munching on lush green grass with snow-peaked mountains in the background (see figure 1).

As a culture we, Pākehā, have drawn on scenes of lakes, rivers and mountains in Aotearoa to sell our ‘clean and green’ agricultural produce for decades (Belich, 2001). In fact, farming and ‘scenic’ tourism, industries — that, broadly, draw on ‘pastoral’ and ‘wilderness’ narratives respectively — were core to the political economy of colonial settlement and are still New Zealand’s biggest money earners (Pawson, 2018). However,

---

* Māori are the Indigenous people or tangata whenua of Aotearoa.
in the last twenty years or so, rather a lot of friction has erupted between the two sectors
fuelled by a wider national debate between environmentalist and farming circles.

The overgeneralised debate is usually centred upon the agricultural industry wanting to
become more intensive and conservation and outdoor recreational non-profit
organisations, like Forest and Bird and Fish and Game, calling for preservation of
indigenous ecosystems. It is commonly understood that what triggered the fracas initially
was Fish and Game’s 2002 ‘dirty dairying’ catchcry that soon became cemented into the
public domain (Holland, 2014). The main issues Fish and Game were then focussed on
was how intensive cow dairy farming was dirtying fresh water, calling instead for a ‘clean,
green’ – or ‘pure’ – New Zealand whilst accusing farmers of polluting (Holland, 2014).

Fish and Game’s framing of New Zealand as ‘clean, green’ and ‘pure’ cannot be
Zealand’s launch of the 100% Pure campaign in 1999. Ginn (2008) argues that in the last
few decades some (Pākehā) New Zealanders have turned towards native flora and fauna
as a way to assert their sense of nationhood that distinctly distances ‘New Zealand’ from
the colonial and British-derived pursuits of farming. Adding to this popular fervour for
‘pristine’ ‘pure’ New Zealand wildernesses was the 100% Pure campaign that still shows
‘enticing’ pictures of ‘pure’ New Zealand ‘nature’. Like nineteenth century propaganda,
the irony becomes that even though 100% Pure is advertised to visitors, it becomes a
reflection on what and who New Zealand is (see Belich, 2001; Evans, 2007) complete with
White\(^5\), slim, heteronormative bodies\(^6\) walking through ‘pristine’ landscapes (Frohlick, &
Johnston, 2011).

\(^{5}\) I capitalise ‘White’ to present it as a political proper noun and to distinguish it from the word ‘white’ as an
adjective

\(^{6}\) See [https://www.newzealand.com/int/](https://www.newzealand.com/int/), particularly the links to walking and hiking.
The friction between these two different kinds of being Pākehā, farming and preservationist, has played out in many public sites, especially when a particular landscape is wanted by both parties. The Mackenzie Basin is a case in point (Thompson, 2011; Pawson, 2018). A sparse, dry, tussock, high-country landscape, the McKenzie Basin is core to Tourism New Zealand’s 100% Pure New Zealand campaign (Thompson 2011, pp.160-163). However, Anna Thompson argues cow dairy farming has dramatically altered this tourist landscape (2011, p.163). South of Twizel, intense irrigation schemes, roading fencing, silage storage, housing and sheds surrounded by green pastures have emerged provoking both environmental and touristic commercial fears (Thompson 2011, p.163).

This cow dairy farming conversion in the Makenzie Basin was a localised reflection of the wider ‘dairy boom’ New Zealand experienced beginning in the 1990s (Johnsen, 2003; Le Heron, 2018; Pawson, 2018). Deregulation of the agriculture sector in the 1980s led to a number of economic changes that economically dampened sheep and beef farming and helped the dairy sector. Global prices for dairy were up during this period and a removal of tariffs only increased the industry’s prosperity. More significantly, in 2001, the dairy cooperative Fonterra — New Zealand’s largest business — was formed (Le Heron, 2018).

Fonterra was an amalgamation between two dairy cooperatives and the New Zealand Dairy Board and at its inception processed ninety-eight percent of milk in New Zealand (Le Heron, 2018). The perceived success of the company, as well as the continued rise of dairy prices Fonterra was offering to farmers, led more and more dry stock farmers to convert and existing dairy farmers to intensify their operations (Foote, Joy & Death, 2015; Johnsen, 2003; Le Heron, 2018; Pawson, 2018).

The arguments against intensive dairying farming have woven through both academic and popular circles that commonly centre on the increased use of synthetic fertilisers (that damages both soil and fresh water), supplementary feed such as palm kernel expeller, and the deforestation to make way for more farms (Anderson, 2012; Barnett, &

---

7 For the 2007-2008, and 2010-2011, season, Fonterra paid out record numbers of over seven dollars per kg milk solids and over eight dollars for the 2013-2014 dairy milking season (https://www.interest.co.nz/rural-data/dairy-industry-payout-history).

8 Intensification can mean an increase of herd size on a particular area and/or an increase of milk production per cow (Barnett, & Pauling, 2005; Foote, Joy & Death, 2015).
Pauling, 2005; Deans & Hackwell, 2008; Foote; Joy & Death, 2015; Holland, 2015; LandCare Research 2009; Larned, Scarsbrook, Snelder, Norton & Biggs, 2004; Macfie, 2014; Preston, 2012; Wright, 2012). Public and academic calls for slowing, or halting, the dairy industry have drawn on the ‘dirty dairying’ momentum by couching their arguments within a ‘clean green’/ ‘dirty’ dichotomy, or within a desire for purity not pollution (see for example, Anderson, 2012; Deans & Hackwell, 2008; Foote; Joy & Death, 2015; Holland, 2015; Macfie, 2014; Preston, 2012; Wright, 2012).

However, during fieldwork for this research global dairy prices began to crash (Beautrais, 2017). In the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 season, Fonterra paid out just $4.40 and $3.90 per kg of milk solids to farmers coming down from the high of $8.40 in the 2013-2014 season⁹. Suddenly, the ‘dairy boom’ was in question and was all too present during the interviews I carried out with participants during fieldwork even though I did not interview anyone from the cow dairy sector. Still, the milk prices were all over the news and some women felt a sense of loyalty to their dairy farming colleagues.

The general election was also held in late 2014 and the public discourse between intensive dairy and a ‘clean green’ environment was used as a political strategy by both the New Zealand National Party¹⁰ and the Green Party of Aotearoa New Zealand¹¹. Both political factions drew on fairly binary views of arcadia. ‘National’ has long been a rurally focussed organisation, presently holding every rural seat in parliament except one¹².

During the election campaign the party extolled the libertarianism and self-reliance of the Victorian¹³ settler (Fairburn, 1989). Contrastingly, ‘the Greens’, heavily focussed on environmentalist issues, emphasised the need for New Zealand to be ‘clean and green’.

---

⁹ See [https://www.interest.co.nz/rural-data/dairy-industry-payout-history](https://www.interest.co.nz/rural-data/dairy-industry-payout-history)

¹⁰ The New Zealand National Party is the largest political party in New Zealand and is broadly, right-wing (see [https://www.national.org.nz/](https://www.national.org.nz/)).

¹¹ The Green Party of Aotearoa New Zealand is commonly known as left-wing and one of its core policies is environmental regulation (see [https://www.greens.org.nz/](https://www.greens.org.nz/)).


¹³ A period in Britain that spanned from 1837 to the beginning of the twentieth century, the era, in which Queen Victoria (1819-1901) ruled (Fairburn, 1989; Schama, 1995).
Settler, romantic arcadias

The impetus for conducting doctoral research began with this binary and the realisation the pursuits of farming and environmentalism (such as conservation) are actually two divergent but convergent ways of expressing the arcadian narrative in New Zealand. I have been pulled into the mythology of this ideal society as a Pākehā myself who loves the land in my country and who has lived and worked within farming and conservation circles. Making the feminist point that I therefore bring my own subjectivities to this research (Haraway, 1991; Rose, 1997) seems somewhat redundant, so wholly immersed as I am in the fibrous strands of the key issues in this thesis. As if the lines between person and project were not fragile enough, I chose to work through these issues with ten Pākehā women who also love land in Wairarapa, a place, in which, I ended up dwelling.

As alluded to in the opening ‘scenes’ of this chapter, Wairarapa has been a good place to compost the mythology of arcadia, with its sprawling farmlands and ‘picturesque’ views. It is from this place that I have drawn on the stories from Pākehā women “of the land” to ground dominant expressions of the arcadian narrative and the binaries which such totalising discourses yield. In serious ways then, this thesis is a compost pile. This particular pile of compost has many layers that have been care-fully chosen: As Jennifer Hamilton and Astrida Neimanis (2018, p.502) warn, “It matters what compostables make compost”.

An essential layer of this compost pile is land. Discussed from a Pākehā perspective, land means many different things. It can mean private property, farm, soil, plot, paddock, estate, terra firma (Collins Dictionary, 2012, p.926). Such foregrounding is important for explaining the phrase “of the land”. Quoted in this thesis’ title, “of the land” is an expression one of my participants, Carolyn, used. It is a succinct and evocative way of illustrating how the ten women I interviewed expressed their relationship with land to me. ‘Of the land’ may refer to those who undertake agricultural work as Carolyn intended it to mean. Yet as this thesis will show, ‘of the land’ could also mean something deeper. ‘Of the land’ is also a helpfully nebulous term which allows a description of women’s
relationships to terra firma that does not confine their stories to what is commonly understood as ‘farming’ in Pākehā in New Zealand.

To become ‘of the land’ also speaks to the settler ideal. In the nineteenth century when Pākehā brought with them arcadian fantasies from mainly Britain. This arcadian importation was far from unique. Since the ‘Age of Discovery’, arcadia had been used as a strategy to colonise many ‘New Worlds’, often framed through the Christian lens of the Garden of Eden or the more secular, English, ‘rural idyll’ (Belich, 1996; 2001; Evans, 2007; Fairburn, 1989; Schama, 1995). However, even though arcadia was a common colonising strategy for Britain, and other Western European colonial powers, the way in which the mythology arrived on the shores of Aotearoa, and how it was subsequently translated, was distinctive. In this thesis, I argue that there have been two dominant arcadian strains in New Zealand since landfall by Britain; the settler and the romantic.

Broadly speaking, Romanticism was an artistic movement that ostensibly countered the effects of modernity like urbanism, industrialisation, capitalist exploitation, human selfishness and greed (Bell, 2014; Evans, 2007; Hess, 2012; Löwy & Sayre, 2001;)

14 Farming is a term that carries certain conventions in New Zealand that not all women practiced. For a definition of a ‘conventional’ Pākehā farmer see for example, Macloon (2013) Pawson (2018) and chapter four and five of this thesis.
15 Romanticism and Romantics will be described in this thesis thus, as it pertains to the actual Movement. Derivations of Romanticism will be described as romanticism or romantic.
Oerlemans 2002; Ottum & Reno, 2016). Contrastingly, the Victorian Protestant\textsuperscript{16} settler ethic embraced the ideals of modernity and was pivotal in building an agricultural capitalist economy. Thus, at first glance, romantic and settler arcadies may seem oppositional. The purpose of romanticism was to counter industry and capitalist expansion, the role of the Victorian settler (Belich, 1996; 2001; Evans, 2007; Fairburn, 1989; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995).

It would be tempting to tell a story of how settler and romantic myths in New Zealand neatly translated as local versions of ‘pastoral’ and ‘wilderness’ arcadies. However, through this thesis’ process of composting, it will become clear that working with fixed binaries are infertile ways of telling stories. As I slowly turn these myths over then, I will show how Schama’s ‘pastoral’ and ‘wilderness’ narratives weave asymmetrically throughout these local idylls, and the practices of farming and environmentalism, often imploding in one another. Schama (1995) himself argues, ‘pastoral’ and ‘wilderness’ arcadies mutually sustain one another, an important point in European milieux. In a New Zealand context too, the settler aspirations of running a small family farm and the idyllic and harmonious connection to ‘nature’ which that relationship produces, is just one example of how the romantic and settler pursuits converge (Belich, 1996; 2001; Evans, 2007; Fairburn, 1989; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995) conveyed so succinctly in the aforementioned pictorial farming promulgated in the nineteenth century.

\textsuperscript{16} A branch of Christianity that detracts from the Roman (Western) Catholic Church
Moreover, and perhaps less appealing, is Patrick Evans’ (2007) ‘colonial sublime’. Tracing the philosophies of romanticism and colonisation in nineteenth century New Zealand, Evans (2007) argues both ideologies were intimately bound in the project of ‘naturalising’ and ‘normalising’ heteronormative Pākehā belonging in Aotearoa and still very much a part of present Pākehā views of land. For example, the romanticised White heteronormativity implicit in 100% Pure campaigns (see figure 2) is similarly used in (Fonterra) farming narratives (see figure 3). Images such as the ones pictured here\textsuperscript{17} of White romantic coupling or White nuclear families not only ‘naturalises’ heterosexuality by placing them in a ‘natural’ setting (Johnston, 2006), it tells the story of how, we, Pākehā are the ‘natural’ and ‘normal’ occupiers of land in New Zealand (Evans, 2007); and that ‘land’ is ‘naturally’ a farm or conserved ‘wilderness’.

These ‘naturalising’ and ‘normalising’ arcadian ideals are an attempt to attain paradise. Whether through pastoral or ‘wilderness’, settler or romantic, farmer or environmentalist, dominant arcadian practices and narratives not only sustain one another in this ambition, but they aid each other in the goal of trying to arrive at transcendence. Collectively, albeit divergently then, the women who took part in this project, and myself, expose, ground and grind these transcendent binaries and ‘purities’, turning them over and over until they begin to break down and compost.

**Composting transcendent arcadias**

Transcendent arcadias are the trouble upon which this thesis centres. In both differing but strikingly similar ways both dominant understandings of New Zealand arcadian narratives presented in this chapter are, as Haraway would say, trying to get back to the Garden of Eden (see in particular 1992b; 2004a; 2004b; 1997; 2011; 2016). Environmentalist and conservation narratives that draw on Romantic ideologies educe a desire to return to a place of ‘purity’ where a harmonious relationship between human and ‘nature’ exists (Evans, 2007; Hess, 2012; Ginn, 2008; Whatmore, 2002) such as the image in figure two and many others on the 100% Pure campaign website demonstrate\textsuperscript{18}. Idyllic farm scenes too, like figure three illustrates, show a romantic version of farming

\textsuperscript{17} For more images like this visit both the 100% Pure and Fonterra websites.

\textsuperscript{18} See for example, [https://www.newzealand.com/int/walking-and-hiking/](https://www.newzealand.com/int/walking-and-hiking/).
wherein human and land are ‘naturally’ connected. Through these filters, we, Pākehā can be seduced into believing that we ‘naturally’ belong in a ‘pristine’ ideal with snow-peaked mountains, sparkling fresh rivers (Frohlick, & Johnston, 2011) and bucolic farmland.

Such wishful thinking may seem starkly opposite to the intensified dairy farming that ‘threatens’ and ‘pollutes’ this ‘paradise’ (see Holland, 2014). Built on the notions of the settler arcadia trying to make ‘material progress’ (Fairburn, 1989) though, recent intensified dairy farming practices19 are also tales of transcendence. Val Plumwood (1939-2008) explained how in the Western masculine story of logic, man’s [sic] ability to achieve the ‘pure’ state of rationality is predicated upon how he [sic] can get beyond necessity, beyond subsistence (1993; 2002). Capitalism and ‘material progress’ is the goal for this figure, cornerstones to the arcadian settler ideal, and the rural sector, in New Zealand (Fairburn, 1989; Johnsen, 2003). Technology has helped and it is in this area that Haraway (1997; 2008; 2016) becomes particularly agitated as she argues the desire for transcending the need for ‘nature’ is rather potent in what she calls ‘technoscience-fixes’ (see also Grebowicz & Merrick, 2013). The desire to fix, tame, control and manipulate what counts as ‘nature’ in the West is about getting to a place of ‘purity’ focused as it is on the project of getting beyond the ‘trouble’ and the ‘mess’ of complex ecologies, and for this thesis, the trouble of colonial settlement.

These transcendent arcadies, despite being seriously problematic, are, I argue, compostable. Composting may be seen as Haraway’s latest call to ‘become with’ (2008; 2016) which, in itself, is about, shredding into pieces, the myth that humans are self-contained. As she says, “if we appreciate the foolishness of human exceptionalism then we know that becoming is always becoming with” (Haraway, 2008, p.244). In this, what Haraway terms, naturalcultural figuring, the multiple worlds formed by earthlings of all kinds are always becoming; “partners do not precede the knotting; species of all kinds are consequent upon worldly subject […] shaping entanglements” (Haraway, 2016, p.13). In other words, nothing exists before relation and everything exists because of relation. Thus composting is not only a process “constantly in-the-making” but “constantly in-the-making” with each other (Ginn, 2008, p.336).

---

19 As well as intensified tourist practices (Pawson, 2018).
Haraway’s (2016; 2019) composting accomplishes the necessary work of breaking down well-known Western binaries, for example, ‘nature’ and culture. That is to say, the philosopher’s ‘naturecultures’ destabilise the knowledges entrenched by Western modernity and produced by Greek antiquity. The Vitruvian Man is key here, a figure borne from Leonardo Da Vinci (1452 – 1519) during the European Renaissance. This Man of Perfect Proportions embodies the exceptionalism of the human European male; individual and autonomous (Haraway, 2008; 2016). Regarded as the epitome of culture, the Vitruvian Man transcends ‘nature’ and everything associated with it, such as women and non-Western Europeans. It is a trope, a myth, that has been retold innumerable times across space-times for hundreds of years fuelling Western projects that have colonised and oppressed those deemed ‘nature’ (Haraway, 2008; 2016; Plumwood, 1993).

Haraway does not take issue with the Vitruvian Man being a trope per se, what she is concerned with is what kind of meaning such a trope communicates. Haraway’s work is full of tropes and finds them generative and creative to work with:

*Maybe because of my Catholic inheritance of fascination with figuration, I’m interested in tropes as places where you trip. Tropes are way more than metaphors [...] Tropes are about stutterings, trippings. They are about breakdowns and that’s why they are creative. That is why you get somewhere you weren’t before, because something didn’t work* (Haraway in Gane & Haraway, 2006 p.152)

Ever a student of inheritance and histories, Haraway takes the meaning of trope from its Greek roots *tropos* that can be defined as turning, moving away from, “swerving or tripping”, (2003, p.20). Trope then in this thesis is a turn of phrase, a ‘thickening’ of literalism to include the figurative, a stuttering and tripping over that yields something that wasn’t there before. To see the Vitruvian Man and arcadia as tropes is to render them reconfigured and view them as not simply stories but stories that express a certain way of being or becoming in the world.

Similar to trope, in this thesis, is mythology. Mythology, which can be understood as a series, or full expression, of ‘myth’, in secular terms, is often seen as derogatory because
of its lack of basis in ‘fact’ (Collins Dictionary, 2012, p.1099; Schrempp, 2012). For example, Claudia Bell (1996) has written a widely read book in New Zealand on Pākehā mythologies that critiques the ‘mythological’ way Pākehā relate to ‘nature’. This idea of mythology is quite different from a religious perspective that positions mythology as a story with deep significance and meaning that has cultural implications which is also often didactic or instructional (Feldt, Gustavo Benavides & von Stuckrad, 2012; Schrempp, 2012). Both definitions are relevant for this thesis which is not religious or secular (see Haraway & Goodeve, 1999; Haraway, 2013).

Arcadia is a secular myth that ‘naturalises’ and ‘normalises’ Pākehā occupation in Aotearoa and is also an ancient religious myth (Evans, Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). These worlds may seem glaringly different from one another. However, I aim in this thesis to show how they are very much entwined leaving room for the category of Pākehā to dip into the world of fiction but still be grounded in the veracities of colonial settler life. A figure that potently articulates the blurring between myth and fact is Pan, the deity and Lord of Arcadia (Borgeaud, 1988; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). Pan is a satyr, half-man and half-goat, a trickster that lives in caves and deep wooded forests and roams steep hills. Pan both personifies and dwells within the Classical Greek idea of ‘uncultivation’ (Borgeaud, 1988; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). Pan carries in his hybrid body a rupture to ‘civility’ that is important for this thesis’ framing of arcadian mythology.

When the crowds at Mount Holdsworth get too much for me I trek further north for a walk where the Tararua Ranges are less traversed and as a consequence, less taken care of by the appointed staff20. These are the haunts of Pan: Spaces in which tree roots are steps, muddy forest floors are tracks and ‘wild’ beasts roam (in this case pigs and deer) — the kind of places where I slip, trip (perhaps trope) and fall until I am face first with the ground. These spaces are “back country”, an uncultivated arcadia (see Robert in Borgeaud, 1988, p.60), and present Pākehā unkempt ‘bush’. Spaces like these are good places for making arcadian compost.

Composting in this thesis is both soil and ground, and mythology and text: It is a fleshly trope. Composting conveys Haraway’s layered work of imploding the material and the

---

20 As a State Forest Park, the Tararua Ranges are maintained by DoC.
Composting for the philosopher is about the literal process of decomposition and composition that makes significance and meaning. Key to this composting process in Haraway’s world, and this thesis, is her response-ability (2008; 2011; 2016; 2019). Response-ability is defined by Haraway as simply, the (cap)ability of response, a ‘thickening’ of the self-contained individualism that ‘(self-) responsibility’ carries. Response-ability is an acknowledgement that everybody is always in relation which is not just a way to tackle human exceptionalism, it is a practice of care-fullness when facing issues of colonialism and ‘race’ (Haraway, 2008; 2011; 2016). Helpfully, Bell (2014) also uses ‘response-ability’ to discuss the need for more care-full relating between settler colonial and Indigenous peoples, positing that — more often than not — the former still do not know how.

Comparably, in his paper, ‘Becoming Pākehā’, John Newton (2009, p.40) argues that identifying as Pākehā is a matter of “learning to speak and act from that political place which our relationship with Māori opens up to us”. Vitally then, for Newton (2009, p.40), Pākehā identity is always a ‘becoming’, which — unlike ‘being’ — “has the tactical advantage of directing us (Pākehā), not to a birth right, but to an on-going process of exploration, negotiation and critique” (see also Bell, 2017, p.456). Newton, Bell and Haraway’s ideas here then, speak to colonial settler identities as relational and never finished and critically, for this thesis, also position Pākehā as noninnocent and complicit.

Noninnocence for Haraway (2016) recognises that the binaries of innocence and guilt are unfruitful and that making knowledges is always going to be dirty work (see also 1997; 2008). I embody this position as I trace in this project how colonially complicit I became whilst spending time with participants. Recognising the dangers of this situation I also point to how complicity may be constructive (Kindon, 2012). Becoming Pākehā then, is a response-able act, a potential ‘becoming with’ that ‘stays with the trouble’ of being a colonial settler (Haraway, 2016). In this thesis ‘staying with trouble’ is vital for composting transcendent arcadian binaries. For, rather than dismissing the beleaguered

---

21 I capitalise ‘Indigenous’ to present it as a politicised proper noun and to distinguish it from the word ‘indigenous’ which is an adjective.

colonial myth and its sharp dualisms between, romantic and settler, or farmer and conservationist, I intend to expose, soil, and break down the boundaries such binaries draw, and all that they contain, with the aim of making fertile arcadian compost.

Helping me with this composting job are ten Women’s stories situated in Wairarapa New Zealand. The women I interviewed pulled me into, not some harmonious innocent rural idyll but, a place with grit, tears, violence as well as love, serenity, awe. Over the course of fieldwork and immersing myself in their stories I felt myself changed, and as it turned out, permanently. It was the affect that moved me so when Lynne was articulating her land to me when I first met her. I was similarly drawn into the care Carolyn expressed over her sheep, Jocelyn telling me about her cattle and Jill and Lyn talking about the waterways and ‘bush’ they called home. Then there were the stimulating conversations over farm environmentalism and Pākehā culture I had with Millie, Sarah and Penelope. I also became entirely absorbed by the stories of Wairarapa soil types, weather patterns, and floods that Mary and Gaye had much to say about. Therefore this thesis is about ‘becoming Pākehā’ for me and the participants that took part in this project and how we collectively but divergently ‘became with’ arcadian land.

We are small fragments of a Pākehā culture still settling. So we offer situated, partial, lustful compostable accounts of arcadianism in Wairarapa. With this in mind, the rest of this chapter will focus on outlining the research questions for this thesis. One overarching question will guide the project as a whole, whilst three sub-questions will support it.

Research questions

1. How do our fleshly situated stories from within Wairarapa compost transcendent myths of arcadia in Aotearoa New Zealand?

   a. How might we, as Pākehā women, living in Wairarapa inherit arcadian histories response-ably?
b. How do our composting narratives of arcadia show the inseparability of flesh and significance, ‘nature’ and culture?

c. How do we story ‘becoming Pākehā with’ arcadian land?

A hairy heartening tale

In the chapters that follow answering these questions takes form as a tale, long and sometimes hairy, thick and sometimes heartening. This not a “[...] story with only one real actor, one real world-maker, the hero [...] a Man-making tale of the hunter on a quest to kill and bring back the terrible bounty” (Haraway, 2016, p.39). Nor is it an account where “props, ground, plot space [and] prey” are backgrounded so the self-contained White male may be regarded as exceptional (Haraway, 2016, p.39). Rather, this is a yarn with multiple and permeable characters, human and not, and sometimes in between. In this vein, I tell this story and build my thesis with the traces of multiple Others at my fingertips. Rather than use killing tools like Haraway’s figurative hunter, I use compost ingredients, materials and matter, care-fully chosen to argue for a composting arcadia.

An important character accompanying women and myself throughout this composting project is Pan. As an embodiment of arcadias that are less ‘cultivated’, or an ‘Other’ to the Grecian ‘Self’, Pan troubles the ideology of transcendence. Yet as this thesis will show, the might of Pan’s power comes not from dwelling in ‘back country’ but travelling to ‘cultivated’ areas and thereby making cloudy the binaries between ‘civilised’ and ‘uncivilised’, ‘nature’ and culture. As a trickster he enters rational bodies through possession and enters the city creating Pan-demonism or Pan-ic, horror, terror and even disgust (Borgeaud, 1998; Schama, 1995).

Inspired by Haraway’s own compost story project (see 2016; 2019b) that is a fictional factual future set in the Community (or Children) of Compost, I use Pan in this research to compose and decompose Pākehā inheritances that are both factual and fictional, sign and flesh, culture and ‘nature’. I use Pan as a trickster figure in the vein of Haraway’s earlier companions too, before her foray into composting, namely the cyborg (see Haraway, 1991), which she says “are [...] places where the ambiguity between the literal
and the figurative is always working. You are never sure whether to take something literally or figuratively. It is always both/and” (Haraway, 2004b, p. 323).

I hope in some way to evoke a similar “ambiguity” in this thesis. This voice will primarily take form in diary excerpts ‘written’ by Pan as a way to leak the mythological, the poetic, into the material world, as one way of showing the inseparability of flesh and sign. In this context it feels incongruous to write Pan as a past tense so I refer to him as a present presence. The diary excerpts I wrote (fragments of Pan’s journey from Arcadia to Wairarapa) end at chapter six, the juncture in which women’s voices in the form of found poetry emerge. The affect I am trying to convey in these creative tendrils is to emphasise the fictive liveliness and fleshliness of arcadian histories. In turn I also wish to engender a sense of mythology and poeticism within women’s stories.

What partly led me to this intimate relationship with Pan was when I re-read that, as a deity of the Arcadians that were considered “autochthons” (Borgeaud, 1988; Schama, 1995, p. 526), Pan is a chthonic one (Haraway, 2016). Chthonic ones for Haraway are figures ancient and present that live “in, or under the earth and the seas” (Haraway 2016, pp.53-54) that both “compose and decompose” (Haraway, 2016, p.102) in ever intricate ways that generate a rather fertile compost pile (Haraway, 2016). Chthonic ones are creatures that tell compost stories (2019) and geo stories (2016) that are situated, troubling and always ‘becoming-with’ like the snake haired gorgon Medusa or the Pimeo cthulhu spider that scuttles around Californian redwood forests (Haraway, 2016). As composting figures, chthonic ones are necessarily feminist and queer. Hamilton and Neimanis (2018), drawing from Haraway’s (2016) project, posit that composting is a feminist practice in that the material act of composting involves routine everyday tasks that is often mucky, difficult and requires disharmonious collaborations. Composting is also an act of domesticity that is associated with subsistence production that helpfully contests the transcendent desires of capitalist production (see Plumwood, 1993). What queering does however, from Haraway’s (2016) perspective, is show how the figurative feminist composters are compost themselves, porous and decomposable (Haraway, 2016).
Queer and feminist epistemologies do not always play well together even if they are both means of challenging heteronormativity in patriarchal and misogynistic societies (Showden, 2012). Whilst the latter tends to disrupt norms and ‘naturalisms’, the former potentially validates ‘norms’ like heterosexual relationships and heteronormative reproduction when arguing the case for women’s emancipation (Showden, 2012). Haraway herself does not like the concept of ‘reproduction’ because of the way it can, ideologically and materially speaking, duplicate what was therefore before. My compost pile — as opposed to Haraway’s — makes more room for reproduction, not only because reproduction was critical to women’s lives through motherhood and farming cycles (see Whatmore, 1991), I too find value in the way reproduction resists extractive modes of production (Plumwood, 1993; 2002).

I also find Haraway’s queering practices (see for example, 1994; 2016; Grebowicz & Merrick, 2013; Taylor & Blaise, 2017) a potent channel for working through the fraught notion of ‘nature’, even if it is not well-rehearsed terrain for queer theory (Taylor & Blaise, 2017). Encouragingly, Affrica Taylor and Mindy Blaise (2017) trace the fruitfulness of Haraway’s (1994, p.60) queering of what counts as ‘nature’ rather aptly. They state:

It is simply not possible to partake in rethinking nature (and culture) beyond the nature/culture divide without simultaneously displacing the autonomous free and agentic individual gendered and sexual subject of liberal humanism (Taylor & Blaise, 2017, p. 594).

What Taylor and Blaise (2017) are pointing to is the tendency for queer theory to focus on being queer as a human exception and one which demands individual human rights. This is not the queering I am engaged in, in this thesis, and I concur with Taylor and Blaise’s (2017, pp.592, 596) assertion that non-humans are “inherently’ queer and therefore never ‘natural’. In this vein, queering in this project is about disrupting what counts as ‘normal’ and ‘natural’ in ‘cultivated’ arcadies, Pan — a hybrid of human and not — a potent embodiment of the kind (of) queering I use for this composting project.

Accordingly, queering ‘nature’ in this thesis, along with feminism, is allied with more-than-humanism for this dissertation. Sarah Whatmore’s ‘more-than-human
geographies\textsuperscript{23} (1999; 2002; 2006; 2013) is important for this thesis’ troubling of human exceptionalism and recognising inheritance and history. Whatmore’s geographical ‘signature’ is steadfastly contrasted with ‘posthuman’, an expression that this thesis will not use but is used elsewhere that ostensibly decentres the human (see Badmington, 2004; Braun, 2004; Castree & Nash, 2004; Murdoch, 2004). Whatmore dislikes the temporalising of the challenge to humanism that posthumanism educes, and I concur. What is helpful for this thesis is Whatmore’s focus on that which “exceeds rather than what comes after the human” (2013, p.82). Haraway, too, seemingly queering words whenever she can, expresses her anathema towards ‘posthumanism’, rejecting any claims that she may be one herself by declaring her position: “I am a compost-ist, not a posthuman-ist” (2016, p.101. Italicisation added).

I can only describe the composting that I draw from Haraway as ethico-ontoepistemology, a term developed by Karen Barad, a theorist whose work crosses with Haraway fairly regularly\textsuperscript{24}. Making the point that to be in any world is to be obligated ethically and in relation, Barad (see for example 2011; 2014) uses ethico-ontoepistemology to illustrate the intimate relation between ethics, ontology and epistemology\textsuperscript{25}. Such a stance, even if in slightly different ways (Grebowicz & Merrick, 2013) is verdantly present in Haraway’s philosophy.

Margret Grebowicz and Helen Merrick (2013, p. 103) maintain that the ethical is “inextricable from the ontological” for Haraway and that this ethico-ontology is about companionship. Fertilely, Haraway’s “ethics of companionship” (Grebowicz & Merrick, 2013, pp.110-111) resonate with Elizabeth Mackinlay’s (2019) translation of ethico-ontoepistemologies as ‘doing, being, knowing’. The ‘doing’ in Mackinlay’s (2019) work here signifies the Harawayan position that ethics is always about doing, relating, ‘becoming with’ each other and that such relation is not just how the world comes to be, but how knowledge is made.

Mackinlay (2019) further argues critical autoethnography (CAE) is an ethico-ontoepistemology. Pioneered by scholars such as Stacy Holman Jones (see 2016) and Anne

\textsuperscript{23} See also Abram (1997) for an elaboration on the term ‘more-than-human’.

\textsuperscript{24} See for example Barad (2014); Haraway, (2008)

\textsuperscript{25} see Taylor & Pacini-Ketchabaw (2018) for fulsome examples of ‘onto-epistemologies’.
Harris (see, with Holman Jones, 2019) critical autoethnography underscores the importance of critical theory in the discipline of autoethnography. Recently, these scholars including Fetaui Iosefo (2018) have also emphasised the importance of ‘auto’ethnography as relational rather than being focussed on self-examination — a point helpfully canvassed by Haraway (2019a) discussing ‘auto’biography. Therefore, I do not use a CAE approach in this dissertation as a way to link the singular (myself) to the universal (Denzin, 2003, p.268). I use CAE in this thesis through my body and Pan’s, to practise composting, a ‘becoming with’ that is feminist, queer and more-than-human (Haraway, 2008; 2016).

Geo(graphical) stories

This is a geographical thesis even if disciplinarily promiscuous. However, if geography is, at its core, ‘earth writing’ (see Adams-Hutcheson, 2019, p. 1018; Springer, 2017) then this thesis is deeply embedded in such a discipline that is committed to whatever constitutes “earth life” (Whatmore, 2004, p. 1362). It is this focus on ‘earth life’, Whatmore notes, that distinguishes geography from any other “generic social scientific enterprise” in the way it, for her, attends to “(t)he miraculous fecundity of the earth and the insistent rhythms of plant life that together generate foods of staggering variety and possibility” (2003, p.139). The women that participated in my project were abundant providers in this regard. The routine sheep work, tree planting, river rambling, under the searing Wairarapa sun, and the cool shade of its trees, talking, eating, patting, gave me access to very lively, animating geographies (Wolch, Emel & Wilbert, 2003). The way women articulated stories with meaning and corporeality also provided seriously fresh ways of viewing arcadia through the practice of composting.

Ten very different women “of the land” detailed their significant more-than-human relationships to me and were generous enough to give me time to interview them at length and on multiple occasions. Helping me were local historians, some of whom I met through my interactions with women. I took my time getting to know Wairarapa so fieldwork took about a year.26 Although, as I will explain through this thesis, my transition from researcher to Wairarapa resident has more or less occurred and becoming Pākehā

26 From early 2014 to early 2015
with Wairarapa continues six years after my arrival. Dwelling in Wairarapa and women’s stories was necessary for understanding them. Using participatory visual techniques, creative writing and ethnography were how I achieved this ‘affect’.

Affect is important in this thesis. It aptly illustrates the impact women’s stories have had on me and it has been useful for framing more-than-human relations. For Julie Archambault (2016) ‘affect’ is helpful in describing human-plant relations, cautious of claiming plants have agency. I am not so reticent. Rather I use ‘affect’ in this project because it is implicitly relational and has curious links to R/romanticism (Ottum & Reno, 2016), which will be explored in more depth in chapter three. For now, it is pertinent to note that ‘affect’ that is commonly seen as an intensity that occurs before emotion, words, text, or ‘representation’ (Ottum & Reno, 2016; Thrift, 2008) is not the affect I use in this project. Composted over with Haraway’s fleshly material-semiotics ‘affect’ in this thesis has emerged as a phenomenon that is textually and corporeally significant. The way I develop affect in this thesis then, in the context of romanticism and creative writing, has important contributions for more-than-human geographies.

More generally, I see this thesis has an extending or building on the many geographers who have made their offerings to the project of de-centering the human. Whatmore’s contributions are already palpable and Neil Badmington’s (2004) close inspection of her work is a worthy contribution in itself. Owain Jones and Paul Cloke’s work (2002; 2004) on trees is also very useful in the more-than-human field that is often interchanged with ‘posthumanism’ and overly focussed on science technology studies (STS) and Actor Network Theory (ANT) (see Braun, 2004). Furthermore, Jonathon Murdoch (2004) importantly highlights the importance of human issues in the debate, drawing on Haraway’s cyborg as an example. Steve Hinchliffe’s (2003) argument for material-semiotics and affective text are also significant building blocks for geography developing, a more-than-human epistemology and ontology (see Braun, 2004; Whatmore, 2002; 2012; 2013), and I see this thesis as a part of this project.

More-than-human geographies raise that wider geographical deliberation over ‘nature’ and culture and this thesis is suitably positioned to contribute in this regard. I would posit

---

27 Even though he misinterprets her work as ‘humanist’ (see Murdoch, 2004, p.1357).
too that my use of Haraway’s own cavernous contemplations on ‘nature’ and culture and the gendered and heteronormative repercussions this binary creates would add a richness to these conversations in geography. Relatedly, this thesis adds to the feminist geographical conversation on embodiment (for example, Cupples, 2002; Kindon, 2012; Longhurst, Ho, & Johnston, 2008; Rose, 1993) in underscoring the importance of human exceptionalism as a feminist issue. The human exceptionalism described in this thesis is also always about ‘race’. I agree with Haraway that ‘race’ and issues of settler colonialism cannot be extricated from what she terms ‘multispecies justice’. In this vein, this thesis contributes to debates that criticise the ‘posthuman’ project as Western-centric and universalising (see for example Sundberg, 2014; Thomas, 2015) by focussing on Pākehā as a geographically and historically situated, still possibly porous and becoming.

Pākehā and our arcadian and romantic mythologies are common themes within literary criticism in New Zealand which focusses on ‘human culture’. To this end, my thesis offers a corporeal and visceral account of often disembodied literary narratives that centre the human (see for example Belich, 1996; 2001; Evans, 2007; Fairburn, 1989: Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). This thesis too, contributes a situated, deep mediation on the links between arcadianism, romanticism and settler colonialism that environmental histories often lack (see for example Brooking & Pawson, 2011; Pawson & Brooking, 2013; Pawson, 2018; Perkins, & Rosin 2018; Le Heron, 2018; McAloon, 2013).

Much of the contributions this thesis makes come from the geo stories of women. In particular, a mutation that arose whilst turning women’s stories over, was landhome making. One way to introduce this term is to see it as a material-semiotic extension of landfall – the land-story that occurred after Pākehā first encountered Aotearoa. Landhome making is also a signal that the making of home on land is always becoming and that ‘land’ and ‘home’ are inseparable entities that together form a natureculture. As a word, landhome is an “illegitimate [and queer] offspring” (Haraway, 1991, p.151) of the romantic and racialised ‘homeland’ and is therefore not innocent; but it is compostable.
Thesis outline

Following this chapter, chapter two explores in more detail the complexities of Pan’s cult, mythologies and representations and how he and Arcadia were lyrically interpreted by the antique poets Theocritus (300-260 BCE) and Virgil. I also point to how, in antiquity, the ideas of ‘nature’ and culture began to separate based on the rational purity of Plato (c.428-c.348 BCE) and Aristotle’s (c.384-c.322 BCE) ponderings. Although the Christian Church inherited these mythical and intellectual ideals, it was the European Renaissance that was most committed in reviving them and is therefore an important focus of this chapter. The Renaissance and the following Protestant Reformation were also key in the shaping of Western modernity and the ongoing separation of ‘nature’ and culture’ since antiquity. By discussing these cultural projects, along with the desire to discover the ‘New World’, I close this chapter by remarking on, how through the centuries, arcadian ideals are a fertile way to tease out European notions of ‘nature’ and culture.

By the late eighteenth century in Europe, what has been termed, the Romantic Movement emerged as an ostensible counter to the imperialising and industrialising of modernity. Yet as I clarify in chapter three, Romanticism in many ways entrenched modern binaries by idealising ‘nature’, thereby inverting rather than countering the dualism. Therefore this chapter navigates the complexities of R/romanticism, its paradoxes, affects, popularisations, and how this artistic genre revisioned the mythology of arcadia in new and very old ways. By troubling romantic arcadian tales of ‘nature’ I begin to illuminate also the kinds of tales Pākehā carried with them whilst settling in Aotearoa.

Hence chapter four is about New Zealand and how Pākehā made it New Zealand through the fleshly narratives of arcadian romantic colonialism (Evans, 2007). Tracing both the agricultural and tourist industries, I detail how intricately, and materially, arcadian, romantic and colonial mythologies are bound. I also conjecture, the settling of Pākehā is ongoing and Newton’s (2009) ‘becoming Pākehā’ becomes relevant here. Guided by Newton’s proposition I make the argument — in this chapter — that we Pākehā continue the work of arcadian romantic colonisation through our relations with both Māori and land.
To compost settler and romantic arcadias response-ably though, a grounded, earthy, situated, local example is needed. Therefore, chapter five traces in-depth the land practices Europeans used in the colonial settlement of Wairarapa. By exploring these details of how Māori land became Crown-owned land, and how the region itself became Māori land and then Pākehā land, significant stories emerge about how arcadia was inherited by us Pākehā who live in the area presently.

Tunnelling further into the compost is chapter six wherein I relate my encounters with the women of this thesis. In detailing how I rambled upstream, patted goats and sheep, and drank coffee and ate cake, I trace, in this chapter, the joys and troubles of performing a feminist more-than human ethnography as a way of listening to women’s stories. Notably, I reflect on my own colonial complicity that although uncomfortable, ended up being a generative position from which to interpret women’s accounts. By discussing these feelings of complicity I also ponder on the efficacy of using visual methodologies and my development of creative writing helped by the field, and certain fielders, of critical autoethnography.

To begin threading me and women together in Wairarapa with one of the many spurs of this thesis I relate stories of trees and pasture in chapter seven. In Green Compost I use women’s narratives to retrace the debate between ideologies of conservation and farming. (Re)productively, by conveying participants’ accounts about trees and grass, ‘pastoral’ and ‘wilderness’ arcadias become very tangled. Hence, by recounting romantic settler tales of deforestation, pasture sowing and tree replanting, women’s perspectives point to arcadian presences but at the same time verdantly trouble them. Notably, however, the troubling women exhibited seemed to be in the very early stages of composting and hence framed as ‘green’.

Chapter eight, with a focus on memories of childhood, recollections of ancestry and feelings of being a Pākehā New Zealander in relation to land, begins developing the fleshly idea of landhome making. Landhome making in this chapter pulls together the strands of making a home on land and the wider cultural morays that (re)produces Pākehā becoming (Newton, 2009). By remembering, and relating stories of land and belonging then, I argue participants showed noninnocent signs of significant Pākehā ‘becoming with’.
Steep, flowing places and contemplative ponderings is what chapter nine is frequently about. By drawing on the more-than-human embodied theme of mountain and hill ranges, and waterways, in women’s stories, I explore the themes of romantic arcadianism. Building on the theme of landhome making introduced in chapter eight I explore how romantic and affective connections to high or watery places are luscious ways for expressing Pākehā relations. Underscoring the problematic dimensions within these affective connections I suggest that women’s accounts also challenge the masculine universalising that is commonly present in dominant R/romanticisms. In particular, through the expression of affect in routine, caring, domestic making encounters, a familial romanticism emerged that showed the presence of ‘becoming with’ that fittingly leads to chapter ten.

In the penultimate chapter I relate the cuddly, woolly and hairy encounters participants and I engaged in with the farm animals they kept. I show as well, the intimate link between nurturing, using and killing (Haraway, 2008) that can cause discomfort. Yet dissolving the binaries between living and dying is vital for any arcadian composting. Understanding women’s relationships with the animals they lived with culturally is also necessary for arcadian composting and it is in this chapter that I weave together Pākehā notions of romanticism, agriculture, capitalism and care. In so doing I conclude that participants’ stories were more than just fluffy bloody anecdotes. Indeed, I illustrate how women’s furry chronicles responded to Haraway’s (2008) call to make cross-species family and thereby conclude chapter ten by reiterating the capacity for women’s stories to compost arcadia.

Chapter eleven uses the compost that is this thesis for ideas that may be new but which have thick rich histories. In this parting section I turn the matter over, in each chapter, one more time, bringing Pan, and the women who participated in this doctoral project, closer to me so as to convey some final remarks about kinship, belonging and ‘ongoingness’ (Haraway, 2016). There are worthy contributions to be made. There are also many limitations. Then there are those future prospects that continue what I have started here: Composting arcadia in Wairarapa with Pākehā women of the land.
Chapter 2. The ‘nature’ and culture of arcadia

Lying on my “bed of green leaves“\textsuperscript{28} I feel glad for my migration from Arcadia to Mantua, north of the city of Rome. The Peloponnese was a desert compared to this fertile abundance where there are “mossy springs, grass soft as sleep is, all besprent with green arbutus shade”\textsuperscript{29}. Harvest is now near in the cooler glades outside the city along the river Po. “The soil will need no harrowing, the vine no pruning-knife; And the tough ploughman may at last unyoke his oxen. We shall stop treating wool with artificial dyes, for the ram himself in his pasture will change his fleece’s colour”\textsuperscript{30}. (Notes from Pan’s diary April 15. 43 BCE Mantua, trans. from Latin.)

Arcadia is a fruitful way to discuss what counts as ‘nature’ and culture in Western societies. This chapter illustrates this claim by exploring the fleshly poetic history of the actual place Arcadia, and its reconfigurations, from Theocritus’ pastoral poetry to the European Renaissance. This examination, in turn, reveals fertile ways to ponder the separation of ‘nature’ and culture within geographical thought and Western philosophy more generally. Importantly, in this chapter, arcadia does not come from “[...] fantasises of natural roots and recoverable origins” (Haraway, 1989, p.379 in Grebowicz & Merrick, 2013, p.44). Rather, the purpose of reaching so far back to ancient Arcadia is to show how the reinterpretations of the so-called paradise has gathered layers through time and space, some readily compostable and some harder to decompose.

Ideas and ideals of arcadia have been sprinkled throughout Western European history unevenly, inspiring jaded urbanites, influencing Christian doctrine, informing the genre of pastoral poetry and painting, and shaping architecture and landscape gardening (Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). To begin showing fragments of arcadia’s signs and travels I trace

\textsuperscript{28} From Virgil’s (c.38 BCE/2009) \textit{The Eclogues} p. 6
\textsuperscript{29} From Virgil’s (c.38 BCE/2009) \textit{The Eclogues} p. 31
\textsuperscript{30} From Virgil’s (c.38 BCE/2009) \textit{The Eclogues} p. 19
the religious cult of Pan whose devotees were seen as bestial, brutish and ‘uncultivated’ as they stalked the rugged mountainous Peloponnese walking their goat herds (Borgeaud, 1988; Schama, 1995; Ruff, 2015). I then highlight particular moments in the Graeco-Roman world that transformed this cult into a pastoral paradise through the poetry of Theocritus and Virgil. I use Schama’s help here by exploring his notions of ‘wilderness’ and ‘pastoral’, both sides to the arcadianism, he argues, that emerged out of antiquity. Helpfully, these contrasting sides of arcadia turn out to be intriguing ways to tease out Plato and Aristotle’s belief in ‘purity’ and ‘sin’ and Western imaginations of ‘nature’ and culture (Plumwood, 1993; 2002; Schama, 1995; Ruff, 2015).

I investigate these ideas using Plumwood’s (1993; 2002) Master Model which deftly explains how ancient scholars formed ideological binaries between ‘cultivated’/‘uncultivated’ ‘pure’/sinful or lightness and darkness. These binaries positioned the ‘pure’ of thought ‘Master’ as righteously dominating those who were ‘sinful’ including women, slaves, and (non-human) animals. Explaining how this philosophy influenced the formation of Christian theology, including the use of Pan’s image to construct the image of Satan, I also draw on Haraway’s work to show how the beliefs of the Master Model were equally inherited by secular humanism during the European Renaissance (Haraway, 2008; 2016).

In fact, these enduring dualisms have come to underpin many modern Western pursuits in the sciences and arts (Haraway, 2008; 2016). Arcadia has been enmeshed in this process. For example, Virgil’s work was revitalised by Renaissance scholars, and distributed more widely by the invention of the Printing Press in the fifteenth century, which ultimately inspired all kinds of renditions of arcadia. Various as the interpretations of arcadia were though, they have been dominated by what was to become distinctly Virgilian: A cultivated ideal — and located within its peaceful fields, the message that arcadia was a paradise and an ideal society that eventually formed into a tangible political economy. Henceforth, arcadia became an apt channel for imperialism.

Visions of arcadia through the often Christianised lens of the Garden of Eden enabled colonisation to be seen as innocent and even divine ‘discovery’ and the subsequent lands ‘found’, possessions for the Western subject. Arcadia, alongside other colonial strategies such as utopia, were also practical strategies to be implemented in the ‘New World’. 
Despite the violent, deleterious qualities of arcadian mythologies and strategies though, I contend that parts of the beleaguered ideal are potentially compostable as I show in some ways how the bounded ideas of ‘nature’ and culture of the so-called paradise may be broken down and re-turned (see Barad, 2014) with soil. It is these compostable matters that are fodder for the remaining chapters and help show the significance of arcadia for how Pākehā New Zealand would come to ‘see’ land. In this sense, this chapter begins to show in fragmented ways how Pākehā have inherited arcadian histories, histories that stretch back many centuries before the common era (BCE).

Pan’s Arcadia

Arcadia is an ancient place located in the Peloponnesus (or Peloponnese) near Mainland Greece (Borgeaud, 1988; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). Several hundred years BCE a group of shepherds lived in Arcadia off the meat and milk of their goats and the acorns from oak trees (Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). As the indigenous people, the Arcadians were said to be older than the moon known as “autochthons, sprung from the earth itself” (Borgeaud, 1988; Schama, 1995, p. 526). The shepherds worshipped the Lord of Arcadia, the divine Pan (Borgeaud, 1988; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). Pan is a satyr. He has cloven hooves, woolly thighs, horns and a man’s torso. Sometimes his face is human and sometimes it is the face of a goat (Borgeaud, 1988; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995).

Arcadia was (and still is) arid and dry, rugged and mountainous but also swampy on the flat lands (Borgeaud, 1988). Hence, agricultural production in antiquity was difficult, which earned the Arcadians a reputation as being hardy, brutish and rough. They were nomads and grazed, and let their goats graze, as they trekked through the mountains (Borgeaud, 1988). Archaeological evidence places Pan as the god who presided over Arcadia at a time that long predates the Olympian Gods worshipped in Mainland Greece (Borgeaud, 1988).

However, by the fifth century BCE, Mainland Greece had developed a curiosity for the stories of Lord Pan and Arcadia and the goat deity was eventually transmogrified into an Olympian Greek god. It was Athens, which at that stage, was a vibrant urbanised hub, wherein much of the understanding of Pan, Arcadia and his shepherd devotees were first
widely spoken and written about. It was the Athenians then — an epicentre of Greek culture and sophistication — that emphasised Arcadians and their god Pan as wild and shaggy (Borgeaud, 1988; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). Pan’s lineage, like most Greek gods, is never set in stone (Haraway, 2016) but in his Classical interpretations he is generally considered the son of Hermes, the messenger deity and progeny of Zeus (Borgeaud, 1988).

Of the many, and more consistent, cultural inheritances the stories of Pan, Arcadia and his shepherd devotees have provided the West (Borgeaud, 1988; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995) two are pertinent here. Firstly, in ancient Greece, ‘Pan’ meant ‘all of nature’, similar to the ‘everything’ it means now in English (Borgeaud, 1988; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). Thus, he was seen in Classical Greece as the God of, or personification of, ‘nature’ (Borgeaud, 1988; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). Another significant aspect of the Pan cult was that he was known for arousing chaos (Borgeaud, 1988; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). Known for his skill with the Pan Pipes made from reeds in Arcadia, Pan was believed to cause ‘pan-demonium’ or ‘pan-ic’ within his victims, commencing with the sound of his pipe playing (Borgeaud, 1988). The transgression listeners experienced purportedly involved a state beyond human rationality that often included divine possession (Borgeaud, 1988).

Being possessed by Pan was not something generally considered virtuous. In Greek thought Pan was a beast and often regarded as ugly and terrifying (Borgeaud, 1988). He embodied the antithesis of ideal Classical Greek culture, steeped in beauty, rationality, and a ‘civility’, that was beyond ‘animalistic’ desire (Plumwood, 1993; 2002). Pan and his Arcadia were an Other to Greek culture. A rocky signifier of his Otherness was the way in which Pan was worshipped in caves, caves being viewed as a negative space devoid of culture in the Classical era (Borgeaud, 1988, p.49). In one of Plato’s most famous allegories — that was widely used in Western Enlightenment philosophy — he explains the cave as a place of ignorance and the light, and the way out, being the path to divine truth (Haraway, 1997, p. 255). In the context of Plato’s parable, Pan’s cave reliquaries also necessarily spoke to the deity’s ongoing role as the god of ‘nature’, an Other in Greek society from which to transcend (see Borgeaud, 1988; Haraway; 2016).
The goat-god presided over places that lay in contrast to the city, in what the Greeks called, eschatiai, or “the edges” (Borgeaud, 1988, p.60). The eschatiai are “outside culture”, beyond the city and cultivated farms; they are the mountain places and the “back country” (Robert in Borgeaud, 1988, p.60) like the dark depths of the Tararua Forest. It is in these edges that Pan created “panic landscapes” wherein strange things happened beyond the control of the human (Borgeaud, 1988, p.59). Often set in shady watery places panic landscapes were a haven for more-than-human queer frolicking. Not only were these spaces queer in the sense that they evoked the “polluted” and “perverse” sexuality sometimes attributed to being a queer person, they were queer because the categories of human and beast were disrupted (see Taylor & Blaise, p.596) through sex and “Bacchic dancing” (Borgeaud, 1988, p.174). Hedonistic play with nymphs, satyrs, humans, and many more creatures’ besides, were part of this Pan-inspired revelry (Borgeaud, 1988, p.59).

Plato disapproved of this kind of Pan worship, and spoke of these fringe dwellings as places to be kept far from the city (Borgeaud, 1988, p. 174; Cosgrove, 2008). Notably, according to Platonic and, in turn, Aristotelian philosophy, feeling this kind of Pan-lish desire was contrary to the human endeavour which was about controlling untamed ‘nature’, ‘animalistic’ behaviour and bodily passions (Braun, 2009; Plumwood, 1993, p.46; see also Paterson, 2009). Plumwood explains how Plato saw humans similar to that of an upside down plant in the sense that our ‘roots’ came out of our head and connected us to heaven (1993, p.69). The roots shooting towards heaven pointed to Plato’s belief that those closest to the earth, were closer to ‘sin’ which, in the context of the time, meant behaviour that contravened the Platonic ideals of rationality.

Revered in contemporary times as one of the most important philosophers of Western civilisation, Plato’s thinking sowed the seeds for the masculine rationality that has so problematically Othered both women and the non-human world for centuries (Plumwood, 1993). This kind of Platonic philosophy tapped into the common misogyny in ancient Greece wherein (rational) beauty, truth and purity was symbolised by the young masculine Greek form (Plumwood, 1993). This was a nationalising sentiment in a culture that was extremely hostile to non-Greeks (Kastor, 2016). Aristotle, too, claimed, women, slaves, ‘animals’ and non-Greeks were associated with ‘nature’ which was bodily and
sinful. Therefore, the “soul” and “rational” mind must always have control over the body and passions so they can then tame and enslave those of the earthly kind (Plumwood, 1993, p. 46; see also Haraway, 2016).

Pan and those who followed him were figures most certainly of the ‘lower’ order. Pan inspired and created trouble. Yet to some extent his ‘uncouth’ behaviour was tolerated as it dwelt within eschatiai. The trouble really began — a point vital for this chapter — was when he entered rational ‘civilised’ spaces. As a chthonic one (see Haraway, 2016; chapter one), Pan’s prowess in this thesis then, is not so much in his capacity to rule rugged Arcadia but his ability to leak from that place into ‘civilised’ and ‘ordered’ spaces whereby he blurs the notion of city and wilderness, ‘nature’ and culture. Bruce Braun (2009, p.21) points out that for Aristotle this battle between being ‘animal’ or ‘human’ was an internal one in every man [sic] yet Pan illustrates, even celebrates, a crossing of those boundaries that mainstream Athenian Greeks tried to keep apart. He is an expert compostist (see Haraway, 2016), enacting the roots of the meaning of trouble — to disturb and make cloudy (Haraway, 2016, p.1) — when he enters the culture of Athenian life.

Cultivating arcadia

In what is known as the Hellenistic period of Western antiquity, the urbanised culture of the Mediterranean soon became nostalgic for the rusticity of rural life that generated a desire for places like Arcadia and gods like Pan (Ruff, 2015). Rising numbers of Pan grottos were erected in rural areas, paying respect to the goat-god that also provided space for weary travellers to take rest (Verity & Hunter, 2002; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). Significantly for this chapter, poets began drawing on the countryside as inspiration for their verse (Verity & Hunter, 2002; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995).

Theocritus was one of these poets from Syracuse in Sicily and his poetry was well received in the highly urbanised Greek city of Alexandria (Verity & Hunter, 2002; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). There is debate whether he invented the pastoral tradition but what is most generally agreed upon was that he was the best poet of the bucolic genre in
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31 The Greek period generally pinpointed as the time after the Classical period and before the emergence of the Roman Empire (Borgeaud, 1988).
his time (Verity & Hunter, 2002; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995; Van Sickle, 1976). Theocritus modelled his now famous *Idylls* on the story of Pan, Arcadia and the shepherds that worshipped him (Borgeaud, 1988; Verity & Hunter, 2002; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995; Van Sickle, 1976). The core theme of his poetry are shepherds competing over who is the best singer and pan pipe player as they roam the countryside (see Verity & Hunter, 2002). Even though Theocritus was inspired by the actual shepherd songs of Arcadia (the geographical place), he softened Pan’s devotees and idealised pastoral life, a distinct move that distanced his arcadia from the former fear associated with Pan and his cult (Borgeaud, 1988; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995).

In the poet’s *Idylls*, there is an emphasis on shady watery places, the favourite spots of Pan who sleeps there during the heat of the day (Borgeaud, 1988; Verity & Hunter, 2002). Unlike the Peloponnesian Arcadian stories though, Theocritus’ arcadia was ‘naturally’ abundant (Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995; Verity & Hunter, 2002). Perhaps one of the more evocative verses of this poetry that conjures such fecundity is at the end of his seventh *Idyll*. Sometimes translated as *The Harvest Home* (Sargent in Ruff, 2015, p.4) and sometimes *The Harvest Festival* (Verity & Hunter, 2002, pp.25-29), it describes shepherds resting in a grove very much like what Pan would enjoy:

> [...]there we lay down rejoicing

> On deep beds of sweet-smelling rushes and freshly stripped vine leaves.

> Overhead rustled many black poplars and elm trees, And

> Sacred water chuckled and gurgled nearby

> As it trickled forth from the caves of the nymphs.

> Dusky locusts were hard at their chirping on shady branches,

> And from afar the tree frog crooned in a dense thorn bush,

> And the crested larks and the

> linnet sang, and the turtle dove mooned,
And the yellow bees buzzed as they hovered around the clear spring.

All was fragrant with rich summer, the odours of fruit time.

Pears lay by our feet, by our sides apples

In lavish abundance were rolling, and the boughs

Of the plum trees, heavy laden drooped to the ground.

And the four-year seal was loosened from the head of the wine jars

(from The Harvest Home v. 130-150. Theocritus trans. Sargent in Ruff, 2015, p.4).

Within these verses Arcadia is charmingly rustic and free from any “restrictions, obligations or associations” that would ordinarily be experienced in the city (Ruff, 2015, p.5). They were words that provided a salve for Alexandrines who lived in a bustling urban world replete with business and politics (Ruff, 2015). Theocritus was himself from a rural area so the poet drew on images of agricultural life that promoted a “sense of well-being”, “harmony between man and nature” and “pleasure in the fecundity of harvest” (Ruff, 2015, p.4; see also Schama, 1995). In a city with a growing gap between rich and poor, pollution and a supposed rise of individualism and selfishness, the middle-classes soon began to view arcadia as paradisial (Schama, 1995; Ruff, 2015).

At the other end of Italy, and sometime later, Publius Vergilius Maro, or Virgil, was raised on a family farm and became one of the most well-known poets in Western history (Schama, 1995; Ruff, 2015). Virgil was born in the town now known as Pietole near the River Po, after the Romans annexed the Greek empire. Like Theocritus, Virgil drew on his own farm and countryside for inspiration for his poetry. Probably his most famous work was his Aeneid. The epic poem details much of the Roman politics of the time and drew on the Arcadians (autochthons), who came from the earth, as a kind of metaphorical soil and blood nationalist origin story for the Roman State (Cosgrove, 2008). Before that however he wrote his Eclogues and Georgics. His Eclogues largely drew on Theocritus’ Idylls (Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). For example, earth mother, being “rich in livestock, in
wealth of snowy milk” (Virgil, c.38 BCE/2009, p. 7) and “unprompted”, “free with all her fruits” (Virgil, c.38 BCE/2009, p. 55), accentuates the ‘idyllic’ theme of man [sic] and land being so harmoniously bound that no cultivation is required.

Like in Theocritus’ time, Virgil’s verse resonated with the mostly urban and educated audience by evoking feelings of peace and tranquillity that the (idealised) countryside can educe (Ruff, 2015, p.16; Schama, 1995). Relieving Romans of political tensions and the stresses of city life, Virgil wrote more about a cultivated farmland rather than the nomadic shepherds of Arcadia in the Peloponnese. Building on the refrain of fertility in Theocritus’ work, Virgil also, rather incongruously, set his arcadia apart from the arid Peninsula (Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). In short, Virgil ensconced arcadia as a pastoral paradise (Davis, 1984; Fairburn, 1989; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995).

Desire for this paradise eventually leaked off the page through Roman metropolises in the form of design and architecture (Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). In particular, Roman notables, such as Pliny the Younger (c.61 CE-113 CE) set about converting Virgil’s arcadia into a decadent hilly, forested, watered, arable — veritable — paradise complete with the comforts of aristocratic life (Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). Sometimes called *villa rustica* and sometimes, *villa urbana*, these country estates were always built close to the city so owners could escape to their country residence, and return to their city obligations readily (Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). Unbound “from any restrictions, obligations or associations” that thwarted the urban educated elite in the city, these built arcadias continued the themes found in the pastoral poetry of both Theocritus and Virgil (Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995).

These arcadias are what Schama calls ‘pastoral arcadias’, wherein the setting is a cultivated rural area which, in turn, became the most common and enduring image of arcadia throughout European societies to come (Schama, 1995). A more agreeable ‘nature’ than the wild rugged realm of Pan and his devotees, Virgil’s pastoral poetry in Roman society furthered the Platonic ideal wherein ‘wilderness nature’ and ‘pastoral culture’ are separate.
One of the more stark illustrations of how ‘pastoral’ and ‘wilderness’ ideals were separated was perhaps how the Christian Church adopted the arcadian narrative. Allan Ruff points to how Virgil’s poetry was heavily drawn upon in forming a palatable Christian theology when Christianity became the official religion of Rome in the fourth century Common Era (CE) (Ruff, 2015). For example, the concept of the Messiah being a shepherd leading his flocks probably originated from the mythology of Pan and his shepherds (Borgeaud, 1988; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). Conversely, much later on, when portrayals of Satan began emerging, it was most likely the figure of Pan and his Athenian-inspired reputation that was used, given he embodied so much of what counted as Christian sin: drunkenness, promiscuity, ‘wild’ dancing and so forth (Ruff, 2015). Even now illustrations of the devil commonly use Pan’s features of cloven hooves, a tail, a male torso, pointed ears and sometimes a goat-like face (Ruff, 2015).

Putting aside the religious aspects, Christian ‘sin’ was eerily similar to that of Athenian ‘sin’ in that both are centred on a breach of rationality, ‘purity’ and ‘cultivation’ (Plumwood, 1993). In fact Plumwood elucidates on how the common Christian
conviction that ‘purity’ must be attained by overcoming ‘impurity’, and the righteous domination of ‘nature’ [sic] by Man [sic], is core to the Greek philosophers’ works (Cosgrove, 2008; Plumwood, 1993). A notable Christian arcadian artwork from the Renaissance illustrates this religious-secular binary. Giovanni Bellini’s (1430–1516) *St Francis in Ecstasy* (see figure 4) depicts an Aristotelian separation of “uncultivated wilderness” (the cave) and “the rational, intellectual spaces of the city” alongside “domesticated pasture and farmland”. It was this pastoralism that signalled a material and semiotic cultivating of arcadia that made the Virgilian ideal so appealing — unambiguously presented here by the saint’s emergence from the ‘dark’ cave to pastoral and ‘cultivated’ enlightenment.

The ‘nature’ and culture of arcadia in modernity

Despite the continuing production of Christian artwork in Europe, and the preaching of its ideals, by the fourteenth century, loyalty to the (Roman Catholic) church had begun to wane. Western European middle-classes began searching for knowledge not ordained by Christianity — these people sought the abilities of human endeavour rather than God (Haraway, 2008; 2016; Ruff, 2015). The European Renaissance was part of this search, which as a watershed moment in Europe, is often considered to be the foundation of Western modernity (Haraway, 2008; Hinchliffe, 2003; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). The Renaissance was a revival of ancient knowledges in all forms. For example, Florentines and Milanese began salvaging the arts, science and philosophy of antiquity that had been hitherto regarded as ‘pagan’ (Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). The wealthy banking Medici family of Florence were pivotal in this recovery, forming a large collection of arts from antiquity over three generations (Ruff, 2015).

Arcadia — predominantly Virgil’s version — was revived in the process (Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). The church may have absorbed parts of the pastoral and Pan over the centuries but the Renaissance ushered in a period that openly celebrated ancient Roman and Greek texts and artwork. The popularity of arcadia as a pastoral paradise only increased with technological advancements. In particular, the invention of the printing press in the fifteenth century enabled the cults, religions and mythologies of
antiquity, and Virgil’s poetry, to become accessible for audiences on a large scale (Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995).

The emerging modern ubiquity of Pan’s cult and Theocritus and Virgil’s poetry inevitably inspired new versions. Sir Phillip Sidney of Pembroke’s (1554 - 1586) (English) *The Arcadia* is a case in point although his rendition resembled more of an “England in perpetual Maytime” (Schama 1995, p. 531) than the Mediterranean landscapes of ancient Greece and Rome. In a similar English vein was John Milton’s (1608 -1674) *Paradise Lost*, an epic poem drawing on the ideals of Eden but citing the geography of Arcadia (Wills, 1998). Contrastingly, Italian poet Jacopo Sannazaro (1458 – 1530) published his *Arcadia* with a little more emphasis on ‘arcadia-as-wilderness’. Written in Italian, rich with the ‘natural abundance’ and pastoralism of Virgil’s *Eclogues*, Sannazaro also described deep wooded landscapes complete with a horned, sexualised Pan-like deity (Schama 1995).

The increasing secularisation of Western Europe eventually led to a direct revolt against Roman Catholicism, by Martin Luther (1483 - 1546). The protest lead to a new form of Christianity that preached a focus on the individual relationship to God stemming from a focus on the written word (the Holy Bible) — helpfully facilitated by the recently invented printing press (Schama, 1995). This modern form of Christianity printed bibles in people’s vernacular language rather than the sacred Latin. God suddenly became accessible for people through text, which allowed worshippers to circumvent the conservative hierarchical system of the papacy (Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995).

What is known as the Protestant Reformation is a fairly good insight into European modernity and the entrenching of the separation of ‘nature’ and culture (Haraway, 2003; 2008; 2016; Jones, 2009). Protestant churches began locating ‘godliness’ within individual thinking and texts that led to an emphasis on rationality over mystery (Haraway & Goodeve, 1999). One of the major distinctions formulated during the time between the Catholic and Protestant faith was the belief in transubstantiation. Transubstantiation is the process by which during mass the bread and wine that worshippers receive is literally turned into the body and blood of Christ. The reformers contested this Catholic interpretation of God’s presence during communion in mass, arguing that the act of receiving bread and wine during service was a sacred memorial,
rendering the bread and wine as symbols of Christ’s body and blood, not literal body and blood (Haraway & Goodeve, 1999).

The Protestant tendency to separate bread and wine from flesh and blood was part of a wider demystification gaining traction in Europe that fostered a reverence for rational and (disembodied) text-based knowledge (Haraway & Goodeve, 1999). A stalwart of Western modernity, this shift in knowledge making is what Haraway’s fleshly material-semiotics works against. Drawing from the act of transubstantiation, Haraway (2003; 2008) does not see a separation between symbols, signs or significance and materiality (see also Haraway & Goodeve, 1999), a matter vital for composting both the significance and flesh of arcadia in this thesis.

Such logic that separates flesh (‘nature’) from sign (culture) can position those with culture and ‘text’ as superior, and inherently equipped with the powers of representing and interpreting ‘nature’ and the material (Haraway, 1991; 1992b; 1994; 1997; 2003; 2008; 2016). Similarly critiquing this dualism are Braun (2009) and Hinchliffe (2003, p. 211) who interrogate these ideas from within cultural geography. Both geographers usefully highlight how this modern rationality establishes the human as exceptional and at the centre of things and non-human ‘nature’ as unthinking and static, discourses that still underpin much Western thinking presently (see also Castree, 2003).
However, within geography it is perhaps Whatmore’s more-than-human geographies that dwells most closely to Haraway’s fleshly material-semiotics. Whatmore’s hybrid or more-than-human geographies most comprehensively challenges “how the world makes itself known” (taken from Whatmore, 2012) which “disturbs”, “unravels”, “perverts” and most definitely “exceeds” (Whatmore, 2002, pp.9, 69, 116, 162 in Badmington, 2004, p. 1345) what counts as human and humanism. As an epistemology, more-than-human geographies leave room for material-semiotics to be lively, earthly, sensual, creative, promiscuous (see Whatmore, 1999; 2002; 2003; 2013) vital ingredients for Haraway’s ethico-onto-epistemology and this thesis’ composting project. Importantly, Whatmore’s (2002; 2003) hybrid geographies also implicitly acknowledge human exceptionalism always involves the politics of ‘race’ and gender.
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**Figure 5. Mr and Mrs Andrews by Thomas Gainsborough c.1750.** Source: The National Gallery from The National Gallery Collection. Retrieved from: http://helicon.vuw.ac.nz/login?url=https://search.credoreference.com/content/entry/ng/mr_and_mrs_andrews/0?institutionId=5378

Gender is important to talk about in the context of a (Renaissance) humanist arcadia. Artistically representing ‘nature’, landscape paintings were a potent way to illustrate a Virgilian paradise complete with the symbols of “Renaissance humanism: diligent labor, placid meaty livestock, and bounteous fields and orchards, all overseen, politically and visually, by the hilltop fathers of the city-state” (Schama, 1995, p.529). These ‘hilltop fathers’ are the men of importance in whatever Western European nation the given
arcadian pastoral scene is set: They are the eyes of the viewer gazing from afar, underscoring the Renaissance landscape gaze as both masculine and masculinist. Gillian Rose further illustrates the gendered way ‘nature’ was viewed within the emergence of Western modernity. Drawing on Thomas Gainsborough’s (1727 - 1788) *Mr and Mrs Andrews* (see figure 5), Rose points to the conflation of woman and ‘nature’ in this rural idyll scene, a cultivated English arcadia (Belich, 2001; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995):

Mrs Andrews sits impassively, rooted to her seat with its wrought iron branches and tendrils, her upright stance echoing that of the tree directly behind her. If Mr Andrews seems at any moment able to stride off into the vista, Mrs Andrews looks planted to the spot [...] Moreover, the shadow of the oak tree over her refers to the family tree she was expected to propagate and nurture (Rose, 1993, p.160)

The essentialising of Mrs Andrews by ‘naturalising’ her vis-à-vis the ‘natural’ fields and trees was a core way women and ‘nature’ were seen as objects separated from men, culture and intellect in modernity (Rose, 1993; Evans, 2007; Hess, 2012; Plumwood, 1993). As Rose (1993) and Plumwood (1993; 2002) explain, both artistic or scientific knowledge making during this time generally equated seeing with knowing and thereby prioritised optical vision over the other senses (Plumwood, 1993; 2002; Rose, 1993). Of course, optical vision was always of the ‘mind’s eye’ not the bodily one, which Enlightenment figure Rene Descartes (1596–1650) illustrated particularly well.

Descartes was a French philosopher who pondered over many things including the qualities of the body and mind. Commonly known as Cartesian philosophy, Descartes’ work on these matters extended, in effect, the Aristotelian view that mind and body were separate (Plumwood, 1993; 2002). The dualism within Cartesian philosophy — like Platonic, Aristotelian and Christian philosophy — was a tool for transcending ‘impurity’, the body, ‘wilderness’ (Plumwood, 1993; 2002). Following the logic of the time, this separation between mind and body, relegated women, ‘nature’ and non-Europeans as objects for examination, exploration and possession (Plumwood, 1993; 2002).
Figure 6. *Et in arcadia ego (or Arcadian Shepherds)* by Poussin 17C.
Source: The Bridgeman Art Library (2014) retrieved from:
http://helicon.vuw.ac.nz/login?url=https://search.credoreference.com/content/entry/bridgeart/arcadian_shepherds_oil_on_canvas/0?institutionId=5378

Figure 7. *Et in arcadia ego (or The Arcadian Shepherds)* by Guercino 17C.
Source: The Bridgeman Art Library (2014) retrieved from:
http://helicon.vuw.ac.nz/login?url=https://search.credoreference.com/content/entry/bridgeart/et_in_arcadia_ego_oil_on_cavas/0?institutionId
Penetrating the ‘ideal New World’

The Self/Other dualism that arose from modern thinking such as Cartesian philosophy was pivotal for conquering new lands and people, in which arcadia was a potent part. What was called the ‘New World’ inspired many to make centuries long colonial excursions, dubbed ‘discoveries’. Fortified by the belief in the emerging science in modern Europe, ‘discoverers’ set out to go farther than ever before filled with a desire for more land, resources, money and political power. Desire to enter ‘untouched’ worlds, fantasies of finding a lost paradise, an Eden, an arcadia, had haunted expeditions from the beginning (Cosgrove, 2008; Ruff, 2015). Ethnographic accounts often read like Virgil’s poetry. An extract from an early ethnography is telling here. Written by Giovanni da Verazzano (1485-1528), it records what he encountered near Cape Hatteras, North Carolina in 1524:

*Following always the shore, which turned somewhat North, we came in a distance of fifty leagues to another land that appeared much more beautiful and was full of great woods, green and of various kinds of trees. Grapevines climbed to the branches, and the place we called Arcadia* (in Cosgrove, 2008, p.69).

Lush gardens were also ‘wild’ and ‘uncultivated’, with many explorers mentioning half-human half-beast creatures howling from the darkness during their encounters (Cosgrove, 2008). Two well-known versions of arcadia in artistry during this period illustrated the fear or anxiety felt over this ‘wilderness’ (Schama, 1995). Baroque painters, Giovanni Francesco Barbieri (commonly known as Guercino) (1591-1666) and Nicolas Poussin (1594-1665) both created works entitled *Et in Arcadia Ego* (see figures 6 & 7). *Et in Arcadia Ego* is translated roughly as “and I too was in Arcady” but it is believed that the ‘I’ refers to death32 which in turn intimates that this classical motto is informing the viewer that “even in Arcady, I death am present” (Schama 1995, p.519).

---

32 In Poussin’s version the motto is etched onto a tomb and in Guercino’s is marked by a skull.
Despite the ambiguity of Poussin’s version, Schama argues the skull in Guercino’s clearly illustrates the presence of death in Arcadia.

To quell such anxiety over ‘dark wildernesses’ was to make that which was ‘uncultivated’, ‘cultivated’. To this end, Arcadia along with other ‘models of paradise’ were formulated into plans for colonisation (Davis, 1981; Belich, 1996; 2001; Fairburn, 1989) which led to not just ‘discoveries’ of Arcadia but a purposeful implementation of political economies (Schama, 1995). Notably, in England, Fairburn (1989, p.125) drawing on Davis (1981) notes five ideal societies that were generated between 1516 and 1700: The millennial; the ‘land of Cockaygne’; the perfect moral Commonwealth; Arcadia and Utopia. New Zealand, a supposed part of the New World, was annexed by the British with the help of Arcadia and also Utopia. Therefore, Utopia deserves some elucidation here.

In 1516 Saint Thomas More (1478-535) wrote Utopia. As a student of the Renaissance, and a privileged educated man, More was influenced by the philosophy of antiquity so, even though a Catholic, More wrote an imagined humanistic and secular model island society. On the island of Utopia, there is no poverty, inequality or dissatisfaction (More, 1516/2016). To achieve such optimal states of living, Utopian lawmakers and enforcers regulate how much one can have to such an extent it becomes ‘normal’ for people to only have what everyone else has which prevents greedy accumulation and scarcity. As a result everybody wears the same clothes and receives the same amount of food which carries no monetary cost. The production of food and materials is regulated by the allocation of each person to a job either growing food or manufacturing goods. However, in Utopia there is always an emphasis on progression through building new technology so the enclosed development of townships are somewhat prioritised over agricultural production (More, 1516/2016).

---

33 Millennial: Economic scarcity has occurred because of human sin which therefore requires the people of this community to be moral and just so to prove to the divine they are worthy. Utopian: Economic scarcity is solved by an authoritarian state by establishing institutions that regulate human appetites without satisfying them; it’s about organising supply and demand. The ‘Land of Cockaygne’: Here the scarcity is wished away and there is infinite abundance which people feast upon wantonly. The Perfect Moral Commonwealth is similar to the Millennial but everyone has persuaded each other to live perfect moral lives amongst the economic scarcity. Finally, the Arcadian: Scarcity is also wished away as Arcadians believe in ‘natural abundance’ and thus, there desire is fulfilled; but the people of Arcadia are self-regulating and therefore, innately moderate, so they only take what they need (J. C Davis, 1981 in Fairburn, 1989, p.25).
Utopianism as an ideal lies in political juxtaposition to what became an arcadian political economy. Where utopianism was focussed on technological advancement and the equal distribution of resources governed by the State (Davis, 1981; Fairburn, 1989), arcadia was based on self-regulation and looked to the past wherein men [sic] and ‘nature’ lived in harmony (Davis, 1981; Fairburn, 1989). Subsequently, drawing on the sense of freedom from the city, politics and obligations espoused in Virgil’s and Theocritus’ poetry, an arcadian society acquired a philosophy based on libertarianism and a rejection of State-led social organisation (Davis, 1981; Fairburn, 1989; Ruff, 2015, p.5; Schama, 1995).

The emergence of this modern arcadian political economy had curious links to another modern development, the discourse of science and the classification of ‘nature’. Modern science, based on the laws of logic and reason, was to become one of the most powerful tools to tame and control that which was deemed Other (Plumwood, 1993;2002; Schama, 1995; Whatmore, 2002). Whatmore (2003, pp.20-21) explains how the standardised system of taxonomy, established in the mid-eighteenth century, ensured ‘wild’ species could be classified and catalogued (Whatmore, 2002). As a method still used to order the ‘natural’ world, these kinds of scientific ‘advancements’ helped entrench ‘nature’ as static and an object to be examined and gazed upon.

Part of the collecting of ‘new’ species ‘discovered’ in the ‘New World’, such as the Americas, was the transportation of them for varying displays. In both European colonies and Europe itself, newly classified beings (dead and alive, human and not) were exhibited in museums and private collections (Grebowicz, 2019; Schama, 1995; Whatmore, 2002). Mostly open to the public, the Western European populous were able to arrive at such sites and gape and scrutinise, become suitably awed, terrified and filled with wonder (Schama, 1995; Whatmore, 2002). The arcadian narrative was influential in this trend (Schama, 1995). Public or private, ‘exotic’ displays of ‘nature’ were a literal attempt in many cases to recreate the Garden of Eden (Schama, 1995; Haraway, 1997; 2004a; 2004b). An early example of this garden construction was French engineer, naturalist and chemist Bernard Palissy (1510–c.1589) who designed an arcadia (that never eventuated) that would represent the “totality of creation” (Schama, 1995, p.537). Driven by what Schama calls his ‘Protestant Platonism’ Palissy echoed the desire
at the time to “bring [...] wildness to heel by sending it to school, making it understand its kinship with the tame and the temperate” (Schama, 1995, p.538).

Bruno Latour (1993 in Taylor, 2013, p. xviii) points to the paradox in this modern boundary keeping. He argues in *We Have Never Been Modern* that on the one hand the modern project was about epistemologically and ontologically separating ‘nature’ and culture. Yet the deep examining and experimenting inevitably reproduced ‘nature-culture’, hybridised forms of both the organic and technological. Thus, he argues, the obsession with purifying the categories of ‘nature’ and culture’ within modernity, was and is always a failed project (Latour, 1993 in Taylor, 2013, p. viii). I more or less agree with Latour and his argument but I would like to emphasise that the world has always been made up of naturecultures and that modern ‘discoveries’ have not made the world any more naturalcultural than it has been previously (Haraway, 2003; 2008; 2016; Whatmore, 2002).

As intimated in chapter one, Whatmore (2006; 2013) rejects the term ‘posthumanism’ because of the way it speaks to the heralding of a new age of human and non-human hybridity. In ancient Greek philosophy, Braun (2009, p. 21) notes too how the ancient Greek thinker Epicurus (341–270 BCE) never saw ‘nature’ being separate from that of human culture in that that humans and non-humans were a world of atoms emergent and contingent. Physicist Francesco Maria Grimaldi (1618 - 1663) also pointed out the limits of binaries during his experimentation with optics. In the context of a dominant European epistemology that framed light and dark being opposing forces — both spiritually and scientifically — Grimaldi found something new. He was carrying out a number of tests with sunlight and dark rooms (Barad, 2014, p.170). During his experiments he realised that the boundaries of darkness and light could not be explained by the then recognised laws of reflection and refraction in geometrical optics. He dubbed this ‘diffraction’, a process in which there was no absolute darkness or lightness, only shadows and fluid, patterned, fragmented bands (Barad, 2014, pp.170-171).

Haraway uses “diffracting rays” to make “interference patterns” or “patterned vision” in her work (1992, pp.295, 299). Diffraction is an important ingredient for her compost making and a material-semiotic reminder that in arcadia there never has been absolute
darkness or light, only shadows and patterns made from the sun and trees. Pan knows
this arcadia well as this is where he can often be found at noon, shaded from the
midday heat (Borgeaud, 1988; Ruff, 2015), snoozing with sunlight dancing through the
gaps in the leaves. Pan knows there is no binary between light and dark, ‘nature’ and
culture, human and not.

Compost layers
Pan is an ancient hybrid, an anathema to high-minded Greeks, a god to others, a
trickster, a trouble maker — a ‘nature’ and culture boundary disruptor, for me, and this
thesis. Whether or not one believes in the literal myths of Pan and Arcadia, those who
dwell in the West recognise what he has come to embody: ‘Nature’, ‘wilderness’, disgust,
panic, pandemonium, animality, sin, Satan, someone from the shadows, the shade,
someone who is always a little shady. Throughout arcadian history in Europe these
manifestations of the goat-god have been both pagan, Christian and scientific. Building
on the discussion of mythology in the previous chapter then, this chapter here has shown
the indiscernibility between what counts as fictitious myth and what counts as scientific
doctrine (see, for example, Haraway, 1994a; Haraway, 1997; Haraway & Goodeve, 1999),
a necessary ingredient for composting arcadia.

After all, arcadia is both myth and land practice, story and architectural design, fantasy
and the New World: Arcadia is a fiction, but one which is fleshly. Admittedly, this rural
ideal has not always seemed very voluptuous when it has been drawn on to illustrate
dominant European tales of White male human exceptionalism that attempt to
demarcate ‘nature’ and culture. Nevertheless, in the manifestations of arcadia as poetry,
garden or science, Pan’s Arcadia often still resonates. In each recreation whether it is in
Athens, Alexandria, Rome, Florence, somewhere in the so-called New World or
Renaissance art, arcadia is recreated. It is my suggestion to turn over the many layers of
the situated fragments of arcadia presented in this chapter, to make compost. I have
come to this conclusion not just because of the dubious and fragile lines between what
counts as ‘nature’ and culture that have been formed throughout European history, I
propose composting arcadia because the mythology means something to White folk, in
particular, for this project, arcadia means something to Pākehā New Zealand.
Amidst the fervour of ‘discovering’ the so-called New World colonisers thrust arcadia upon Aotearoa leaving colonial descendants to figure out what to do. I have chosen to compost. As Schama (1995, p.574) concludes at the end of his treatise on arcadia “the sum of our pasts, generation laid over generation, like the slow mold of the seasons, forms the compost of our future. We live off it”. If I take this to mean a (natural)cultural past then this chapter has tried in fragmented ways to illustrate Schama’s own ideal. Nevertheless, before arriving in Pākehā New Zealand there are a few more rather sensual layers to compost arcadia with which can be broadly described as romantic, the subject of the following chapter.
Chapter 3. ‘Staying with the trouble’ of romantic arcadias

Sitting here on the edge of a ridge in the Fontainebleau Forest I wish to relate what a lovely day I have had. I met an Englishwoman but one who knew the French language and even a little of the Latin and Italian I spoke. She has been the first human that is unafraid of me since I made the move to France. I saw her as I was coming out from behind a bushy copse. She was “clinging round an old oak, pressing its rough trunk with her roseate lips, as her tears fell plenteously”\(^\text{34}\). Her fair cheeks flushed quickly red as she turned and met my gaze. She looked down at my woolly legs and cloven hooves and stared with wonder. She called herself a Romantic and asked if I might share my story with her. So we sat on a rocky shady hilltop with the pastoral plains in front of us. I told her of my tale as we watched “the slender blades [break] through the dark soil” and “the new dropped lambs repose on the young grass”\(^\text{35}\). When I had finished a short version of how I came to be in the forest I dwelt Mary — her name was — told me about the ‘Romantic Movement’ in which she was involved, which sounds very enticing for a roaming shepherd pipe player such as myself (Notes from Pan’s diary April 2nd. 1813. Fontainebleau, France. Trans. from Latin by author).

Romanticism was very influential in shaping how (a New Zealand) arcadia is presently viewed. This chapter explores this connection that consequently develops (from the previous chapter) the particular and partial insight into what counts as Western ‘nature’, and indeed, culture, in this thesis. The Romantic Movement emerged from about the eighteenth century in Western Europe, largely in England, France and Germany (Löwy & Sayre, 2001). It can be generally categorised as a philosophical resistance to modernity.

\(^{34}\) The Last Man Shelley, p.257  
\(^{35}\) The Last Man Shelley, p.214
and its projects such as urbanisation, modern capitalism and industrialisation (Bell, 2014; Evans, 2007; Hess, 2012; Löwy & Sayre, 2001; Oerlemans 2002; Ottum & Reno, 2016; Taylor, 2013; 2017). Broadly, Romantics felt that the products of the modern period (see chapter two) generated more woes than good like greed, poverty, ill-health, selfish individualism and a separation from ‘nature’ (Hess, 2012; Oerlemans, 2002; Ottum & Reno, 2016). Thus, it was a philosophical and artistic movement that commonly idealised ‘nature’ wherein adherents called for a ‘return’ to that which had been ‘lost’ (Bell, 2014; Hess, 2012).

Arcadian tropes figure profusely in this narrative given its own focus on a reversion to the past to when man [sic] and ‘nature’ lived in harmony (Evans, 2007; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). Already widely known with the advent of the Renaissance, pastoral arcadian ideals were ripe for Romantic picking in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries with its visions of paradise and idealistic rural living. Contrastingly, I will also explore in this chapter how Romanticism finds kinship with a ‘wilderness’ arcadia. In particular, the ‘sublime’, characterised by Edmund Burke (1729-1797) as a feeling of awe or terror (Evans, 2007; Sayle, 2001) became a rich genre in which to relate narratives of ‘scary’, dark arcadian landscapes (Schama, 1995).

Sublime sensations when faced with an immensely terrifying but beautiful mountain range can be deeply affecting. Lisa Ottum and Seth Reno (2016) agree and detail how many of the Romantics reproduced profoundly affective accounts of relating to the more-than-human world. Central to Ottum and Reno’s (2016) argument is the centrality of William Wordsworth (1770-1850) and how his work shapes contemporary views of environmentalism and conservation. Drawing on several Wordsworthian scholars, Ottum and Reno’s collection fruitfully propose a Romantic/ more-than-human/affect nexus. Such alluring propositions present curious ontological queries, made richer by fellow colleague Scott Hess who disagrees with these authors’ main contention.

I will trace these romantic themes and arrive at a quagmire of affect, more-than-humanism, human exceptionalism, sublimity, the picturesque and ‘purity’. I then wade through this muddle for two reasons. Firstly, R/romanticism has had a significant impact on the way Pākehā relate to land which, as I will explain, is acutely problematic. Yet, the second reason why I use this chapter to deliberate on R/romanticism is because, building
on Sayle (2001) and Ottum and Reno’s (2016) contentions, I do maintain that romanticism has a role for Pākehā ‘becoming with’ land. Indeed, the creative writing of land or the more-than-human, in this thesis, undoubtedly draws on romantic affect in that, I, myself, draw on this Pākehā inheritance to knit flesh to text (see Haraway, 2003; 2008; 2016; 2019a;2019b).

Blurring the boundaries between more-than-humanism, affect and romanticism is what composting is about. Consequently, at the close of this chapter, I, with the able help of Pan, compost romanticism. Composting has the ability to ‘stay with the trouble’ of romanticism and turn over its self-contained legacies of colonialism, racism and heteronormative misogyny, and maybe point to something more fertile although far from innocent.

**Romantic pastoral and ‘wilderness’ landscapes**

A significant arcadian ideal Romantics drew upon was the focus on the past as a site of ‘authenticity’, a reaction to the ‘progressive’ future-focussed Enlightenment projects occurring in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Bell, 2014; Hess, 2012; Oerlemans 2002; Ottum & Reno, 2016). The (arcadian) ideal of small-scale farming like Virgil talks of in his poetry was a case in point. Many Romantics endeavoured to practice this kind of agriculture themselves as they hankered for a world when things were more ‘simple’ (Hess, 2012; Oerlemans, 2002; Ottum & Reno, 2016; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). In this regard, Virgil’s *Georgics* that paint the gruelling practice of everyday farm life was a pungent muse for Romantic thought and practice (Ruff, 2015).

Virgilian romantic ideas and ideals influenced the construction of architecture as well (Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). For example, in the early eighteenth century in Britain, Pliny’s architectural designs — based on Virgil’s arcadia — were translated by Robert Castell into English which in turn triggered an international trend in villa country estates (Ruff, 2015; Schama 1995, p.539). ‘Nature’ during this period became a cultivated commodity for entertaining purposes (Grebowicz, 2015; Schama, 1995). Landed gentry began opening their villas up for the middle-classes to come and visit for a price (Schama, 1995). Although, some property owners opened up their estates with the aim of showing
a more elaborate performance (Schama, 1995). Known as *fabriques*, artworks were physically built on site ostensibly producing alluring romantic arcadian landscapes (Schama, 1995). Often drawing on classical ‘wilderness’ arcadian ideas such as nymphs, satyrs, caves and fire, these arcadias were purposely made to conjure key tenets of romantic feeling such as sublimity, awe, fright and eroticism (Schama, 1995).

The Romantic period also built on Renaissance zoological projects discussed in the previous chapter in an attempt to showcase the ‘New World’—material-semiotic exhibitions of Edenic Gardens (Haraway, 1997; 2004a; 2004b; Schama, 1995). These modern botanical and zoological spectacles were literally contained, ‘under glass’ whereby tropical gardens (by using iron ribs and hot water heating) could be grown. The repeal of the glass tax in Britain in 1845 meant construction for these gardens became much more feasible in the later nineteenth century (Schama, 1995). Such Edens were replete with beasts hitherto unknown to European eyes such as pythons, puff adder and rattle snakes and poisonous frogs (Schama, 1995, p.56). Even though the impetus behind these glasshouse gardens were for the collation of scientific knowledge building, in practice they equally became sites of popular attraction; scaring, revolting and awing audiences for a fee (Schama, 1995). Feeding time for the snakes on show was an especially popular time for visitors as live mice were fed to the hungry carnivorous reptiles (Schama, 1995).

This material-semiotic division between ‘nature’ and culture, positioning the latter as the human knower, is an apt description of how botanical gardens and zoological attractions play out in the West presently. Whatmore discusses Paignton Zoo in Devon that at the time of her writing claimed to be the only combined zoological and botanical “garden” in the United Kingdom (UK) (Whatmore, 2002, p.42). The zoo then was also undergoing a remodelling that would see the complex become an Environmental Park whereby more ‘natural’ settings would be constructed for the enclosed fauna (and flora) (Whatmore, 2002, p. 44). Like its Renaissance and Romantic counterparts, Paignton Zoo Environmental Park is committed to zoological education that is partly promulgated to visiting audiences during feeding time with the resident Elephants (Whatmore, 2002).

The glass may have been removed and a focus on conservation efforts in the animals ‘home’ countries may be emphasised but zoos today are still a “showcase for public
entertainment and education which is designed to keep animals and people in their proper place” (Whatmore, 2002, p.42). Even though these present day botanical gardens and zoos separate ‘nature’ from culture they contemporaneously foster that romantic desire to be with the Other and to assimilate and incorporate that Other, a common impetus in any Master Model binary (Plumwood, 1993; 2002; see chapter two). Such wants led to fairly ridiculous practices like the Victorians housing apes dressed up in nursery clothes and made to sit at tea parties (Schama, 1995, p.563). Nevertheless, it was these kinds of hairy, furry romantic trends that laid the foundation of current ‘pet-keeping’ (Perkins, 2003).

Building on the centuries-old European legacy of ‘familiars’, or companion animals, (Haraway, 1997; Perkins, 2003; Plumwood, 2002), David Perkins (2003) argues in the latter part of the eighteenth century, in England at least, there was a cultural change that eventually formed a wide spread culture of kindness towards non-human animals that could be ‘tamed’. As part of a transition towards idealising non-human fauna, people began to appreciate non-human Others as entities to experience joy with itself, rather than simply employing them for economic use such as food or transport (Perkins 2003).

As illustrations of capitalist privilege, pet-keeping and zoos demonstrate Plumwood’s Master/Slave binary, wherein the non-human is enrolled as an object for human pleasure. Even if pet-keeping exercises a kind of corporeal intimacy, often becoming part of one’s family, Plumwood warns this practice can simply move the boundaries of ‘nature’ and culture by relegating ‘pets’ as being honorary humans rather than contesting the binary itself (Plumwood, 1993; 2002). In this sense, ‘pets’ are a cultivated ‘nature’ in contrast with ‘uncultivated’, wild ‘natures’. Cultivated and uncultivated ‘natures’ in the Romantic era were commonly expressed in tense companionship with one another and accentuate the arcadian ideals of pastoralism and ‘wilderness’ — the latter being an act often seen as a more ‘authentic’ harmony with ‘nature’. 
Figure 8. Sunset in the Forest of Fontainebleau by Théodore Rousseau. c.1848. Source: Kurlander, & Kelly (2014, p.121).

Figure 9. The Forest of Fontainebleau by Narcisse-Virgilio Díaz de la Peña c. 1868. Source: Arthive retrieved from: https://arthive.com/artists/630~Narcisse_Virgilio_Daz_de_la_Pea/works/276461~The_forest_of_Fontainebleau
A verdant site for such Romantic ‘authenticity’ was the Forest of Fontainebleau in France. Vital in this French tale was the forest’s caretaker, Claude-François Denecourt (1788-1875). Romantic Théophile Gautier (1811-1872) penned a description of Denecourt as le Sylvain or Sylvanus, a deity from antiquity who was a well-known Arcadian and associate of Pan (Schama, 1995, pp.546-547). Gautier described the custodian as a “vegetable presence” owing to his hands being “ribbed like the trunk of an oak”, cheeks that had “the broken red veins of early autumn leaves” and “fingers divided like twigs” (Schama, 1995, p.547). Denecourt’s battles with the French authorities over the maintenance of the forest only furthered his reputation as a ‘wild’ Sylvain.

This Romantic ‘wilderness arcadia’ inspired its visitors artistically. Théodore Rousseau (1812-1867) and Narcisse-Virgilio Diaz de la Peña’s (1807-1876) pieces are instructive here (see figures 8 & 9) illustrating dark wooded areas suitable for Pan and his companions to dwell within (Schama, 1995). Once it had become popularised by wandering Romantics, the forest soon became an attraction for the wider middle-classes. Denecourt was ready for this. Like the owners of the aforementioned Fabriques, the caretaker knew how to provide just enough ‘wilderness’ to relieve the urban symptom of civility but make it safe enough for people then to return home unharmed (Schama, 1995). Walkways that traversed the forest’s diverse landscapes were constructed, even carving out openings of caves to add a sense of Pan-like ‘wildness’ to the walking experience (Schama, 1995). Over time, guides were written and published, equipment sold and even a café was established (Schama 1995 p.557). This was the beginning of the pursuit of hiking and Denecourt has been credited with its invention (Schama, 1995, p. 547).

Although hiking (‘tramping’ in New Zealand) is a modernist pursuit, made possible by the creation of a capitalist middle-class cultures (Amato, 2004) it came from a romantic desire to ‘commune with nature’ in what Trentmann (1994) calls ‘nature worship’. Like the draw of Denecourt and Fontainebleau, many areas of ‘wilderness’ and ‘nature’, from the mid-eighteenth century became sites of spiritual renewal (Trentmann, 1994).

‘Nature’ was seen as a locus for transcendence and salvation for those bound in modern capitalist urbanism (Trentmann, 1994). Even well into the twentieth century in what Trentmann (1994) calls neo-romanticism, leaving the city to be relieved of its hustle and
bustle was seen in spiritual terms (Trentmann, 1994). For instance, Trentmann (1994) draws on an example of a group of hikers from Wiltshire in the early twentieth century who set out on a walk in the middle of winter 1926. The leader of the group, Rolf Gardiner recollected the event:

\[...\] we were to subdue ourselves to the dark masterhood of midwinter; we were to discard the nervous titter of the waking mind and yield to the inherent forces of the spirit incarnate in the earth (1943, p. 19 in Trentmann, 1994, p. 583).

The spiritual aspect of the belief in ‘nature’ also ushered in revivals of the cult of Pan as one Rambling\(^\text{36}\) group wrote:

\begin{quote}
The Pipes of Pan are silent in our city streets and most of us must be content, as we toil in the rectangularity of city offices or amid the merciless whirring of the machine we serve, to look with longing at our restricted sky [...] And we are content and will not complain, however hard our lot may be, so long as we have the leisure that will permit of occasional enjoyment of this full freedom of life in the world of Pan. There we will search and find that beauty so intangible and fleeting, yet so real and permanent, that is so essential to our tried and tired spirits. (Ramblers’ Association Library London, 7 October 1936, in Trentmann, 1994, p.588).
\end{quote}

As a theme that will be picked up in the next section, rambling in ‘wild’ areas (including the Fontainebleau Forest) is an example of Romanticism that was seen as a more ‘authentic’ way to ‘worship nature’ than gawking at apes in a zoo. However, a point of this foray into pastoral and wilderness romantic arcadias is to underscore how both traditions continue the modern dualism by either taming ‘nature’ (Schama, 1995) or believing ‘nature’ to be a font for human purification (Taylor 2013; 2017). Therefore, in the next section I examine this R/romantic separation of ‘nature’ and culture with a distinct focus on Wordsworth given Evans (2007) assessment that of all the Romantics,

\[^{36}\text{A hiking activity usually performed on unmarked tracks}\]
the English poet had the largest impact on the romanticism that was used to colonise Aotearoa.

Troubling romantic ‘nature’

Wordsworth’s *The Guide through the District of the Lakes* (1835) was an important cultural mark in Romantic Victorian Britain (Evans, 2007; Hess, 2012). Versions had been written by the poet as early as 1810 but the 1835 version is seen to be the definitive text (Whyte, 2000). The guide also went through several printings between 1842 and 1859 such was its popularity, greatly contributing to Europe’s “cult of scenery” occurring at the time (Evans, 2007, p.61). It is these texts that are part study and part guide that Hess (2012) and Evans (2007) draw on to illustrate Wordsworth’s disembodied relationship to ‘nature’.

Wordsworth’s Lake District guide(s) convincingly demonstrated the crossover emerging between romantic wonder and popular tourism. Ian Whyte (2000) also suggests Wordsworth’s compendium resonated with the emerging discipline of geography, noting his proficiency for observation. Thus, Wordsworth seemed to have skill for seeing and framing ‘nature’ even though he was a writer; and it is this culture of gazing that Wordsworth developed which, Hess (2012) argues, has so profoundly shaped Western visions of the more-than-human world.

Key to Wordsworth’s disembodied vision was the impact the picturesque medium had on the poet. Hess (2012) suggests Wordsworth was known to have been inspired by this mode of artistry that focussed on producing an image that was pictorially pleasing. Conceptually, the mode of the picturesque relied on a singular central view that was some distance from the viewer (Hess, 2012). It was a kind of framing that was inherited by photography and which also influenced the emergence of environmentalism (Hess, 2012). Ontologically and epistemologically the picturesque view reinscribes “the separation of the perceiving mind or subject from its object; the corresponding separation of mind and body; and the more general division between humans and

---

37 The Royal Geographical Society in Britain was established by 1830 (Whyte, 2000).
nature” (2012, p.21). The distance between the viewer and the viewed within this genre is literal and figurative, a material-semiosis (see in particular Haraway, 1992b; 1997).

Wordsworth claimed to have rejected this distancing and pictorialising method in favour of a more direct communion with ‘nature’ even reputedly mocking picturesque artists who used Claude Glass to draw and paint ‘scenes’ (Hess, 2012). Nevertheless, Hess (2012) contends Wordsworth relied on the philosophy of the picturesque as an ontological tool to write his poetry. Thus, even though Hess (2012) himself suggests that Wordsworth rejected some picturesque techniques, he posits that the Romantic used several ideological elements of the mode in his writing. In particular, Hess (2012) has closely analysed the poet’s production of very optical and stationary ideas of ‘nature’ wherein his work is often constructed upon a scene with one dominant perspective. He calls this Wordworthian trope the ‘halted traveler’ — which the scholar argues was a distinguishing factor throughout the writer’s work. The ‘halted traveler’ is a free subject wandering where he wishes and stops where he wants so as to gaze at a scenery and compose a picture. To demonstrate, Hess (2012, pp.24-25) analyses Wordsworth’s “I wandered lonely as a cloud”:

The poem presents what is essentially the experience of the picturesque traveler, suddenly halting his progress through the landscape for protracted observation at the moment when it forms an attractive pictorial composition. The poem’s main action begins at the moment of composition, when the narrator sees the daffodils “all at once” […] “along the Lake, beneath the trees” […]. Although the narrator begins in motion, the poem depends on his stopping at this specific, stationed point of

38 Thomas West (1720-1779) is said to have named and popularised the Claude Glass and written his own Guide to the Lakes (1778) before Wordsworth. The Claude Glass was a convex shaped mirror that was used to capture the pictorial tone of a given scene named after the landscape artist Claude Lorrain (1600-1682). It allowed even amateur artists to sit, for example on a bench at a lake area, and literally and figuratively idealise ‘nature’ (Evans, 2007). It was a technology that technically and philosophically produced the picturesque (Evans, 2007; Hess, 2012).

39 Evans (2007) also points out that Wordsworth was influenced by the picturesque artist William Gilpin (1724-1804).
view: a version of the picturesque “station” from which such travelers learned to compose the landscape.

In supposed contrast to these picturesque practices were the sublime experiences of Transcendentalism, a Romantic development in which Wordsworth was a part (Ottum & Reno, 2016; Trentmann, 1994). Trentmann (1994, p.588) describes Transcendentalism as the “cult of the solitary individual”. Put differently, Transcendentalism was a way for men to become ‘one with nature’ by exorcising all the distractions of modern life, a case in point being the Transcendentalism of Henry David Thoreau (1817-1862) in which his focus on ‘wilderness’ would later inform American environmentalism (Grebowicz, 2015; Taylor, 2013). Thus, even though ‘neo-romantic’ rambling groups obviously journeyed as a group, these rambles had the purpose of “clos[ing] the circuit between oneself and nature […] to allow the revitalizing energy of unspoiled nature to flow through one’s body” (Trentmann, 1994, p. 588).

Typically building on the binaries of a (self-contained) ‘man’ and ‘nature’, Transcendentalism perpetuates the semiotic-material belief that men [sic] can be purified from his [sic] sins of the city and modernity by transcending the material world and entering into a trouble-free innocent Garden of Eden, a paradise (see in particular Haraway, 1992b; 2004a; 2004b; Haraway, 1997; Plumwood, 1993; 2002). In this sense the transcendent narrative is a reaction to the ‘modern man’ who wants to get beyond ‘nature’ (Plumwood, 1993; 2002). As Plumwood (1993; 2002) noted though, the human desire for romantic transcendence similarly positions the man as knower, conqueror, intellect, and spiritual apex of humanity leaving ‘nature’ Othered and possessable.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) was an important figure too in not so much Transcendentalism as a tradition, but a believer in the ideology of ‘pure nature’, a potent font of Transcendentalist philosophy. Taylor (2013, pp.6-7) frames Rousseau as an Enlightenment thinker who preached about how “Nature was not only an antidote to society but [also] promised to be society’s ultimate salvation”. Couched in the dogma about how children, alongside ‘nature’, are ‘innocent’ and ‘pure’, Rousseau concomitantly sermonised on the components that would make an ideal society (Taylor, 2013). The philosopher’s principles followed typical arcadian lines: The harmonious
reconnection between human and ‘nature’, self-sufficiency, freedom and innate morality (see Fairburn, 1989).


Plumwood’s ‘critical ecological feminism’ (1993) critiqued the romanticism within ecofeminism as well. The philosopher very much supported the ecofeminist principles of problematising misogynistic patriarchy and the abuses directed at more-than-human worlds as a result (Plumwood, 1993; 2002; see Whatmore, 2002, pp.157-158). However, she was uncomfortable with the way ecofeminism idealised ‘nature’ and women that invariably lead to an essentialising that simply inverts the Master/Slave binary (see also Mack-Canty, 2004). Whatmore (2002) too points to the intersection of feminism and environmentalism as the space where an important environmental ethics may occur but, like Plumwood, points to its pitfalls.

To illustrate, the geographer discusses the tendency within each philosophy and its resulting intersections, as pondering on relations between “already constituted objects” (Rajchman, 2000, p.12 in Whatmore, 2002, p.158). Here, Whatmore speaks to the core of Haraway’s ‘becoming-with’ which is a worlding wherein identities “do not preexist their relating” (Haraway, 2008, p.165). Even within all the rich scholarship Plumwood completed as well, she still framed an ontology between humans and “our relationships to nature” (2002, p.16). Thus, it is the more-than-human geographies of Whatmore (2002; 2006; 2013a; 2013b) and Haraway’s ‘becoming-with’ (2003; 2008; 2016) that I suggest seriously trouble the singular idealised concept of ‘nature’ and in turn ideals of ‘purity’ and transcendence within romantic arcadianism.
The potential for violence from fantasising about ‘pure’ ‘nature’ in romantic thought is material and requires an uncomfortable foray into ‘race’ and racial purity (Haraway, 1997) important for this project centred upon Pākehā politics and what we have inherited. Fantasies of a White ‘pure race’ and the desire, at very bloody costs, to achieve such ‘purity’ by eliminating ‘impurity’ and contaminant risks has a long history in Europe (Haraway, 1997). However, Romantic ideology inspired a rather insidious version of White exceptionalism that has significant repercussions for how Pākehā have interpreted arcadia.

In 1987 Martin Bernal (1937-2013) published a controversial thesis regarding Greek antiquity. In Black Athena Bernal posited that archaeological evidence in Greece, including many of the recovered history writings of the period, point to the land of Greece being colonised and founded by Egyptians and Phoenicians (Kastor, 2016). Known as the ‘Bernal controversy’, Bernal also argued that during the nineteenth and early twentieth century R/romanticism, coupled with the emergence of ‘race’ as a scientific category, contributed to a deliberate neglect by modern historians. Bernal pointed to how scholars deliberately overlooked histories written by the Greeks themselves, histories that recorded African and Middle Eastern cultures as founding Greece (Haraway, 1992;1997; Kastor, 2016).

Bernal, drawing on much revisionist history research completed by Black intellectuals, argued these omissions were part of a mythologising that cast the Western origin story as one of White purity (Kastor, 2016; see also Haraway, 1992b, p. 331). In this context it is difficult to not view (ancient Greek) arcadian revivals in the Romantic era as being part of a wider cultural impetus for White racial purity, particularly in its more ‘cultivated’ versions of the rural idyll and Garden of Eden whereby the narrators tell a story of a lost past that needs recovering (Evans, 2007). Such “racism and Romanticism in the fabrication of the story of Western rationality” (Haraway, 1992, p.331) highlights the danger of believing in ‘nature’ and things ‘natural’ and the fraught legacy of Romanticism.

Another disconcerting illustration of Romantic White fantasising about nature and ‘race’ was the Romantic counter to the rise of the secular state. Many Romantics, concerned at the modern construction of nationhood emerging in the eighteenth and nineteenth
centuries, put forward the idea of a ‘natural nationalism’ based on the ‘authenticity’ of a country’s ‘natural’ origins (Bell, 2014; Kaufmann and Zimmer, 1998; Smith, 2009). Anthony Smith (2009, p.98) argues, this kind of national community was often based upon the idea of a homeland which is a nation built from, for example, “common myths, memories, symbols and values” rather than a secular state construction.

Preoccupied with ‘moral’ nation building steeped in a “return to nature and roots” (2009, p.36), Smith makes the point that the Romantics sought a scared nation, a spiritual homeland. Through both the revival of arcadia and the construction of nation building then, ‘nature’ in the Romantic era becomes a location of exclusion and purification. This repackaging of arcadia as a ‘natural’ and ‘naturally’ White ideal society also troublingly coincides with the colonisation of New Zealand in the nineteenth century wherein arcadian and romantic mythologising were used as tools to ‘naturalise’ and ‘normalise’ White occupancy and build an arcadian nation (Evans, 2007), as the next chapter will show. These palpable violent veracities are what Pākehā have inherited through our relations to land. Therefore, in the next section, I ‘stay with the trouble’ of romanticism and wade through what parts of it may be compostable, continuing with the fraught figure, Wordsworth.

**Romantic affect**

Wordsworth’s *Peter Bell* (1799), analysed by Kurt Fosso in Ottum and Reno’s (2016) collection is an apt introduction to this section on R/romantic affect. *Peter Bell* is a long storied poem about Peter Bell and a donkey and the affect generated between the two. The donkey is found by Peter near a waterway standing next to the equine critter’s ‘master’ who was drowned. Peter Bell finds the dead ‘master’ whilst flogging the donkey to get out of his way. He hits the donkey until it is lying on the ground groaning with pain. Upon seeing the dead (human) body, Peter Bell passes out. When the rover awakes, and feels the donkey still next to him licking his fingers, he starts to regret his behaviour as he perceives the donkey’s loyalty to his dead master and himself (Fosso, 2016). A transformation occurs on the behalf of the rover as he begins to feel an affinity for the creature (Fosso, 2016). Fosso (2016) contends that it was Erasmus Darwin’s (1731-
1802) \(^{40}\) *Zoonomia* that influenced Wordsworth’s apparent empathy for non-human animals like donkeys. Specifically, the sense of affect Darwin philosophised was about the shared embodied sensation that can occur in relation wherein sentient bodies, human and not, involuntarily feel another’s pain, sorrow, joy (Fosso, 2016).

Darwin was a biologist, philosopher and poet and practised, what Seth Reno (2016, p.29) calls, an “affective neuroscience”. By drawing on contemporary medical research Reno — somewhat cheekily — makes the case that “tree hugging has psychological and physiological benefits” but goes onto argue this phenomenon is something Darwin was already writing about in the eighteenth century (Reno, 2016, p.29). According to Darwin the cycle of the ‘natural’ world is one of happiness and pleasure wherein all species (including humans) are interconnected and supportive of each other — a concept explained through his theory on “the happiness of organic Life” within his work *Phytologia* (1800). In effect, Darwin proposed that “the material world is embodied happiness. The world runs on pleasure” (Reno, 2016, p.32).

Reno contends that William Wordsworth was enamoured by the love of ‘nature’ Darwin described. Drawing on *Phytologia*, Wordsworth developed a theory of “intellectual love”, which as the Wordsworthian contends, describes an affective relationship with the non-human world. Reno (2016, pp.37-45) goes on to suggest that this more-than-human affectivity spoke to an ecological ethics that can be seen in Wordsworth’s *The Pedlar* \(^{41}\) (1798-1804, 2.420-28). The word ‘sentiment’ here refers to the coalescing of individual feeling and social principle (Reno, 2016). Considering this point, Reno (2016, p. 45) argues, ‘the sentiment of Being’ in the passage below indicates “an ecological interconnectedness of which humans are a part”.

```
I felt the sentiment of Being spread
O’er all that moves, and all that seemeth still,
O’er all, that, lost beyond the reach of thought,
And human knowledge, to the human eye,
Invisible, yet liveth to the heart,
```

\(^{40}\) Grandfather of Charles Darwin (1809-1882)

\(^{41}\) To be later incorporated into Wordsworth’s *The Prelude*
In the same collection of essays edited by Reno and Ottum several other scholars provide in-depth accounts of the links between Romanticism, natural history, environmentalism, and more-than-human affect. Sarah Weiger (2016, p.109) writes an insightful essay about practices of natural history that counter the “cataloguing and display, or categorization or accounting” activities the discipline is more widely known for touched on in the previous chapter. By drawing on the imaginings within Romanticism, some natural historians prioritised a practice of science that perceived ‘nature’ as a creative force and recorded very detailed artistic descriptions (Weiger, 2016). Charles Darwin was one such scientist, a scholar who tried, in effect, to understand a plant’s perspective by closely observing its life cycle (Weiger, 2016, p.115).

Weiger (2016) also points to how Wordsworth was a keen natural historian building on Reno’s (2016) argument that he was an avid science student. Allison Dushane (2016) is of a similar opinion and suggests that the Romantic’s devotion to ‘nature’ revealed important more-than-human affects. In fact, Dushane argues that the Romantic writings of Wordsworth — alongside (Erasmus) Darwin’s — “reconceive the relationship between human and non-human agencies” (Dushane, 2016, p.127).

Ottum and Reno (2016, p. 6) bring Dushane, Weiger and Fosso’s arguments together with their own work to cogitate on Romantic affect and its ability to communicate the more-than-human world. The literary intellectuals build their argument by drawing on Brian Massumi’s work on affect, paying particular attention to the way Massumi perceives affect as something not necessarily conscious, and that which happens before emotion — characterising the phenomenon as being experienced by humans and non-humans alike. In this sense, affect is implicitly relational, more-than-human and seemingly ineffable.
Geographer Nigel Thrift’s nonrepresentational theory becomes important to discuss here given the concept’s role in exploring affect. Thrift’s argument is also important in the context of romanticism more widely given romanticism’s role in ‘representing’ ‘nature’. Thrift (2008) appropriately points to cultural geography’s tendency to focus on representations rather than doing, suggesting that sensuality and liveliness is not found in pictorial or textual representation but is experienced through affective encounters and movement. To be sure, there are innumerable examples whereby Romantics use writing or artwork to culturally represent ‘nature’, which not only separates ‘nature’ and culture but position humans, typically, male and White, as the knowers of what must be known (Haraway, 1992b; 1997; Hess, 2012; see also chapter two).

However, R/romanticism in the context of affect — the argument Ottum and Reno (2016) advance — unsettles this notion, this separation of affect and representation. Within more-than-human romantic affect, there is potential to perceive representation as more like an articulation of a meaningful encounter, something Haraway (1992b) called for some time ago. More recently too Michael Carolan (2008) has discussed the issue of ‘representation’ and affect in his critique of non-representational theory. His advocacy of a more-than-representational theory emerges from his argument that non-representational theory ostensibly disregards the very medium (text) used to convey affect.

However, more-than-representations still separate the ‘doing’ from that doing’s significance. Herein lies the problem, Haraway (& Goodeve, 1999; 2003; 2008; 2011; 2016; 2019a; 2019b) continuously points out, of the separation of text and flesh, culture and ‘nature’, material and semiotic that both non-representational and more-than-representational theories tend to reproduce (see for example, Carolan 2008; Thrift, 2008; MacLaren, 2019). Indeed, Andrew MacLaren, in describing non-representational theories very recently (2019 p.3) has argued “[w]e cannot literally feel through words”. Yet it is the affect, sensation or feeling within words or art that R/romanticism is, arguably, tasked with creating.

significant thought. Symbols or signs for Haraway become signification and significance, corporeal love, felicitously expressed through her relationship with the now deceased Ms Cayenne Pepper, a talented Australian Shepherd. Together they “sign[fied] in the flesh a nasty developmental infection called love” (Haraway, 2003, p.3). Cayenne was Haraway’s ‘Significance Other[ness]’ and it was through this relationship based on mutual care and respect that the philosopher’s fleshly material-semiotics was advanced. For me and this project, Haraway’s fleshly material-semiotics, among other things, queers the word semiotic by turning it over and over again until it becomes not just a disembodied symbol but loving significant meaning ‘of the flesh’.

Haraway’s ethico-onto-epistemology then, does not just challenge human exceptionalism and the staid binary between ‘nature’ and culture, it opens up the possibilities of partially articulating the ineffable. I understand MacLaren’s (2019, p.3) claim that “[w]e cannot literally feel through words”, for many of us in the West cannot given the secular humanist histories many of us have inherited but Haraway, who was raised in a Catholic culture, maintains words and language for her have always come from a feeling, sensuous body (see Haraway & Goodeve, 1999). Perhaps then, the closer text or “black milk” (Cixous, 1993, p.78) is to the body and sensation the more likely it is to be able to articulate something like more-than-human affect.

Jane Sayle (2001) posits that for deep affect to be achieved in romantic expression, the masculinist ‘self-transcendence’ inherent in the genre needs feminising. Once this is achieved, “words” she argues, “at their most sublime, have the force and feel of water” (Freeman 1995, p.26 in Sayle, p.143). I admit to being seduced by this proposition taken as I have been with the words of the Romantic writer Mary Shelley (1797-1851). In her writing “the very wind whisper[s] in soothing accents” (1831/2013, p.78) whilst she and I listen to the “rivulets murmur” (1826/1996, p. 332) and “[b]ehold the verdant carpet spread at our feet, and the azure canopy above” (1826/1996, p.62). As I have alluded to however, it is Haraway’s feminist and queer philosophy that I suggest has the most potential for composting romanticism to produce more-than-human affect. Importantly, such affective romanticism is not a solution for the racism and colonialism the genre freight through its various bodies. What this literary field can do, when open to becoming affected by Haraway’s philosophy, is show how to knit flesh to text in ardent
lustful ways that begin articulating relationships with land more fulsomely (see chapter six).

**Composting romantic ‘nature’**

Romanticism began as a response from a few privileged artists and their discontent with modernity, even though it was probably capitalism and modern society that enabled the flourishing of elitist bohemians and creatives (Hess, 2012). The genre too was, more often than not, misogynistic and continued the centring of the European male as the Renaissance did. Romanticism’s nostalgia for a ‘pure’ simpler time also became rich fodder for racial purity, nationalism and racism. Pākehā have inherited these histories. In fact, Hess (2012) argues, a Wordsworthian view of the non-human world is how ‘nature’ is seen in the West presently.

From this reading it is difficult to imagine that this beleaguered artistic field may, in some way, be salvageable. Yet there are moments in romantic sensations whereby the feeling of affect blurs the line between romanticism and more-than-humanism, encouraging me to ‘stay with the trouble’ of whatever this muddling conjures (Haraway, 2016). However, the kind (of) romanticism that I wish to ramble through is a queer feminist feast full of love, desire and meaning that Haraway’s philosophy enables.

A naturalcultural approach to romantic ‘nature’ does not make it innocent but it may make it compostable. Composting the self-contained male figure makes romantic ideas of ‘nature’ dirty, sullied, earthly, soiled. Queering the belief in ‘nature’ or things ‘natural’, is a key ingredient in this process. In fact, a “[q]ueering [of] what counts as [romantic] nature” (Haraway, 1994, p.60⁴²) necessarily disturbs the genre’s premise that — in its desire for ‘reconnection’ — relationships are made between “already constituted objects” (Rajchman, 2000, p.12 in Whatmore, 2002, p.158).

Haraway (1994, p. 59) has said “nature is good to think with” and Taylor (2013; 2017, p.61) more recently has suggested “nature is seductive”. I agree with both of these propositions and would, respectfully like to add that romantic ‘nature’ is good to think with and romantic ‘nature’ is seductive. Romantic ‘nature’ is, I argue, key to think with

---

⁴² For fruitful interpretations of Haraway’s ‘nature’ queering see Grebowicz and Merrick (2013, pp.22-47) and Taylor and Blaise (2017).
and through, to enable a necessary unearthing, and turning over of how Pākehā relate to the more-than-human world: This, I also posit, is an implicitly seductive idea, wrapped as it is in deep affect, land lust and a yearning for belonging which is the focus of the next chapter.
Chapter 4. Unsettling Pākehā romantic arcadias

“It’s such a cold raw foggy day”\(^{43}\). It matches the dour scene of the Lyttelton Port I recently quitted. I stealthily disembarked from the Randolph just before dawn and have hidden myself securely in a cave on the Heathcote River after a steep clambering over what people are calling the Bridle Path\(^{44}\). Mud, trees and fresh water are my friends in here and a stark contrast from the dirty smelly crowded barracks of the place on the other side of the hill\(^{45}\). The settlers are calling this place Christ’s Church but I have yet to see any sign of this elusive Messiah or his abode. Arcadia is even further from my grasp. Alas! I knew all too soon once I had stowed away on the ship that there was some kind of human trickery at play when they claimed this voyage was returning to my home of Arcadia.

I was even further saddened by the stories I overheard by the passengers on the way out here. Drunkenness and violence are apparently rife in many quarters\(^{46}\). I learnt from a young woman named Elizabeth\(^{47}\) that the British ten years ago signed a sort of peace Treaty with ‘the mour-rees’ in a place they call Waitangi\(^{48}\). But now troops are ravaging natives’ homes if they refuse to sell them land\(^{49}\). What kind of Treaty allows this? How much more land do these colonisers —yes colonisers — need? I

\(^{43}\) In Sayle (2001), p.58
\(^{44}\) See Evans & Evans (1994).
\(^{45}\) See Evans & Evans (1994).
\(^{46}\) See Fairburn (1989)
\(^{47}\) See (Walker, 2004, p.94).
\(^{48}\) The Treaty of Waitangi carries a charged and contested history that I don’t have much scope to expand on in this thesis. Aspects of the purpose and practicalities of the signed document are important for highlighting the intensity of forgetting that arcadian settlement so deeply wrought though. The Treaty was written by William Hobson (1792-1942) the then governor of New Zealand and was eventually signed by 540 Māori chiefs as it travelled from Waitangi around the country (Walker, 2004). The main contestations over the document still, are its translation and the more, in my opinion, egregious acts, of the Crown breaching the Treaty in the ensuing years (Belich, 2001; Evans 2007; Walker, 2004).
\(^{49}\) See Belich (1996); O’Malley (2019); Walker, 2004
have heard they have already nearly bought the entire Southern Island - an area of 20 million hectares — having sold for 2,000 pounds a couple of years back\textsuperscript{50}.

From what I have heard the gentleman named Edward Wakefield, through his Company, buys land from the mour-rees very cheaply (and with a certain amount of bullying I might add) and then sells it to settlers for a tidy sum indeed\textsuperscript{51} — the passengers on board the ship were incredulous at the prices they had to pay. Still they should be lucky they have land to soon live on (Notes from Pan’s diary December 4, 1850. Canterbury).

Since European settlement arcadia has saturated what Pākehā deem ‘nature’, although as the excerpt from Pan’s diary shows above, it is an arcadia the goat-god does not recognise as his own. Building on chapter three then, this part of the thesis narrates the story of how arcadia developed in New Zealand as both romantic and Victorian. Within these investigations I hope to illuminate how arcadian and romantic narratives were used as devices to forget or veil the harshness of settler life and the obligations we as a culture have towards Māori. I also trace how arcadian mythologies have been continuously used to ‘naturalise’ and ‘normalise’ European occupancy which from the outset framed the South Pacific Islands as a ‘natural discovery’, a land open and waiting to be taken and possessed (Evans, 2007).

I elucidate on how this drive for land possession — conceptually and materially — is still a core part of dominant Pākehā relations towards land given its influence in the construction of (Pākehā) nationhood (Evans, 2007). Hence this chapter extends the argument in chapter one that Pākehā are colonial subjects still settling. To begin fleshing these themes out I trace the early colonisation of Aotearoa by the British\textsuperscript{52}. I then show how since the late eighteenth century British romanticism constructed New Zealand as

\textsuperscript{50} The Canterbury Purchase of 1848 (O’Malley, 2019, p.24). See Walker (2004, p. 106) for an earlier estimation
\textsuperscript{51} See O’Malley, (2019); Walker (2004).
\textsuperscript{52} Who were far from the most domain coloniser but in the end economically and culturally secured the colony as theirs (Belich, 1996)
arcadian. During a time where artwork and scientific recording were tightly woven, the pictures of New Zealand depicted early on an arcadia. Then, throughout the nineteenth century, mountains, rivers, lakes, and forests were enshrined through artistry following the Victorian romantic conventions of the time. Helped by certain technologies, I sketch how these paintings, photographs, and ultimately films have popularised an optically visual romantic arcadianism in New Zealand.

Gazing at scenes was only one part of a complex arcadian settlement though. Arcadia as an ideal political economy or society was influential in the formation of a masculine construction of Pākehā culture and farming nation (Bannister, 2005; Belich, 2001; Evans, 2007; Fairburn, 1989). Based on Virgilian pastoral ideals, New Zealand was couched as being a ‘naturally’ abundant fertile farm, as one entrepreneur stated in 1823; “there is no country on earth more circumstanced for the operations of agriculture than New Zealand” (in McAloon, 2013, p. 78). Protestant Christian and Victorian, the arcadian ideal-as-farm engendered powerful tropes in settler New Zealand like the moral importance of land ownership and ‘material progress’ that are still core concepts to how we, Pākehā, as a culture, relate to land.

A potent collision of romantic and settler arcadies emerged during what Belich calls the ‘recolonial’ period. From the 1880s a campaign was formed that drew on the mythologies of ‘scenic’ views and fertile farmland to secure an agricultural market in Britain (Belich, 2001). These advertised arcadies purposely evoked an England-of-old as developers sought to tighten their relationship with Britain. An inadvertent side effect from this meaty buttery exchange was a cementing of arcadian mythology as a national identity for Pākehā. The continuation of this arcadian nationalising in the first half of the twentieth century was literally constructed through expos and White men’s writing (Evans, 2007).

What emerges out of these stories are romantic settler arcadies that are still presently used in both the agriculture and tourism sectors as tools to ‘normalise’ and ‘naturalise’ our Pākehā belonging in New Zealand. Nevertheless, it is this belonging that we have, seductive, noninnocent, and routinely violent. Therefore I close this chapter by discussing
the possibilities of ‘becoming Pākehā’ through composting our histories rather than using
them to obscure and forget the brutality of how we became to ‘belong’ in New Zealand.

Romantic visions in New Zealand

Since the illustrated recordings of Dusky Sound by William Hodges (1744-1797) in the
1770s, New Zealand has been gazed at and penetrated by European men, producing
scientific and artistic depictions that have idealised colonisation (Evans, 2007). Driven by
a desire to discover a Garden of Eden, an arcadia, in the New World, the first Europeans
who made landfall in New Zealand often couched the islands in these terms (Belich,
2001; Evans, 2007; Fairburn, 1989). As mentioned in the previous chapter, what
intensified these arcadian visions was the romantic “cult of scenery” that emerged during
the first half of nineteenth century in Europe, temporally coinciding with the influx of
settlers to the South Pacific colony (Evans, 2007, p.61). Hence, predominantly British, and
by that stage, Victorian, a particular kind of gazing became key to understanding land in
New Zealand by European settlers which, in turn, would greatly influence how we,
Pākehā, would come to understand ourselves.
Figure 11. In the Southern Alps 1881 by John Gully. An example of his foray into the sublime. Te Papa Tongarewa. Source: Johnstone (2006, p.144)

Figure 12. Milford Sound by John Buchanan 1863. An example of the sublime genre because of the size of the mountains. The Hocken Library, Dunedin. Source: Docking (1971, p.37)
Mountains, lakes and rivers were popular choices for pictorialisation. John Hoyte’s (1835-1913) work is illustrative of such tendencies, his work expressing common picturesque tropes such as inverted mountain reflections in placid lake water (see figure 10) (Evans, 2007). John Gully’s (1819-1888) water colours could also be construed as picturesque although he did venture into the New Zealand sublime as well (see figure 11). John Buchanan (1819-1898) and Charles Heaphy (1820-1881) too, produced sublime alpine pieces defined so because of the exaggerated way they portrayed Mitre Peak (Milford Sound) and Taranaki, respectively (see figures 12 & 14). As mentioned, sublimity is, more or less, that sense of simultaneous marvel and terror (like the feeling of ‘awe’) which, owing to the dramatic alpine landscape, rushed and gushed through the new colony readily. However, it was Petrus van der Velden’s (1837-1913) Otira Gorge renderings produced in the 1880s (see figure 13) that were considered most comprehensively sublime (Evans, 2007).

Sublimity was part of that affective experience felt within the heart of Transcendentalism. Discussed in the previous chapter, sublimity and its affects were touted by the Romantics as a more ‘authentic’ approach then the medium of the
picturesque also perused in chapter three. Evans considers these two framings of “nature” as core to the production of land in New Zealand. He argues whether “nature” was framed as picturesque or sublime though (Evans, 2007, p. 128), the romantic looking at land succeeded in “normalising” and “naturalising” settler occupancy and therefore expressed the same kind of forgetting politics (Evans, 2007).

Technology helped of course, and pushed the picturesque mode into the limelight (Hess, 2012). By the late nineteenth century photography had developed as a genre in the colony and, Evans (2007, p.62) argues, “completed the work of conquest and occupation” (see figure 16). Photography was significant on a material level as well as an ideological one. Photographs were much easier to produce, allowing large amounts of common scenes to be proliferated throughout the colony. Hence, it was photographs that fuelled a burgeoning scenic tourist industry and by 1880, a travel agent from Thomas Cook and Son had arrived in the country, signalling a formalised sector (Evans, 2007).

Rotorua and its people were packaged together as a prime tourist site building on the early romantic depictions of Māori in the late eighteenth century (see figure 15). On the one hand, the famous Pink and White Terraces, Otukapuarangi and Te Tarata, in Rotorua, once commercialised, attracted 2,000 Europeans a year. On the other were more ‘authentic’ guided tours of the geothermal area with two kinds of performing haka put on by local Māori. There were was a “bowderlised” version or a “gentleman’s” variety “‘complete with its indecencies’” for fifty times the standard price (Wevers, 2002, p.206 in Evans, 2007, p.63). The objectification of Māori through this kind of tourism by staging these local performers as culturally static (they wore traditional dress) and sexualised (their bodies were there to be gazed at), was an intense Othering that was driven by the romantic desire for the erotic and exotic (Evans, 2007; Schama, 1995). Importantly, Rotorua is still core to the tourism sector in New Zealand and is an uncomfortable

---

53 This scene of Dusky Bay by Hodges reveals the lack of any discernible native flora and presents a male figure that shows no perceptible features of being Māori: It is an arcadia (Bonehill, 2006) of the European mind rather than any material sense of what Hodges was purportedly recording.

54 Seeing its profitability the government tried to take ownership of the giant waterfalls. However this geothermal phenomenon came to an abrupt end when Tarawera erupted in 1886, destroying the Terraces and killing more than 150 people (Evans, 2007).

55 See https://www.newzealand.com/int
legacy that tells the colonial story of how European’s ‘sympathetic’ view of Māori are part of the ‘nature’ we/they sought, wanted to gaze at and possess (Evans, 2007).

Figure 15. A View in Dusky Bay, New Zealand by William Hodges 1773. Auckland City Art Gallery. Source: Docking (1971, p.17).
Figure 16. Mitre Peak, Milford Sound 1883. Dunedin, by Burton Brothers studio, by Alfred Burton. An example of the photography industry emerging in the 1880s New Zealand. Source: Te Papa Collections (C.018117).

There were also landscapes where Māori were usually absent altogether like in the South Island that was quickly declared by William Hobson as *terra nullius* (Evans, 2007; Walker, 2004, p. 97). To illustrate, Fiordland, in the south western corner of the country has been a site of much romantic inspiration since the late eighteenth century and the botanical renditions of Dusky Sound by Hodges during his voyage with James Cook (1728 – 1779) (Bonehill, 2006; Evans, 2007). Tramping through Fiordland forests has become a popular Pākehā pursuit as well and by 1888 the Milford Track was cut and huts were established for overnight stays (Evans, 2007). Walking through Fiordland is now even more popular for domestic and international tourists, the National Park itself, being core to *100% Pure* advertisements. The most common channel of exploring the expansive fiords presently are boat cruises that float through Milford Sound so tourists can languidly stare at the ‘picturesque’ mountain scenery.

Further accelerating the romantic experience within New Zealand landscapes has been the introduction of computer-generated imagery (CGI) used for films (Evans, 2007). The ostensibly awe-inspiring cinematography of *The Lord of the Rings* (a three part trilogy) and *The Hobbit Trilogy* that were shot in New Zealand are demonstrative here. Both the film production using CGI and the subsequent film tours of the actual places of where it was shot (using *100% Pure* branding) cast the nation as a factual-fictional English rural idyll (Gurevitch, 2014). Despite been technologically twenty-first century feats (most scenes were manufactured with CGI) (Gurevitch, 2014) the ideology of gazing at these ‘landscapes’ is very nineteenth century. It is also hard to overstate the saturation of the films branding in New Zealand. For example, Middle Earth (the fictional home of the film’s characters) was for a time core to its campaign and Tourism New Zealand still states:

*Ever since the first The Lord of the Rings movie was released in 2001, New Zealand has been known as the ‘Home of Middle-earth’. New Zealand’s dramatic scenery — golden*

---

56 Latin for ‘nobody’s land’ a common colonial strategy used during ‘the Age of Discovery’ for asserting land rights and possession (Walker, 2004).
57 Regarded as the first European to navigate and map New Zealand.
58 See [https://www.newzealand.com/int/](https://www.newzealand.com/int/)
59 See [https://www.newzealand.com/int/destinations](https://www.newzealand.com/int/destinations)
plains, towering mountains and enchanting valleys — plays the mythical world of Middle-earth on the big screen in both The Lord of the Rings and The Hobbit Trilogy. More than 150 locations throughout the country were used to film The Lord of the Rings and The Hobbit Trilogy. Many activities and attractions offer the chance to see the film locations for yourself.

Writing before the *Hobbit Trilogy* was released (2012-2014), Evans (2007) points to how the Lord of the Rings (LOTR) films trace the ‘scenic wonderlands’ so pictorialised and disseminated in colonial New Zealand. Spanning the country’s ‘natural’ features, these scenic wonderlands included Lake Taupō, sheep stations in the high country, Fiordland, the Southern Alps, Twizel, Wanaka and Queenstown, all used as the set for Middle Earth (Evans, 2007). The LOTR legacy situates New Zealand as a ‘natural’ rural idyll, an English fantasy world whereby Pākehā can feel like they ‘naturally’ and even spiritually belong (Evans, 2007; Gurevitch, 2014). Indeed, in such “ritualised aesthetics” like scenes of the elf-queen against snow-peaked mountains is where Evans argues the “romanticism of New Zealand’s white settlement project shows itself as its most overt” (Evans, 2007, p. 134).

The ideology that fuels New Zealand’s romantic tourism is intricately tied to environmentalist ideology. As alluded to already, romanticism and environmentalism have a close relationship in general throughout the West (Braun, 2009; Grebowicz, 2015; Hess, 2012). A rather large case in point of this nexus is National Parks, thousands of hectares of “nature-in-reserve” — “wilderness spectacle[s]” (Grebowicz, 2015, p.64; see also Braun, 2009). In New Zealand there are thirteen National Parks that domestic and international tourists alike enjoy, the largest one being the aforementioned Fiordland (Ruru, 2012). Typically all thirteen parks feature heavily in 100% Pure campaigns.

By 1874 in New Zealand the idea of a National Park was first mooted in relation to the Rotorua area inspired by the establishment of Yellowstone National Park in the U.S in 1872 (Grebowicz, 2015, p.11; Ruru, 2012; Star & Lochhead, 2013). At a pragmatic level
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See [https://www.newzealand.com/int/home-of-middle-earth](https://www.newzealand.com/int/home-of-middle-earth)
much of the proposed areas for the parks were seen as unproductive for farming and economically viable as tourist sites so the conservation of these areas was not usually contested (Ruru, 2012; Star & Lochhead, 2013). By 1894 the Tongariro National Park Act was passed and Tongariro became New Zealand’s first National Park (Ruru, 2012; Star & Lochhead, 2013).

The legislative moves towards conservation for tourism and local recreation were also part of the wider project of building a nation (Belich, 1996; 2001; Evans, 2007). Organisations like the Scenic Preservation Society were key in promoting species distinct to Aotearoa and the need to have “contact with nature” (Star & Lochhead, 2013, p.147). Mostly middle-class White men who lived in urban areas, different branches of the group were key lobbyists in enshrining the protection of indigenous ecosystems in law (Star & Lochhead, 2013). The emphasis on indigenous flora and fauna commenced a growing interest in ecosystems which were not British that — in turn — led to an explicit nationalising by the 1920s (Star & Lochhead, 2013). Such protections on indigenous plants and birds excluded Māori language and tikanga and in many instances expelled Māori themselves, in the name of conservation rendering these spaces ‘normally’ and ‘naturally’ White (Evans, 2007; Grebowicz, 2015; Ruru, 2012; Star & Lochhead, 2013).

Building a (White) nation on its unique flora and fauna has not just persisted in New Zealand but intensified. Ginn (2008) argues that in the past thirty or forty years Pākehā New Zealand have demonstrated a desire to express the country’s ‘post-colonial’ stance by rejecting, for instance, the colonial imagery of the rural idyll imported from Britain, and embracing indigenous flora. Ginn (2008, p.336) has dubbed this “eco-nationalism” and contends that for many Pākehā, native ‘nature’ “offer[s] a unique basis for our culture and sense of national identity” (Department of Conservation, 2000 in Ginn 2008, p.335). Through this process Pākehā are provided with an “origin myth” that goes back to a time before humans and disassociates and purifies ourselves from the messy material happenings of deforestation and agricultural production (Ginn 2008, p.335). From within such a veil of forgetting we, Pākehā, are able to draw on the salvific qualities of ‘nature’

---

62 See Grebowicz (2015) who points to how First Nations People were similarly removed in the U.S.

Interrogating this concept with Haraway’s naturecultures, Ginn explains how the eco-nationalist state claims typical knowledge of native ‘nature’. For instance, such ‘nature’ is outside culture but endangered by culture but Western rationality can save it. "Nature is [also] docile and where nature is not docile, it must be disciplined and made to fit within neat spatial and temporal boundaries and the linear history of the nation state" (Ginn 2008, p.339). The fragility of the indigenous ecosystem thus requires conservation and preservation lest it be lost. Therefore, a narrative is generated that positions native ‘nature’ as necessarily separate from humanity, safely contained.

Eco-nationalism is a potent local example of a ‘natural nation’ or romantic homeland (see Kaufmann and Zimmer, 1998) discussed in the previous chapter. Pākehā have no common ancestral heritage like for example Jewish and French peoples may claim when speaking of a homeland (see Smith, 2003). But we do believe we have ‘nature’ like Ginn’s (2008) eco-nationalism suggests. Indeed, a common refrain in scenic preservationist circles was that ‘we’ have scarce human history but make up for it “by the rich offering from the hands of Mother Nature” (Anderson, 1925 in Star & Lochhead, 2013, p. 154). National Parks then become vital in the way they “impress on our spirit of nationhood” (Cowan, 1925 in Star & Lochhead, 2013, p. 154). In this story, Pākehā expel Māori history, Māori worlds, and possess ‘nature’, a familiar theme in the trouble of colonial settling in New Zealand.
A”[...] land flowing with milk and honey”\textsuperscript{63}: Settler arcadianism

In a very functionary way, romantic arcadianism veiled the harsh reality of industrial colonial production — like the stench of waste from butchered carcasses and raw sewerage (Evans, 2007). Throughout much of the nineteenth century waste — and most problematically industrial waste — was dumped just outside of towns (contaminating Māori food gathering places) as the first sewerage treatment plant wasn’t built in the colony until 1882 in Christchurch. These kinds of systems were inevitably not going to work long-term and so maintaining the myth of paradise was important for encouraging a kind of arcadian optimism in the face of many experiences that were distinctly not arcadian and not remotely paradisial by most people’s standards (Fairburn, 1989). Much of the idealising materials were written by both private individuals and organisations in the form of novels; tourists’ accounts; travellers’ tales; memoirs of former settlers; scientific and ethnographic works; and letters and articles from colonists and retired colonial officials printed in newspapers and magazines (Fairburn, 1989, p.20).

Fairburn (1989) argues that out of all the proposed ideal societies that drove Europeans to the ‘New World’ (see chapter two), arcadia seeped into the soil of Aotearoa most ardently during the nineteenth century. From his perspective, a New Zealand arcadia was deeply Victorian and therefore British, romantic, Protestant and committed to ‘material progress’ (Fairburn, 1989; Pawson & Brooking, 2013), inflections that did not always work together very well. A common material trope that seemed to incorporate many of these nuances though, was the ‘garden’. Victorian colonisation was typically framed as a mission to create a garden out of the ‘wilderness’ settlers came upon. In this mythology settlers’ goals were to cultivate the ‘uncultivated’ land resonating with the Victorian desire for ‘improvement’ and ‘progress’ (Fairburn, 1989; Pawson & Brooking, 2013). As Henry Sewell (1807-1879) from the Canterbury Association declared: “The first creation was a garden, and the nearer we get back to that garden, the nearer we approach what may be called the true normal state of Nature” (in Pawson & Brooking, 2013, p.20).

To make an arcadian garden one had to own private property, it in itself a fundamental principle of a New Zealand arcadia (Fairburn, 1989). Owning land freed many men [sic]

\textsuperscript{63} (Atkinson, 1854 in Fairburn, 1989, p.22).
from the class system in Britain, allowing working-class men into the property buyers’ market, and middle-class men, the opportunity to purchase farmland hitherto unavailable to them (Fairburn, 1989). In this sense New Zealand became a ‘classless’ society but more notably, owning private property achieved that cornerstone of an arcadian political economy, libertarianism (Fairburn, 1989). As Fairburn (1989) argues, New Zealand was never a colony of egalitarianism; land ownership was not about equal distribution but equal opportunity (W. D Hay 1882 in Fairburn, 1989, pp.51-52).

The subsistence (garden) production that many settlers engaged in also spoke to the freedom and self-regulating political economy central to a Virgilian pastoralism (Fairburn, 1989; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). Being free from government organisations was key and in the beginning many settlers tried to bypass the (British) Crown entirely when seeking their own arcadia. German naturalist Ernst Dieffenbach (1811-1855) was one such proponent who said of the Nelson settlement,”subverting the natural order of things” (in McAloon, 2013, p. 79). To be truly “democratic”, he argued, settlers needed to be independent and governed by small government (McAloon, 2013, p. 79). However ‘squatting’, the practice of leasing land from Māori directly, did not last long as it soon became illegal given the Crown were not going to make any money off such ventures or retain colony control (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010; Marr, 2001).

Despite having to purchase land off the Crown and live in an increasingly regulated society, the libertarian politics that equated morality with owning private property remained powerful in the colony (Fairburn, 1989). Indeed, William Rolleston, who was part of Canterbury’s educated gentry, claimed that the possession of land was “the greatest teacher of morality” (1879 in Fairburn, 1989, p.65). The moral virtue of settlers wanting to cultivate land were necessarily defined against those who apparently did not, entrenching the interchangeability of cultivation and morality (Haraway, 1997). This kind of ‘cultivation narrative’ provided settlers with a belief that they ‘naturally’ or divinely deserved land rights as one settler newspaper explained:

64 At the top of the North Island
Who has the right to most land? He who has cultivated it. This is God’s law, and all the chatter about rights of the natives to land, which they have let lie idle and unused for so many centuries, cannot do away with the fact that according to this, God’s law, they have established their right to a very small portion of these islands. Land should be no more considered the property of the uncivilised human beings who find themselves on it, but cannot use or improve it, than wild animals of a lower order who roam over it for food and prey [...] (in McAloon, 2013, pp. 78-79).

The brutal Othering of Māori here is symptomatic of the desire within Victorian colonisation to see land in New Zealand as an empty space awaiting moral men to fashion it into an arcadia (Evans, 2007; Fairburn, 1989). Christian mythology helped the arcadian cause as figurations of the Promised Land were prominent alongside Edenic tropes (Fairburn, 1989; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). For instance, the ‘land of milk and honey’ was one of the most common ways to express an arcadian Christian fecundity in New Zealand, which is a paraphrased quote from the Book of Deuteronomy65. Even labour unions bought into Christian myths to advertise to their members the possibilities of abundance in New Zealand. An extract written in 1870s by the National agricultural labourers’ union is instructive here:

*Rush from the old doomed country to such a paradise as New Zealand. A GOOD LAND — A LAND OF OIL, OLIVES AND HONEY; – A LAND WHERE IN THOU MAY’ST EAT BREAD WITHOUT SCARECENESS: THOU SHALT NOT LACK ANYTHING IN IT* (Labourers’ Union Chronicle in Fairburn, 1989, p.22).

Even though Fairburn (1989) cites this quote, he is quick to point out how anti-union and anti-socialist New Zealand became. Not only did the colony arguably re-entrench
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65(6:3): Hear therefore, O Israel, and observe to do it; that it may be well with thee, and that ye may increase mightily, as the LORD God of thy fathers hath promised thee, in the land that floweth with milk and honey. (The King James version which details how Canaan, the Promised Land has been pledged to the Jewish people Fairburn, 1898, p.24).
the aristocracy from the ‘old country’ via wealthy settlers immediately obtaining large stations, the arcadian mythology fostered what Fairburn (1989, p.13) calls “extreme individualism”. A belief in individualism and libertarian politics was also, in part, fuelled by colony practicalities, especially in less built up areas. For instance, settlers who bought land outside of the early towns were geographically isolated from each other owing to the lack of infrastructure like roads, transportation and communication technologies (Fairburn, 1989, p.176).

Road engineering was difficult with such hilly, bush-covered terrain with fast rivers and a lot of rain. Fairburn (1989, p.176) cites an example as late as 1880 in Alfredton (Northern Wairarapa) where there was a man rescued from the road stuck in mud up to his arm pits. These conditions for many years contributed to a sense of self-reliance especially for those living in the more remote regions (Fairburn, 1989), a trait that no doubt contributed to the self-reliant culture that would develop within rural New Zealand (Belich, 2001; Johnsen, 2003). Fairburn (1989, p.178) notes that an illustration of such individualism even manifested in church, sports or neighbourhood organisations. Specifically, per capita, the numbers of settlers who took an interest in these volunteer groups were much less than other colonies. For example, only about one quarter of the population from 1874 to 1896 belonged to a church. A pragmatic factor that may have exacerbated this situation was that the hours of subsistence work settlers commonly performed, which coupled with paid work, resulted in very little time for organised leisure (Fairburn, 1989, p.187).

Fairburn (1989) points to one important caveat of this individualism; namely family. The heteronormative family of man, wife and children often became the key social outlet for early settlers given their geographical and technological isolation. In this vein, Fairburn (1989) argues, the settler definition of family — based on immediate blood ties — was actually just another form of individualism with women and children being, more or less, incorporated into property (see also Plumwood, 1993). Again, in later years within New Zealand rural society, this model of the family-as-individual would become a prominent feature that — loyal to arcadian doctrine — promoted a heteronormative libertarian political economy (Belich, 2001; Evans, 2007; Johnsen, 2003; Johnston, 2013).
An arcadian farming nation

Theoretically, according to Fairburn (1989), the more organised a society became the less arcadian it became. However, Belich (2001) frames the influence of utopianism and arcadianism a little differently. Belich (2001) notes how both utopianism and arcadianism were fairly matched in early settlement and implies utopianism had the edge of the rural idyll fantasy. He described utopians as wanting rapid, “artificial town-led” progress as opposed to arcadians who favoured paradise; “steady, natural farm-led growth” (1996, p.306). Owing to the political economic situation of the 1870s though, Belich suggests that arcadianism became the prevailing colonial discourse of New Zealand as a country:

In short, New Zealand became a farming nation.

I agree with both accounts Belich and Fairburn provide and I would suggest that there never were any ‘pure’ utopian or arcadian narratives and they more often than not seemed to collide. This, Evans (2007) suggests, was evident from the start. For example, Edward Gibbon Wakefield’s (1796-1862) plans of small farm settlement aimed to convert ‘wilderness’ into a Garden of Eden (Evans, 2007; Pawson & Brooking, 2013, p.20). In this arcadian story, land was “virgin” and therefore, for the “moral atmosphere of the country”, needed penetration and cultivation by (White) men (Wakefield 1849, p.118 in Pawson & Brooking, 2013, p.20). Nevertheless, Evans (2007) points to how utopian this scheme was in political structure given its highly organised and evenly distributed land plot demarcations.

Nevertheless, there were perceived purities or perhaps totalities within dominant discourse and although utopianism had a chance, argues Belich (2001), the colony’s finances forced developers to abandon the goal of a bustling commercial hub with the advent of a global down-turn in the 1870s. To keep the colony afloat, New Zealand had to strengthen its ties with Britain which in effect meant becoming the empire’s farm (Belich, 1996; 2001). Consequently, between the 1880s and 1920s New Zealand was promoted as an arcadian paradise to ensure Britain continued to buy our farm products. This not only required an intensification of propaganda but an intensifying of farm practices.

One of the most significant tools for constructing a farming nation probably began with the introduction of refrigeration technology. Refrigeration through ice packs was used
globally in the eighteenth century to transport foodstuffs such as salmon, beef and dairy (Belich, 2001). However, in 1877 the first successful steam-powered mechanical freezer shipment travelled from Argentina to France (Belich, 2001, p.54). Then, in 1882, in Port Chalmers (in the South Island), the Dunedin set off shipping 5,000 sheep carcasses and some butter, all mechanically refrigerated, to Britain. Farmers in New Zealand wanted it: Sheep farmers throughout the previous decades were having to drive surplus sheep over cliffs or boil them down into tallow for soap and candles and by 1882 there was already a domestic dairy market established (Belich, 2001).

Problems arose quickly though. Freezing capacities on board ships were fine but freezing works and land-based refrigerated transport was needed. Not only this, a sizable meat industry required more technologically advanced farms. For example, more fencing, equipment, fertiliser and better grasses were needed for large scale meat growing as opposed to wool or small-scale mixed farming (Belich 2001, p.56). This was a sizable problem as the capital to make these changes was thin owing to the colony’s economic stagnation at that time (Belich, 2001). As a result, it was generally genteel entrepreneurs, landed and not, who made the big investments. For example, they built the freezing works and dairy factories and, until 1900, also supplied most of the sheep meat (Belich 2001, p.60).

Glitches also emerged on the demand side. British consumers did not like the taste of the colony’s protein. They disliked the taste and texture of merino, thought the butter tasted too fishy and strong, and were very particular about their cheese (Belich, 2001). To address customers’ issues production methods needed to change. Consequently, by the turn of the twentieth century butter was nearly all factory made which provided it with a more even and milder taste. Merino sheep almost became an “endangered species” as they were replaced with Lincoln, Romney and Southdown and were also bred smaller, and killed younger, to meet the consumer demand for a less gamy flavour (Belich, 2001, p.62).

These changes occurred alongside increased production and a tightening of relations between New Zealand and Britain (Belich, 2011, p.58) — so much so that by 1901 New Zealand was exporting over 100,000 tons of meat and dairy which grew to 500,000 by 1941. Wool remained important but eventually became secondary to protein (Belich,
Beef was not a strong export product at this stage but by 1933 New Zealand supplied approximately half of Britain’s imported lamb mutton, cheese and butter. As Belich points out, these are absolute numbers, so, per capita, New Zealand seemed to be living up to the mythological ideal—so revitalised in the late nineteenth century — that the colony was Britain’s farm and a “protein exporter’s paradise” (2001, p.66).

Citing economic historian, J D Gould, Belich (2001, p.60) also remarks how the productive capabilities of sown pasture (through subsiding and promoting, for example, lime fertiliser and later superphosphate) were as key to agricultural development as refrigeration. To elaborate, Brooking and Pawson (2011) detail how pasture sowing country-wide became an intensive project since the 1880s which, effectively, reflects Cathy Marr’s (2001) detail of intensive pasture sowing in Wairarapa. By 1890 sown grass area had doubled to 2.82 million hectares from 1.4 million hectares in 1880. By the mid-1890s it had risen to 4 million and by the First World War, 5.9 million hectares of New Zealand land had been converted to agricultural grass land (Brooking & Pawson, 2011, pp.13-14). This growth reached its peak in 1921 when the New Zealand export economy was 93 % grass based (Brooking & Pawson, 2011, p.2), at a time when other developed countries went into more profitable industries such as manufacturing (Brooking & Pawson, 2001, p.9).
In the throes of marketing such farming pursuits images arose which reasserted romantic arcadian views as a tool of settlement. Belich notes the most quintessential arcadian New Zealand image produced during the recolonial era was sheep or cattle grazing on lush green grass with snow peaked mountains in the background (2001, p.84) (see figure 18). As Belich (2001, p.84) and Evans (2007) both point out as well, this arcadian pictorialisation became not just an advertisement for farm products to Britain; it, along with the overall marketing ploy, influenced how Pākehā New Zealanders started to ‘become’.

Trade fairs also helped (Evans, 2007). From the Dunedin Exhibition in 1865 to the Centennial Exhibition of 1930-1940 New Zealand sold itself to world through machinery, farm equipment and pictorialised Māori scenes. Evans (2007) suggests the most memorable fair was the second Christchurch Exhibition (1906-1907). Devised by the then Premier, Richard Seddon (1845-1906), the main premise of the fair was to promote trade and tourism which seemed to work as, throughout the six months it was running, annual beef and mutton exports increased by more than 20 million pounds (Evans 2007, p.61). Again, these expos were as much a commercial advertisement to the world, as they were a propaganda machine for settlers to entrench what it meant to be a (Pākehā) New Zealander (Belich, 2001; Evans, 2007).

Other more legislative movements bolstered the arcadian story in New Zealand. In the 1890s Seddon instituted a number of land reforms that in effect broke up the very large gentrified farms that had been established earlier that century. Seddon was a working-class man and ruled, despotically, with this ethic always in mind. Consequently, he pushed through parliament The Lands for Settlements and Advances to Settlers Acts in the early nineties (Belich 2001, pp.59-60, Fairburn 1989, p.263). These schemes broke large estates up allowing smaller blocks to be available for purchase. Credit was then provided at a low cost by the government for small farmers to buy these subdivisions. As a result, banks were pressured to also increase access and lower the cost of credit. Advertised as ‘national’ development these farming pursuits were clearly targeted at White settlers, as except for Ngāti Porou, Māori were locked out of these opportunities (Belich 2001, pp.59-60).
The purpose of these Acts was for the Crown to buy land and sell it to men [sic] with less means in an effort to support an agricultural nation. It was a plan rooted in White-centric socialism and the belief in equal distribution, not equal opportunity as the arcadian narrative does not dictate (Fairburn, 1989). The reforms were politically utopian but were presented as an important part of constructing an arcadia as the dominant message was clear: New Zealand was a farming nation that the Seddon reforms helped to engrain in the colony’s psyche culturally and economically.

This cultural and economic rallying, broadly speaking, defused the initial class tensions between big and small farmers (see next chapter), or wealthy and working-class settlers. Big farmers became smaller and small farmers became bigger (Belich, 2001; see also Fairburn, 1989). Thus farmers soon found more in common than not, politically, and began voicing their opinions as a rural collective (Belich, 2001). This was the rise of the rural conservative farmer in New Zealand who extolled the arcadian virtues of self-reliance, nuclear heteronormative family making and economic libertarianism (Fairburn, 1989; Little, 2007; Johnsen, 2003). Farmers became a distinctive group in New Zealand that gained significant political power (Belich, 2001). Belich observes that approximately one-third of parliament members between the 1900s and 1980s were farmers and between, 1912 and 1935 and, 1949 and 1972, farmer-dominated governments ran the country (2000, p.150): A group that seemingly continued the project of settling.

An arcadian nation: Still settling

The ideal farmer figure was, and to large extent still is, White, male, self-reliant, stoic and physically tough — in short the Kiwi Bloke (Abdinor, 2000 Bannister, 2005; Evans, 2007). A literary example of this Kiwi Bloke Evans (2007, p.133) explains is the Arcadian Man: The White New Zealand male who is “at one with nature and as handy with the pen as with [fishing] rod and gun”. These are tropes, as Evans intimates, which venture beyond the farm gate. Indeed, in building an arcadian and masculine nation, rugby, fishing, hunting, warring (overseas) and mountaineering as well as farming, all contribute to the formation of a country built on the White settler male, agriculture being just one of his endeavours (Abdinor, 2000; Bannister, 2005; Evans, 2007). What this section aims to detail then is how this figure is a settler, still settling, still unsettled.
To do so I return to the mountains, sites of elevated mythologies in the cold flesh of a New Zealand sublime (see Evans, 2007; Haraway, 2003; 2008; 2016). As canvassed earlier on in the chapter, mountains in New Zealand have long been romantically gazed at by Pākehā (Evans, 2007). An intimately connected colonial pursuit to that of viewing mountains was climbing them. Initially, settlers wanted to ‘explore’ mountainous regions. Using Māori guides, Pawson (2013) notes was the surest way to success. For example, Kehu66 led Charles Heaphy from Nelson to the West Coast and four unnamed Kāi Tahu Māori forged the ‘European’ path across the Main Divide67. Māori were indispensable during settler alpine expeditions68 because they had already canvassed these atua. Kā Tiritiri o te Moana already had intersecting paths all over the mauka connecting east to west well before European arrival (Pawson, 2013, p.160). Even though there was doubtless respect towards mountain and scout by the European climbers, it is the latter who remain at the centre of the story. The settlers are endowed with full names in the history books and the status of ‘discoverer’, ‘explorer’, ‘pioneer’, a point illustrated, literally, by the subsequent identification attributed to each peak ‘found’ (Evans, 2007).

Mountains for many settlers in New Zealand, and in other colonies, were that ‘wilderness nature’ imagined to be awaiting European discovery, a ‘nature’ to possess; and mountain climbing and recreation may be seen as ongoing material symbols for achieving that colonial desire (Evans, 2007; Grebowicz, 2015). That is to say, alpine climbing serves as a cold hard technique for proving settler virility and his [sic] ability to conquer (Evans, 2007; Grebowicz, 2015). Mountain ascents became a cultural motif of New Zealand, early on, ‘Mount Aspiring’69, ‘Mount Cook’70 and ‘Mount Egmont’71 being favourites to climb (Pawson, 2013). Such heteronormative mythologising was deeply romantic. For example, a Mount Cook [sic] Company (1922) advertisement depicts a local romanticism here comparable to that of the ramblers’ campaign for life outside the city cited in the previous chapter:

---

66 Full name birth and date unknown
67 Through the Southern Alps from the east to West Coast in the South Island (Pawson, 2013, p. 161).
69 Formerly known and now known as Tititea/Mt Aspiring
70 Formerly known and now known as Aoraki/Mt Cook
71 Formerly known and now known as Taranaki/Mt Egmont
The air is so dry, pure and invigorating —
As to make the winter climate at the Hermitage
The most delightful, cheering and healthful in the Dominion —
GET AWAY FROM THE FOGGY, STUFFY TOWNS

Mountaineering and mountain recreation continued the White masculine colonial settlement project well into twentieth century New Zealand (Evans, 2007; Newton, 1999). This colonial masculinity almost climaxed with photojournalist Brian Brake (1927-1988), artist John Drawbridge (1930-2005) composer Douglas Lilburn (1915-2001) and poet James K Baxter (1926-1972). In 1949 the four men ascended Tititea in the hope of creating a kind of poetical documentary “in a self-conscious quest for the essence of the nation”, but was never brought to fruition (Evans, 2007, p. 138). The ultimate climax, nationally speaking of course, was the subsequent ascent of Mount Everest by Edmund Hillary (1919-2008) in 1953 (Evans, 2007). Hillary, eternally enshrined in the History books of New Zealand, literally embodied the White settler male: stoic, resilient, pioneer, conqueror (of mountains72) (Evans, 2007).

There were also another group of White men in twentieth century New Zealand that typified Evans’ Arcadian Man that warrant noting here. Citing Newton (1999) Evans (2007) points to how it was both mountaineering and the cultural nationalists in the 1930s that most consciously tried to construct a distinct White masculine country. The cultural nationalists were a group of Pākehā male writers that wanted to unshackle themselves from the empire and so decided to focus on a unique New Zealand writing voice (Evans, 2007). A helpful tool in achieving this goal — and a still significant historical step in New Zealand literature — was the formation of a New Zealand owned and operated publisher, the Caxton Press, founded by the writer Denis Glover (1912-1980) in 1935 Christchurch.

The voice of these writers often claimed to speak through land, thereby ‘naturalising’ their ‘authentic’ identity as New Zealanders. A.R.D Fairburn’s (1904 -1957) Dominion published in 1938 is demonstrative here of the cultural tone at the time: “Land of

72 Hillary (1975, p.162) said of reaching the top of Everest “Well, we knocked the bastard off!”
Mountains and running water/rocks and flowers/and the leafy evergreen/O natal earth/Fairest earth/fount of life, giver of bodies, /deep well of our delight” (in Evans, 2007, p.128). Frank Sargeson (1903-1982) too expressed himself as an Arcadian Man through his writing and gardening. Framing himself as “Mr Natural” he blended text with soil by illustrating — through his abundant crop of tomatoes and peppers — how he was “deeply in touch with nature and its rhythms” (Evans, 2007, p.131).

This search and celebration of an ‘authentic’ New Zealand voice was performed, Evans argues, as if the previous one hundred years had never happened. A striking version of colonial forgetting — by burying oneself (literally perhaps) in the soils of arcadia — the cultural nationalists as a collective claimed a kind of White indigeneity (Evans, 2007). By ‘normalising’ and ‘naturalising’ their connection to the land in New Zealand the literary group dispossessed “Māori even of the experience of being dispossessed” (Evans, 2007, p.127 original italics). Much of this White indigeneity came from the South Island (Evans, 2007). Sargeson may have been living in Auckland but the culture of the nationalists drew on the empty space of the South as a trope, a wide open space wherein men could carve out their nationhood and harmonise with ‘nature’ (Evans, 2007, pp.136-139), still used in the twenty-first century (see for example figure 17).

The mythical romance of the snow-peaked mountains, vast Canterbury Plains, deserted Mackenzie Basin, arid central Otago and remote high country, have become much used signatures in New Zealand literature and art (Bannister, 2005; Evans, 2007). Figurative men of this space have also become rather popular. A case in point is the ‘Southern Man’. The ‘Southern Man’ gained wide-spread status in New Zealand by selling — in one of his guises — Speight’s beer through a long running series of television advertisements in the late twentieth century (Law, 1997). Within these commercials Southern Men were presented on high country scenes with an intimate knowledge of land which inherently implied that were more virile and ‘authentic’ than men who lived in the city (Law, 1997).

A final figure worth engaging with here is Barry Crump (1935 - 1996), who, more or less, reified the conceptual White masculine indigeneity, in ‘the bush’. Like the nationalists, Crump was ‘becoming’ Pākehā in arcadian and violent ways. By writing about his hunting adventures he demonstrated his knowledge of the land and his hunting skills, the
epitome of what it meant to be an Arcadian Man (Evans, 2007). Popularised through television commercials in the 1980s and early 1990s73, selling Toyota Hilux vehicles, the narrative tells a similar story to that of the Southern Man. Posed next to Lloyd Scott who played an effeminate city dweller, Crump extolled the virtues of the Arcadian Man out on the land illustrating the compulsory heteronormativity in such dominant Pākehā mythologising (Evans, 2007; Johnston, 2013).

**Becoming Pākehā**

What I have navigated in this chapter is the settler and romantic mythologies of Pākehā arcadianism inherited from Europe. I have traced how these two inclinations converge and diverge in complex ways that both, whether discordantly or not, continue the work of the colonial project at the same time as forgetting it ever existed. Showing how these goals of romantic settler transcendence play out in present farming and environmentalist circles highlights how we, Pākehā, are still settling in very unsettling, unsettled, ways.

An anecdote Evans (2007) cites about a conversation he had with a television executive and a letter to the *Listener* magazine in the 1980s is illustrative of this cultural unsettlement Pākehā feel within our own culture, and our inability to face such anxieties. The executive told him that the most common broadcasting complaint at the time (also in the 1980s) was rural television shows such as *Country Calendar* showing scenes of butchered meat whilst people were eating their lamb or beef for dinner. The theme of the letter was similar in content (Evans, 2007, p.117). These potentially frivolous complaints are nevertheless fragmentary insights into how much Pākehā cannot bear to face what we have wrought with the advent of colonising Aotearoa and entrenching our identity in industrial farming (see Haraway, 2008).

One way to inherit these arcadian histories response-ably, ‘in the flesh’, could be to take what we have and compost it (Haraway, 2008; 2016). Not a composting of the ‘naturalising’ kind but of the troubling kind. Yet we could still take composting tips from say, the cultural nationalists, a point that diverges from Evans (2007) argument which is to throw them all out in the waste-only-bin. For example, he scathingly writes of the

---

73 To see the first advertisement visit NZ on Screen: [https://www.nzonscreen.com/title/crumpy-scotty-toyota-ad](https://www.nzonscreen.com/title/crumpy-scotty-toyota-ad)
nationalists’ composting projects as a response to increasing non-organic fertiliser used on the country’s farms, and a wider trend towards urbanisation. The nationalists he posits championed a return to arcadia, to “live with the land” again (p.132) such as Sargeson becoming “deeply in touch with nature and its rhythms” (p.131) even in his suburban garden in Auckland.

Evans perceptively uses compost as both a material example of the nationalists’ commitment to ‘natural’ processes, and an ideology that was used to claim a ‘natural’ and Edenic relationship to land (p.132), an example of what he calls “affective indigenisation”(p.129). Perhaps if we were to turn this compost pile over with new matter though, with feminist and queer care-full response-ability then maybe their words and legacies could be rendered salvageable and reused to grow a becoming Pākehā. This is how I interpret Haraway (2016)’s call to ‘stay with the trouble’. As such, in the following chapters I get closer to the ground and arrive in Wairarapa to explore the histories of Pākehā becoming in a place rife with romantic arcadian tales and farming legacies that may still yet be compostable.
Chapter 5. Inheriting Wairarapa ‘in the flesh’

It’s raining today as I repose in a rocky cave with kahikatea all around, in my camp in the depths of the mountainous Tararua Forest. Today marks the 100th year I have lived here. Yes, it has been 100 hundred years since I quitted Lyttelton and (I hear on good authority) the people of my previous abode are still publishing stories about a goat-man scaring children?

I survive by the ancestors that have granted me permission to dwell with them. Rangitāne is their name. I am a denizen in both senses of the word. My hosts have taught me wondrous things about the beings around me, the tall trees, trickling streams, and lively bird life. It is steep country in this place but the people of Rangitāne have already made suitable paths for foraging and hunting. What a journey it was to get here from Canterbury: The memory of it fills me with affection and despair.

Of course I had no choice but to move elsewhere in those difficult days of the 1890s. I had been spotted by a group of youths in the local cemetery and therefore my position in Canterbury was becoming perilous. Berthing in Wellington harbour I made the trek through a long valley and steep hills just before dawn. As I arrived at the top of the Remutaka ridge I saw below me. Oh what a sight that was. I will remember it for a thousand years to come. I wailed as I bore (modest) witness to the wide-scale erasure of forest on those dear flood plains. Tree stumps were strewn everywhere. Clouds of dust and ash hovered near newly burnt forest. Many roads and bridges had

---

75 See Haraway (1997).
already been constructed. There was no possibility of me passing through undetected, to arrive at the place I sought called Tiraumea. So I fled to the only feasible spot. As I entered through what I now know as the Waiohine River I was stopped in my tracks: “The immense mountains and precipices that overhung me on every side, the sound of the river raging among the rocks and the dashing of the waterfalls around” caused me to fall in love at once! And it is here in the Tararua Ranges that I live with divinely spun love. After all: “Is not love a divinity, because it is immortal?” (Notes from Pan’s dairy, 1991).

Focussing on how arcadia not just plays out in New Zealand in a broad sense, but in a more localised way allows a depth that this composting project needs. By exploring Wairarapa in particular, I was able to get close to the mud, muck and mess of Pākehā settling and the arcadian endeavour. Exploring these histories caused me to realise what else we Pākehā have inherited by living in Wairarapa so this chapter also traces the indigenous genealogies that make up people and land in this region, millions of years in the making (Dawson & Lucas, 2011; Williams, 2017). Far from being done, finished, and in the past, these histories are constantly being remade with each new encounter, dwelling in the bodies of whatever constitutes Wairarapa ‘now’ (Haraway, 2003; 2008; 2016). So despite the insistence of the dominant humanist myth that Pākehā are self-contained modern individuals, this chapter points to how Pākehā are just as affected, unmade and remade by the land as Māori and anyone else who makes their home in Wairarapa, a place named by explorer Whātonga as ‘glistening waters’.

Wholly noninnocent and at times violent, brutal and disingenuous, Pākehā have intimately engaged with land and Māori for a few years now. In this short space of time so much has materially changed since the early non-intensive pastoralists to the ‘lifestyle block’ owners. Throughout this time the myths of arcadia have

---

76 Shelley (1818/2010, p.77)
77 Shelley (1926/1996, p.111)
resonated whether it is a farmer seeking ‘material progress’ like the settler figure or a romantic arcadia that veils the grind of daily life both introduced in the previous chapter. Exploring arcadian narratives from within the waters, grass and rock of Wairarapa paves the way for how I met the women I interviewed. Furthermore, this situated history telling of the area makes room for a composting of what we, who dwell (t)here, continue to inherit.

Indigenous genealogies

To revision arcadia with a composting philosophy, the rock, water, dirt, leaves and bodies in Aotearoa that did not travel all that way from White empires are important to recall in the sense that Pākehā have inherited them even if unwittingly. In a time, probably beyond Pākehā imagination, what was to become Aotearoa New Zealand, was submerged under the sea (Williams, 2017). Connected to the wider continent known as Zealandia, Aotearoa emerged from the ocean to become land (Williams, 2017). Nonetheless, approximately ninety-four percent of Zealandia stayed underwater and so it has been, roughly, the remaining six percent that has risen as earth (Williams, 2017). About eighty million years ago Zealandia separated from Gondwana, thus providing a view from above of a long narrow terrain (Williams, 2017). However, far from New Zealand being an unbroken wedge, the land is actually a series of fragmented, but connected, pieces (Williams, 2017).

One of the most significant geomorphic (the intersection of geology and geography) aspects within the Aotearoa landscape is the mountains (Williams, 2017). Mountain formation depends on rising rocks and land. However, as rocks rise they are also continuously eroding so mountains only occur if the rate of rock and land emergence is greater than that of the rate of erosion (Williams, 2017). The reason why rocks move in this way is because of plate convergence which is frequent in New Zealand owing to the fact that the country lies between the Australian and Pacific plate which are constantly moving at different rates and directions (Williams, 2017, p.32). In short, New Zealand mountains were formed by tectonic movement pushing rocky land upwards.
It is estimated that the Tararua Ranges (see figure 19) the most considerable mountain range in Wairarapa, emerged about two million years ago (Williams, 2017, p.42). These expansive ranges are made of greywacke and argillite rock. Covered in marine sediments, these rocks fractured and emerged with a certain amount of folding which eventually formed the mountains (Boffa Miskell Ltd, 2010; Williams, 2017). A similar process formed the Remutaka and Aorangi Ranges, the other two principal mountain ranges in Wairarapa (Boffa Miskell Ltd, 2010; Williams, 2017).

Mountains are a vital part of the ongoing movement and materialisation of the region’s landscape. In particular, the many waterways that begin in the Tararua Ranges, such as the Ruamāhanga, grind ground and freight the alpine rock over the flats (Boffa Miskell Ltd, 2010). Thus, greywacke pebbles, gravel, silt, sandstone, mudstone and limestone now cover the plains and also eventually formed the
eastern hill country (Boffa Miskell Ltd, 2010; Eden & Parfitt, 1992). Thus, the Wairarapa can be broadly characterised in four broad central landscapes types: Mountain ranges, plains and lowlands, hill country and the coast (Boffa Miskell Ltd, 2010; Marr, 2001).

Still at a time that is likely to be outside Pākehā imagination the mountains, plains, lowlands and even hill country was forest. For millions of years lively naturalcultural systems emerged engaged in the ancient art of the “dance of encounters” (Haraway 2008, p.4) so as to remake their themselves over and over again, specialists in living and dying with each other (see Haraway, 2016). Indeed, through the processes of photosynthesis, forest floor composting, wind and rain, the forest gradually formed a layered system of cone bearers, frond growers and flower producers from the canopy to the soil floor (Dawson & Lucas, 2011).

Each tree kin developed its own qualities, needs and rituals such as tūrepo needing fertile soil, lemonwoods having a distinctive aroma or kahikatea appreciating swampy wet areas to sit their long roots in (Dawson & Lucas, 2011). Kahikatea sometimes also preferred to mingle among themselves, they are after all, are much taller than any other tree neighbour (Dawson & Lucas, 2011). Other trees struck out on their own too as a means of regenerating disturbed forest. Tōtara, mānuka, kānuka and tree ferns, for instance, developed a great aptitude for reproducing after forest damage (Dawson & Lucas, 2011, pp.92, 108, 311). Rewarewa were often present in forest regeneration as well, highly visible with their conical shape (Dawson & Lucas, 2011). Their “corporeal differentiation” (Whatmore 2002, p.119) is rhythmically cyclical but not harmonious, finished, or whole (see Haraway, 2016) with fungi, spiders, tūī, kererū and more using one another and making one another. This antique forest being made and unmade was not a Garden of Eden, it was a compost — an ancient Community of Compost (Haraway, 2016).

Approximately twenty-six human generations ago the first people entered this forest (Potangaroa in Boffa Miskell Ltd 2010 p.93). A particularly illustrious figure was Whātonga, grandson of Toi te Huatahi. Whātonga was a notable explorer in the early human settlement of the lower North Island and is credited with naming many of the mountains, rivers and lakes in Wairarapa (Marr 2001, p.11, Potangaroa in
Boffa Miskell Ltd 2010 p.93; J. Potangaroa personal communication, March 15, 2014). He was probably also responsible for naming the region itself as looking upon Lake Wairarapa from above he purportedly named it so, owing to its ‘glistening waters’ (J. Potangaroa personal communication, March 15, 2014). Te tini o Awa, descendants of Toi te Huatahi were known as the first people to settle in the area. Accordingly, descendants of Te tini o Awa became known as the people of Ngāi Tara and Rangitāne. Later, Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa arrived from Hawke’s Bay over several migrations since the early fifteenth century (Marr 2001, p.11, Potangaroa in Boffa Miskell Ltd, 2010 p.93). In south Wairarapa Ngāti Ira and Ngāi Tahu whakapapa back to Te Aomatarahi who arrived roughly twelve generations ago. Presently Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa and Rangitāne o Wairarapa are the principal iwi of the area (Potangaroa in Boffa Miskell Ltd 2010 p.93; J. Potangaroa personal communication, March 15, 2014).

The dense varietal forest that covered the plains and mountains provided the new settlers with building materials, medicine and food. The fruits of the kahikatea and titoki trees were used for eating and its foliage for medicine, and the timber from tōtara trees was good for carving, and house and waka building (Dawson & Lucas 2011; p.92, 108, 311). Plump birds were eaten and the feathers used for garment making (Marr, 2001). Like, most new settlers, Wairarapa Māori approached this forest and its non-human inhabitants exploitatively (Marr, 2001; J. Potangaroa personal communication, March 15, 2014). Tracts of forest were burnt for cultivation and species were hunted to either extinction or near extinction. The temperature would have been cold compared to where the people had previously come from and therefore survival, by eating protein and fat, was a priority (Marr, 2001, p.8; J. Potangaroa personal communication, March 15, 2014).

However, a transition period around the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries occurred when faced with dwindling resources. Systems were formed so the ecosystem could regenerate. Resultantly, detailed and intimate knowledge of each local area of occupation in Wairarapa emerged and developed over the next few centuries (Marr, 2001, p.8; Potangaroa in Boffa Miskell Ltd 2010 p.94; J. Potangaroa personal communication, March 15, 2014). A subsistence and small trade economy
(between iwi) emerged using, in particular, eels, planted kumara and gourds, birds, kaimoana and forest materials (Marr 2001; Potangaroa in Boffa Miskell Ltd 2010 p.94). Thus, over time, Wairarapa Māori came to learn to live with the land by moving within its seasonal rhythms which usually meant migrating from inland to the coastline and then back again (Marr, 2001). By setting up temporary camps in certain forest areas, river banks, or trekking over mountains at different times of the year, hapū were able to build and maintain a sustainable “economy, social system and culture” (Marr, 2001, p.9), and form a relationship of “use” with “respect” (Plumwood, 2002, p.160).

About four hundred years ago Māori also learned to stop burning “virgin” forest recognising the impact they were causing, ecologically (Marr, 2001, p.13). What they continued to burn were regenerating trees which is what Cook and his crew would have seen as they made their way along the Wairarapa coast in 1769 (Marr, 2001). This burning on the eastern hill country had the purpose of fertilising the ground for bracken fern growth, the root of which was starchy and key to the local diet (Marr, 2001). Consequently, the land to the east may have been left sparser then before human introduction but the ferns, along with sedges and mānuka shrubs that Māori subsequently grew there — along with the existing groups of matai, tōtara, tawa and kahikatea trees — still allowed the land to flourish (Marr 2001, p.13).

I had the privilege of learning this people-land Wairarapa bedrock from Joseph Potangaroa, the first sit-down interview I conducted for this research which took place in his house in Masterton 2014. Joseph Potangaroa was the person I was referred to whilst in communication with the iwi in the region, Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Kahungunu ki Wairarapa. Jo had the tribal authority to discuss Wairarapa Māori history even though he was principally affiliated to Rangitāne o Wairarapa and Ngāti Kahungunu further up the coast. Generously Jo also gave me a draft he wrote for the Wairarapa landscape study (see Boffa Miskell Ltd, 2010 for the published version) which details the human history of the region before Europeans arrived. I also owe a great deal of thanks to Jo for supporting me in writing my mihi that cites Wairarapa Māori whenua, namely the Tararua Ranges
and its waters, I feel describe my home. Further research led to me to Waitangi Tribunal commissioned reports and the Wairarapa Waitangi Tribunal report which investigated iwi grievance. It is these sources from Potangaroa, Cathy Marr and the Tribunal itself — and local Pākehā historians — that I draw on to explore the land and history of Wairarapa.

Becoming Pākehā in Wairarapa

A local Pākehā historian that informs much of this chapter is Gareth Winter. Gareth has written a significant amount about early Māori European contact and Pākehā history in the region. He has authored several publications\(^78\) and worked at the local library and district council as an archivist in Masterton. Owing to the rural and provincial character of Wairarapa, from a Pākehā perspective, Gareth fortuitously knew a lot about the farming history in the region. I was very grateful that he was happy to take a break from his work on a couple of occasions and join me for morning tea. Sitting around a kitchen table in frosty July 2014 then, with the curtains tied up to let the sun through, Gareth warped time and space for us both. I followed his reverie back to the nineteenth century to view what was happening between settlers and land. Unlike the written European history I had read, Gareth kept knitting colonial encounters back to the land where we were sitting on, the street names adjacent to us, and the cemetery down the road.

Masterton’s Original Cemetery lay adjacent to a newer one and contains many of the first European settlers including Masterton founder, Joseph Masters (1802-873). Since Gareth introduced me to the place I often visited the cemetery to think about my research. Moss-covered, crumbling headstones lie wedged in the humus coloured soil, scattered with leaves and twigs from the towering exotic trees overhead. In autumn both old and new cemeteries are covered in golden falling leaves. Brown and crunchy underfoot I crushed them while surveying the dead who

\(^{78}\) For example Street Stories: How Masterton’s Streets Got Their Names (1998); Street Wise: How the Streets of Carterton, Greytown, Featherston and Martinborough Got Their Names (1999); The Look of Masterton: A Celebration of 150 Years 1854-2004 (2004); A Very Publick Reserve: The Story of a Community’s Parks (2008); Two Men of Mana and Other Stories: A Celebration of Wairarapa’s Early Days (2010)
provided me captivating history lessons. Sitting on a large tree root or dilapidated stone wall I regularly pondered at the union between composted humans and soil below me and how interesting it is that — in more ways than one — this togetherness provides a rich foundation for the town and the region.

The first Pākehā settling of Wairarapa began on the coast whereby sealers and whalers set up shore based stations through agreement with local iwi. Then, in the early 1840s, Europeans settled inland following the establishment of the New Zealand Company’s Wellington settlement (Winter in Boffa Miskell Ltd 2010 p.95; G. Winter personal communication, July 8 2014). Early entrepreneurs such as Charles Clifford (1813-1893), Henry Petre (1820-1889) and Frederick Weld (1823-1891) negotiated lease holding with iwi directly. In a colony-wide context this was conducted fairly early on, Clifford and Weld having set up Wharekaka by 1844, one of the first sheep stations in the country (Peden & Holland, 2013, p.92).

By 1845 twelve hill country stations had been negotiated in the region (Winter in Boffa Miskell Ltd 2010 p.95; G. Winter personal communication, July 8 2014) and by 1847, there were 1,300 cattle and 13,000 sheep (McAlloon, 2013, p. 80). This early pastoralism was the result of an amicable relationship between Pākehā and Māori. In fact, this “leasehold economy” (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010, p.23) that emerged during 1843 was beneficial for both parties. Māori iwi were paid a reasonable amount (approximately 12,000 pounds per year) whilst the settlers probably made around nineteen to twenty percent annually on their investment: “Ventures like these were the life-blood of the new colony” (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010, p.23).

Indeed McAlloon (2013) points to how Wairarapa, along with the east coast of the South Island and Hawke’s Bay, quickly became core to the colonial economy.

Culturally, this system for Māori was based on the iwi tradition of tuku whenua (Marr 2001, pp.17-18; Waitangi Tribunal, 2010). Tuku whenua allows long term occupation of somebody else’s land. There are obligations that came with such a gifting though. Recipients were expected “to contribute to the welfare of the community”, by for example, providing produce from the land and supporting the giver socially and politically (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010, p.31). Such a leasing relationship ensured Māori retained ownership of their land and a monetary
income whilst also allowing Pākehā settlement to proceed at a rate with which they were comfortable (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010). Belich too (1996, p.226) notes the relationship between these early pastoralists who mostly settled on Ngāti Kahungunu land, arguing that it would never have been viable unless Wairarapa Māori had wanted to take part given the expertise the settlers lacked. In these early farming days then, Māori-European relations continued the fruitful cross-cultural relations forged between Māori and the sealers and whalers who had arrived in the late eighteenth century (Belich, 1996).

For settlers, being able to come across land and make a deal with iwi directly fulfilled the arcadian fantasy of procuring property in the ‘New World’ and making a living from it, without the hassle of government regulation or interference (Fairburn, 1989). However, this system of ‘squatting’, as mentioned in the previous chapter, was soon classed as illegal under colonial law because at the time all leasing or selling had to go through the Crown (Marr, 2001; Waitangi Tribunal, 2010). There was also evidence to suggest squatters were becoming unsatisfied with simply leasing and wanted to buy land outright (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010). There were murmurs too that pastoralists were becoming impatient with iwi obligations associated with tuku whenua traditions (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010).

At any rate Crown land surveyors in the 1840s were already being sent (from Wellington) to explore the inland of Wairarapa to ascertain its farming suitability (Winter in Boffa Miskell Ltd 2010; G. Winter personal communication, July 8 2014). Following the squatters lead, surveyors concluded that the easiest route to farming would be the eastern hill country where there was not as much bush compared to that of the flood plains (G. Winter personal communication, July 8 2014; Waitangi Tribunal, 2010 vol 1). In 1853 a komiti nui was held to discuss the bulk selling of the recently surveyed land, led by, the then Governor, George Grey (1812-1898) and Crown purchase agent Donald Mclean (1820-1877) (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010).
Figure 20. A map of where the New Zealand Wars took place. Wairarapa is located on the south east of the North Island. Source: O’Malley (2019, p.8)
Grey and Maclean sold tangata whenua a vision (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010). They demonstrated how selling land to the Crown would make Māori lives immeasurably better, not just because of the large amount of capital they would receive, but of the close partnership that would ensue between Māori and European; after all, both peoples were to share “a common destiny” (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010 vol 1, p.ii). The European negotiators also insisted there would be many reserves for Māori to live on (Carle, 1946, p.123). During the komiti nui Grey’s proposal was accepted by Māori although in what capacity they agreed to is rather suspect given Grey warned iwi if they rejected the offer by the Crown, the pastoralists leasing Māori land would be expelled (Carle, 1946, p.123). In other words, iwi had little choice but to agree to Grey’s proposal if they wanted to continue their relationship with Europeans (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010).

Relations between Wairarapa Māori and settlers after the sale soon began to fray and were part of a breakdown of the relationships between Māori-European relations more generally. The Treaty of Waitangi had been signed in 1840 which ensured sovereignty and British protection for Māori country-wide (O’Malley, 2019). Part of the Treaty deal was that if Māori wanted to sell land, they had to make an offer to the (British) Crown first, a tactic to freeze out other European countries looking to assert their power (Belich, 1996). Belich (1996) explains that the mythology that Britain was the only serious contender in the race to annex New Zealand is still prevalent. However, the historian asserts that this is the narrative the Crown and developers promoted so as to encourage that kind of optimism touched on in the previous chapter. Britain’s ‘natural’ dominance was a way to assure settlers, coming all the way from the antipodes to make a new life, that they were arriving in a British-controlled colony.

For Britain’s plan to work though, land was needed and many iwi decided to stop selling as they were worried about losing their mana and tūrangawaewae (O’Malley, 2019; Walker, 2004). They were also becoming increasingly alarmed at the amount of settlers arriving in the new colony. To cut a very violent bloody and
 compulsory story short\textsuperscript{79}, the Crown reacted to iwi not wanting to sell their land by breaching the Treaty and confiscating land on the basis of very dubious legal reasons (O’Malley, 2019; Walker, 2004). Conflicts broke out around the North Island with Wairarapa being a curious exception (see figure 20).

Why such a story is important to Wairarapa is owing to the region’s questionable title ‘the bloodless province’ (G. Winter personal communication, July 8 2014). The belief that Wairarapa was never involved in the nineteenth century military engagements has created the veneer that Pākehā settled this part of the country peacefully. As figure (20) shows there is some truth to this idea as Wairarapa, a region in the Southern eastern corner of the North Island of New Zealand is, along with the South Island, conspicuously free of recorded wars. Yet as intimated, the more probable reason there were no wars in these places was because of the swift way in which the Crown took control in terms of politics, land and people beginning with the bulk selling of land in 1853.

Consequently, on the one hand there were settlers in Wairarapa believing they were living in a conflict-free province and on the other the other were iwi, who by this stage had little political power and land (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010). Undoubtedly, the promise that Grey made with Wairarapa iwi — who has infamously been called by Walker “the hit-man of colonisation” (2004, see p.103) — was not kept (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010). For one, there were the practicalities of such a deal that were less than satisfactory. As part of the negotiations with local iwi and hapū certain reserves were established for Māori to occupy. Yet, these reserves were not fully discussed, thought through, or clearly defined, and were ultimately areas the Crown also later purchased (Waitangi Tribunal 2010 vol 1; see also Walker, 2004, p.138). Moreover the stations previously leased to pastoralists by iwi, were owned by the Crown by 1853, and so the land was sold back to the original squatters leaving Māori with no land, no rent and no legal authority at all (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010). Compounding this situation was the alarming amount of European settlers arriving that soon outnumbered Māori.

\textsuperscript{79} See O’Malley (2019) for an in-depth account of each ‘New Zealand war’.
There was a sense of betrayal felt by iwi that settler populations were able to obscure with the forgetting narrative: ‘Bloodless province’ — arcadian in its intent to smother complex situations with harmony and peace (Evans, 2007; Waitangi Tribunal, 2010). As time went on Māori did not just become numerically outnumbered, but also culturally, economically and legally marginalised. This was not just a breach of Grey’s promise but a breach of the Treaty signed by Wairarapa Māori, that ensured legally, a partnership between both parties (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010; Walker, 2004). Thus, even though there was no armed conflict in Wairarapa there was serious loss of mana in the thrust of Europeans making home and things were set to get much worse (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010; Walker, 2004). For example, By the 1940s rural iwi existence began to dwindle through successive land legislation that, in broad terms, allowed land to be confiscated if it was not used for capitalist production (Walker, 2004, pp.197-199). This move pushed Māori into urban areas which the Crown encouraged as it was good for national economic growth, commonly known as the nation-wide urbanisation of Māori in the mid-twentieth century (Marr, 2001; Walker, 2004, pp.197-199).

However, the Masterton Borough Council and many Masterton residents had other ideas when Wairarapa Māori began moving into town (Marr, 2001, p.81). Specifically, Pākehā locals became “openly suspicious and antagonistic” towards Māori buying houses (Marr, 2001, p.81). More tension arose as the council discovered the government was planning to build a designated area for Māori social housing. In 1945 the council wrote a letter to the Native Department elaborating on its concern that such housing would be located too close to town and suggested it be built outside on the outskirts where it would be “easier to supervise” as there were no “blighted or neglected” dwelling areas in Masterton and they wanted to keep it that way (Masterton Borough Council, 18 May, 1945 in Marr, 2001, p.81). The residents agreed and were also worried that Māori moving into town would reduce the value of their houses. Even the Borough’s engineer wrote in a memo that he had “no time for natives” and insisted that any housing built for Māori needs to be a separate site “exclusive from Europeans” (Cooper, 31 May, 1945 in Marr, 2001, p.82).
Unfortunately, these sentiments are still felt throughout Wairarapa (Marr, 2001; Waitangi Tribunal, 2010 vol 1; Walker, 2004). A vignette entered into evidence for the Waitangi Tribunal Report (2010) by the then educator, Marama Fox\(^\text{80}\), is demonstrative of such White exceptionalism. In the 1990s Fox proposed to set up a kōhanga reo in Carterton, a Wairarapa town not far south of Masterton. Once it had been lodged for consent through the local council, submissions were filed against the project. Among the concerns were “fear of loud noise, abandoned vehicles [and] gang affiliations” (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010 vol 3, p.900). Furthermore, when a building had been found to set the school up, before it was even opened, it was vandalised, complete with the letters ‘KKK’\(^\text{81}\) tagged on the front door. Once the kōhanga reo was operating it was further targeted by someone flooding the building. One Friday night someone opened a window and placed a hose through it and left it running all weekend. As the children graduated Fox also set up Te Kura Kaupapa o Wairarapa which faced similar issues and opposition (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010 vol 3, p.900).

Exacerbating the marginalisation Māori experience in Wairarapa are the most recent and reliable census statistics\(^\text{82}\). From the 2013 census data\(^\text{83}\) 86.6 percent of the Masterton District population identified as European New Zealander\(^\text{84}\) compared to that of 18.6 percent who identified as Māori. In the Carterton District people who asserted that they were European New Zealander was 91.4 percent, contrasted with 11.8 percent who said they were of Māori descent. Within the Tararua District — a part of the Wairarapa for this project — 85.2 percent categorised themselves as European New Zealander, weighed against 21.2 percent of those who stated that they were Māori. Lastly, in the South Wairarapa District, which includes the towns of Greytown, Featherston and Martinborough, 90.2

\(^{80}\) And former co-leader of the New Zealand Māori Party
\(^{81}\) An acronym for the White supremacy organisation, Klu Klux Klan
\(^{82}\) There was widespread criticism of the 2018 census for not producing accurate data especially for Māori, and not producing useful data sets in a timely manner. See for example: https://thespinoff.co.nz/atea/01-08-2018/has-the-2018-census-failed-maori/
\(^{84}\) Statistics New Zealand does not have an option for Pākehā, only European New Zealander.
percent claimed a European New Zealander ethnicity whilst 13.7 percent said that they were Māori\textsuperscript{85}.

Māori are not only dramatically outnumbered by Pākehā in all districts, but since the selling of iwi land, Māori have worked for farms rather than run them, working-class labour being the most common form of employment such as sheep shearing or abattoir work (Marr, 2001; Waitangi Tribunal, 2010). This is not what iwi counted on when they entered into a relationship with Grey. Nevertheless, in the drive for nineteenth century settlement, or ‘material progress’ (that other transcendent Pākehā desire alongside forgetting) the new comers were far too preoccupied with their own politics to worry about their obligations to Māori in the future or at the time.

\textit{Figure 21.} Cleared bush in Mauriceville Wairarapa 1890s. Alexander Turnbull Library. Source Fairburn (1989, p.157)

\textsuperscript{85} Māori had the option of identifying as only Māori or Māori in conjunction with other ethnicities therefore percentages can add up to more than 100\%.
In the same year the komiti nui was held (1853), there were mounting tensions from within the settler population as well. Joseph Masters (1802-1873), a settler living in Wellington, was becoming disconcerted at the amount of Wairarapa land being sold to former squatters who, by that time, had become rather wealthy (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010). As a working-class man from England, Masters was determined to secure a livelihood for him and his fellow companions (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010). Therefore, Masters approached Grey and proposed a Small Farms Association (Charles Rooking Carter (1822-1896) also became significant to the process at a later date). Masters’ plan was to carve up the densely bushy Wairarapa flood plains into forty acre farm blocks with one acre blocks set aside for the development of towns. Envisioning a kind of “arcadian ideal of land owning peasantry” (Winter personal communication, July 8 2014) Masters drew on the
(working-class) arcadian propaganda at the time which advertised New Zealand as a “labourer’s paradise” (Fairburn, 1989, pp.43-44): Masters’ himself literally leading the way, purportedly carrying a box of bees on his back over the Remutaka hill in 1855, a year before a road was built connecting Wellington and Wairarapa (Carle, 1946).

Charles Bannister (a local historian) was told the story of how Masters achieved his goal by a local named Tukanohi (or Tukunohi) many years later (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010 p.111). Even though there is no evidence that Te Retimana Te Kōrou, chief of Ngāti Hāmuia (hapū of Rangitāne), or his son-in-law Ihāia Whakamairu, objected to the sale of their land on the flood plains, there was undoubtedly pressure. For example, part of the negotiations between Masters, Te Kōrou and his hapū at Ngāumutawa (near present-day Masterton) Masters (with Grey by his side) emphasised how the towns to be built would benefit Māori greatly. For instance, rather than travelling all the way to Wellington, iwi could purchase the things they needed readily in the proposed towns of Masterton or Greytown (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010).

Thus, bush clearance began. In Greytown alone over 10,000 acres of bush was cleared within ten years of small farm settlement (Marr 2001, p.20). Towns were built around rivers which acted as ‘natural’ borders such as the Waiohine between Greytown and Carterton and the Waipoua in Masterton (Maclean, 2001; Marr, 2001). Initially, Carterton was known as the Three Mile Bush and established so settlers working on the road between Masterton and Greytown could stay somewhere convenient. However, it eventually emerged as a town and in 1859 changed its name to Carterton after small farm advocate Charles Rooking Carter.

The land there was cleared and small crop, dairy and dry stock farming was established along with saw milling (G. Winter personal communication 8 July 2014). In fact, shortly after the establishment of Greytown and Masterton, the Wellington Provincial Council laid out just over one hundred ten acre sections within the Three Mile Bush or Carterton for working-class settlers (Marr, 2001, p.21).

Further south to the east, Martinborough was also established but much later by another working-class man John Martin (1822-1892). Despite his humble origins
Martin eventually made enough money to buy a very large farm which he cut up into blocks and sold on as small farms. In 1879 he carved the 33,000 acre Huangarua station into 593 town plots of 1 acre and 334 farm blocks that ranged from 4.5-1100 acres (Howland, 2002, p.78). It was during this period that farm development throughout Wairarapa was intensified through the introduction of exotic pasture sowing, fencing and large-scale clearance of indigenous flora (Marr, 2001).

Even north of Masterton, which was both very bushy and very hilly — and therefore difficult to clear and settle — was to be developed. One of the most significant clearances in northern Wairarapa was the 1870s deforestation of the Forty Mile Bush, which was the southern part of the Seventy Mile Bush, stretching across Wairarapa and Hawke’s Bay (Marr, 2001; G. Winter personal communication, July 8 2014). Gareth explained to me that during the 1870s Scandinavians were assisted to migrate and fell the area which was reputedly so dark they needed lanterns to see what they were doing even in broad daylight (G. Winter personal communication, July 8 2014).

In what was to become Mauriceville, settlers were promised forty acre blocks of land (see figure 21) in exchange for such work including road and railway construction (Marr, 2001; G. Winter personal communication, July 8 2014). An image (see figure 22) was taken of the forty mile bush around 1875. Pawson and Brooking (2013, p.19) use it to illustrate the prowess of the settler in colonial New Zealand. They argue the picture shows the road and the man as symbols that the vast dense vegetation may be overcome. This reflected the setter ethos at the time, an era of intensification and overcoming ‘wilderness’ to cultivate a sense of home, personally and culturally.

---

86 The Crown had bought it as part of the purchase of Rangitāne land.
Similar scale clearances were occurring near Mauriceville in what is now known as Alfredton. Originally named Moroa\textsuperscript{87}, like the rest of Wairarapa, Alfredton was cleared by Europeans largely through fire. However because parts of the indigenous forest was so dense and wet a large amount of bush remained (Edmonds, 1987). Tracking north of Alfredton was to be called the Tiraumea district where again, wet dense bush made it difficult to clear. Accordingly — because of its remote location — early settlers were tasked at building their own roads and houses and cooked mainly on camp ovens as few company or Crown resources made it to the new European settlement (Burns & White, 2006). The dwellings settlers lived in were built from timber of Kahikatea trees (Burns & White, 2006, p.20). Kahikatea wood was straight grained and easy to split and handle. The timber was cut into slabs and were then measured and cut evenly by making their own chalk line by using burnt flax sticks to make a paste out of the black carbon which they then smeared along fishing twine (Burns & White, 2006, p.20; see also Evans, 2007, p.50).

\textsuperscript{87} Probably a misunderstood version of the local iwi name mangaroa: manga = stream, roa = long. Long stream (Edmonds 1987, p.11). Moroa was also one of the promised reserve sites for Māori that never eventuated (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010).
Figure 24. ‘Bush fellers’ in Tiraumea. Source: Burns and White (2006, p.284)
Local historians Ngaire Burns and Jill White (2006) also explain in lucid detail the routine of settlers clearing the bush for agriculture (see figures 23 & 24). Then known as the Waterfalls district, felling took place in the winter because despite the wet conditions the weather was cooler and there was less to do. A typical winter’s day began in the dark at 5.30am with breakfast by hurricane lamp, bush felling all day until there was no more daylight, and then returning home after sunset. In summer the day was devoted to general sheep work, working for other settlers, or working on the roads to supplement the new settlers’ income (Burns & White, 2006, p.19).

Essentially, the men used a slash and burn technique. In the forest undergrowth vegetation was cut with a slasher in fine weather to avoid the axeman being constantly wet from the water-soaked foliage. If the weather was bad the larger trees would be chopped down and if it had not already been cut, the undergrowth was left. Medium-sized trees were axed partly through and then the heavier trees were cut all the way through which when fell, also crashed the partly felled trees to the ground. Cutting always commenced at the bottom of the hill so that the falling trees fell clear and avoided a tangle of trunks and branches. Trees up to 1.5 metres across were felled. If they were larger they were left to be burnt down or at least killed (Burns & White, 2006, p.19). After firing, the ash-covered ground was sown with grass seed and fenced if necessary, or financially possible (Burns & White, 2006, p.19). Unfortunately, the “natural fertility” of the ‘burns offs’ depleted very quickly so added fertilisers were eventually needed (Burns & White, 2006, p.19).

Despite little involvement from the colonial government Tiraumea was still farmed under the Crown’s Pastoral Lease scheme where the first European settlers were able to acquire quite large areas (Burns & White, 2006). However, owing to the quickly depleting fertility (following the bush burning) many of these original European settlers left. Thus, Burns and White (2006) note how by the 1890s there was a new wave of settlers that came into the area, many of whom came from Canterbury. Second-wave settlers were only able to purchase 200 acres because of recent Crown legislation. However, if the land was seen to be of low quality blocks could be extended to 320 acres (Burns & White, 2006). In practice though, some
blocks reached 2000 acres in size due to the land’s poor condition (Burns & White, 2006).

Not all the hilly places in Wairarapa were able to be cleared though. As intimated, the Remutaka Ranges were partially cleared for travel between Wellington and Wairarapa. However the sprawling bushy alpine Tararua Ranges were only able to be cleared in the foothills and lower reaches where settlers tried their hand at farming and exotic\textsuperscript{88} forestry (G. Winter personal communication, July 8 2014; Marr, 2001). In the drive for ‘material progress’ the ranges were seen as more or less wasted space even if they were included in the bulk selling of Māori land (Marr, 2001; Pawson, 2013).

These ‘wasted spaces’ — mountains — as explained in the previous chapter, soon became a focus point for settler recreation and a space wherein virility could be proven (Abdinor, 2000; Bannister, 2005; Evans, 2007). Even though the most popular ascents were the snowy-peaks that filled so much of the mountainous country in New Zealand (see chapter four), the Tararua Ranges still garnered interest. In 1910 1,000 people climbed Mount Holdsworth (one of the higher peaks in the ranges) during that year’s season (Pawson, 2013, p.163) and by 1919 the Tararua Tramping Club (TTC) was formed.

Along with the rest of Wairarapa then, the Tararua Ranges became a White space even though archaeological evidence points to how Māori roamed the mountains for generations, even along the precarious tops (Marr, 2001; Pawson, 2013, p. 60). The bushy mountains were to be Whitened even more with the prospect of building hydropower development on several of the rivers (Pawson, 2013). This was seen as one of the reasons as to why the ranges were not ushered into the sacred shrine of ‘National Park’ status — a process categorising, in law, a romantic arcadianism wherein ‘wilderness’ is bound, preserved and protected for (White) people to come and gaze at (see chapter three and four). The hydropower plans did not eventuate but the mountains were never going to be a National Park anyway. The lack of “spectacular scenery” (Pawson, 2013, p.172) the shaggy ranges apparently did not

\textsuperscript{88} Pine trees of different kinds such as Redwood and Radiata
possess, prevented the area from ever becoming a National Park, and instead was awarded the lesser title of Forest Park in 1954.

**Living (with) inheritances**

In one sense, much has changed in Wairarapa since Europeans first penetrated the bushy mountains and cleared the flood plains to make way for an arcadian ideal. The small farms Masters initiated have all gone and the one acre plots in town have being cut into quarter acres and smaller. Much of the farmland even into the mid-twentieth century is now been built upon with houses. Masterton, the original focal point for an ideal, is far from it. Apart from a few clusters of wealth, the town is filled with the White impecuniosity I lived in as young person in Christchurch. In the east where I reside pavements are routinely littered with broken glass and dog faeces; takeaway rubbish and empty alcohol bottles fill the gutters; loud fast modified cars dominate the streets; drunk teenagers row at night; petrol fuelled backyard fires regularly spark; and relentless police sirens and intermittent brawls can be heard and seen outside my office window. Skinny hungry dogs wander in search for food with countless cats doing the same but ducking under and jumping over people’s fences.

Yet these scenes are materially and meaningfully attached to the nineteenth century. For one, the class divide between big and small farmers is still stark. Farmers possess the wealth and urban dwellers – the contemporary small farmers – are mostly poor. I see too the street names, the acre plots, the family names, the racism towards Māori, the farming landscapes that all speak of the place’s lively violent history. I have talked to low paid workers, fellow customers, ambling strangers, gardeners, hunters, trampers in Masterton for a few years now and the settler ethic of always needing to make more ‘material progress’ (Fairburn, 1989) still seems to be the priority.

One major political economic shift that has caused much of the contemporary focus on ‘material progress’ for every one of us here was the economic reforms (see Marr, 2001). Faced with national financial pressure the fourth Labour government, driven by the then finance minister Roger Douglas, instituted what is now known
domestically as ‘rogernomics’. Rogernomics was a free market approach to the economy that followed other Western countries such as the UK and the U.S (see Harvey, 2005). However, a distinctiveness of New Zealand’s neoliberal89 economic reforms has been the changes to the agricultural sector which was, at the time, and still is, the core national economic performer alongside tourism (Haggerty, Campbell & Morris, 2009; Pawson, 2018).

Post-World War II farming in New Zealand experienced a long boom. Between the 1940s, through to the 1950s and 1960s, Wairarapa shared in this nationwide trend of agricultural prosperity which kept towns buoyant (Marr, 2001). By 1967 however, wool prices began to dip (Haggerty, Campbell & Morris, 2009). Thus, with falling commodity prices, and Britain joining the European Economic Community (ECC) in the 1970s, sheep and beef farming in Wairarapa declined during the 1970s and by 1989 the local abattoir was closed (Marr, 2001, p. 70). The Waingawa Freezing Works (between Carterton and Masterton) was the region’s biggest employer and in the 1960s employed up to 700 people at the peak of the season (Marr, 2001, p.69).

Rogernomics dramatically altered the agriculture sector throughout New Zealand but the reforms hit sheep and beef farming more readily (Barnett & Pauling, 2005; Johnsen, 2003; Marr, 2001). To be sure, the other main agriculture sector in New Zealand, dairy farming, was affected but owing to its ostensive efficient internal structuring and reliable markets, investment into dairy increased during this period and the industry actually thrived (Barnett & Pauling, 2005, p.277; see also chapter one). The specific reforms for both sectors included subsidies, such as fertiliser and supplementary minimum price schemes being cut; tariffs were removed from agricultural imports; the exchange rate was floated; interest on loans was increased; a new tax system was introduced and previous government support for, pest and weed control for example, became privatised (Barnett & Pauling, 2005 p.271; Johnsen 2003, p.129; see also Harvey, 2005). The positives such as tariff

89 David Harvey (2005) summarises neoliberalism as an increase of production and consumption in order to achieve maximum profit within business. Principally, this occurs through government deregulation, privatisation and an entrepreneurial culture that seeks to create markets wherever they do not exist.
removal could not stem the tide of sheep and beef farmers losing 40% of their income through subsidies though, especially as wool prices were low and they had to pay for their own inputs; so as a result many went bankrupt (Barnett & Pauling, 2005, p.277; Johnsen, 2003 p.129).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wairarapa 1990</th>
<th>Sheep stock</th>
<th>Beef cattle</th>
<th>Dairy cattle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masterton district</td>
<td>1,263,167</td>
<td>63,965</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carterton</td>
<td>346,566</td>
<td>19,769</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Wairarapa</td>
<td>759,973</td>
<td>28,748</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tararua District</td>
<td>2,345,040</td>
<td>8,1642</td>
<td>1,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,714,746</strong></td>
<td><strong>194,124</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,271</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite this palpable reality farmers’ organisations emphasised the advantages of neoliberal reforms rather than its shortcomings (Johnsen, 2003, p.129). For example, Federated Farmers underscored the values of freedom, autonomy and efficiency within the restructuring through policy statements, public addresses and media (Johnsen, 2003, p.130). This in effect “naturalised” these concepts (Johnsen 2003 p.130), drawing on the political economic principles of the arcadian economy (Fairburn, 1989). Indeed, not only did the rural restructuring espouse settler arcadian tenets such as self-regulation and self-reliance, the ‘naturalising’ at play sought to veil the problems that existed (see Evans, 2007; Fairburn, 1989). In fact, Sarah Johnsen (2003) explains how shrouding the issues that arose from the neoliberalising of agriculture led to a dismissal of the struggle experienced on the farm level and the internal disagreement within farmers’ organisations concerning these economic reforms. Moreover, where struggle was admitted farmers were framed as incompetent even though many farmers suffered social and psychological
impacts, stress and physical ill health, much of which led into the 1990s (Johnsen, 2003, p.130).

Sheep and beef have always dominated Wairarapa. A local historian Cyril Jordan Carle (1921-1988) wrote a history of the district about a hundred years after European settlement (1946). He recorded then that in the 1940s sheep and beef were the main farming stocks largely owing to the wide expanse of relatively unfertile land not suitable for dairy farming. Still, dairying in the region has always been steady with many of the small farms being turned into dairy farms during the twentieth century (G. Winter personal communication, July 8 2014). According to Carle, in the 1940s there were nearly 2,000,000 sheep and 45,000 dairy cattle with a large amount of beef cattle as well. Collectively, agriculture (including horticulture such as fruit) amounted to around six million pounds a year for the region — an ostensive ‘paradise’ (Carle, 1946).

Even in the 1990 agricultural census the there were high stock numbers with sheep and beef unsurprisingly most prevalent (see table 1). Yet by 2017 there was a marked decrease in stock numbers which points to a reduction in farms in Wairarapa rather than destocking given the period of the twenty-first century has been one of intensification even in the dry stock sector (Barnett & Pauling, 2005; Johnsen, 2003; Pawson, 2018). Significantly there was a decrease in sheep and beef numbers and an increase in dairy cows (see table 2). As discussed in chapter one, many farmers chose to convert to dairy during the boom (see chapter one) and this was the case in Wairarapa. Although, looking at the figures in table 2 and the data analysed by Le Heron (2018, p.30), the dairy boom in Wairarapa was not as intense as it was in areas such as Waikato, Northland, Southland and Canterbury.

---

90 1990 is the earliest ‘sub-national’ data available at Statistics New Zealand (see http://archive.stats.govt.nz/infoshare/SelectVariables.aspx?pxID=decf19c7-f96b-4387-a19d-5bf8ade7abfb)

91 Sheep, beef and dairy were the central farm types although there were a number of grain, vegetable and fruit operations (see http://archive.stats.govt.nz/infoshare/SelectVariables.aspx?pxID=decf19c7-f96b-4387-a19d-5bf8ade7abfb)

92 Farm counts for 1990 were not available to compare with 2017 farm counts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wairarapa 2017</th>
<th>Sheep stock</th>
<th>Beef cattle</th>
<th>Dairy cattle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masterton district</td>
<td>822,747</td>
<td>56,759</td>
<td>16,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carterton</td>
<td>233,623</td>
<td>20,255</td>
<td>21,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Wairarapa</td>
<td>370,554</td>
<td>45,969</td>
<td>49,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tararua District</td>
<td>1,358,369</td>
<td>123,586</td>
<td>124,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,785,293</strong></td>
<td><strong>246,569</strong></td>
<td><strong>212,186</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Other strategies that dry stock farmers chose to implement in the wake of the reforms was to sell, diversify or subdivide their land (Howland, 2002, p.78; Johnsen 2003; Sanson, Cook & Fairweather, 2004; Swaffield & Fairweather, 1998). Subdivision, whereby farmers carve up blocks of land to sell, made available, an abundance of small holdings in the market at a time when there was a counter-urbanisation movement within Western countries (Swaffield & Fairweather 1998). To elaborate, Swaffield & Fairweather (1998) argue a certain portion of wealthy urban residents during the 1980s and 1990s in the West were becoming dissatisfied with city living (Howland, 2002; Swaffield & Fairweather 1998). New Zealand was no different in this regard and what has become commonly known as ‘lifestyle blocks’ emerged wherein mostly urban buyers decided to purchase small rural properties ostensibly for the ‘lifestyle’ rather than its conventional ‘productive’ value (Swaffield & Fairweather, 1998).

A case in point is the town of Martinborough. Martin’s borough, largely reflected the wider national agricultural economy throughout the twentieth century (Howland, 2002, p.78). For example, the district experienced the wool boom during the Korean War and the economic waning in the 1970s (Howland, 2002, p.78). Peter Howland notes (2002, p.78) that during this time locals described Martinborough as
a “ghost town”. This economic situation coupled with the government’s forewarning of subsidy cuts provoked sheep and beef farmers to make tough decisions (Howland, 2002, p.78). Consequently, Martinborough underwent serious land transformation.

Specifically, the wine grape-friendly soil became increasingly used for growing vineyards (Howland, 2002). The first vineyards in the Wairarapa were introduced in 1880s but were abandoned by 1905 owing to the impending decision to enforce the area as ‘dry’ (Marr, 2001). They made a reprisal though and in 1978 Alister Taylor planted a vineyard at the place that was to become Te Kairanga winery (Howland, 2002; Marr, 2001, p.70). By the 1990s, owing to both the availability of land and its free draining soil, wine became a thriving industry in Martinborough and has since extended into Gladstone and Masterton where there are similar soil types. Marr (2001) explains with the advent of the wine industry in Martinborough there has been a rise in adventure tourism, holiday homes and farm stays (see also Howland, 2002). Concurrently many ‘lifestyle blocks’ and “specialist alternative farms” have emerged that have focussed on new farming ideas such as goats, emu, ostriches, alpacas, llamas and uncommon or rare sheep and cattle breeds (Marr, 2001, p.71).

Advertised as a “clean green” “picturesque” “rural idyll”, Peter Howland suggests Martinborough contemporarily resonates with the ideals of the “original Arcadia” which he defines as “the prototypical rural idyll believed to be the foundation of agriculture and domesticated animals, art, music, literature and collaborative community” (2008, pp.77-81). Like Pliny the Younger then (see chapter two & three), wanting to escape the city but still maintain an “urbane” cultural sophistication (2002, p.81), Wellington wine tourists in Martinborough seek an arcadia built on urban visions (Howland, 2002; see also chapter two). Indeed, the establishment of wine tasting, wine drinking, and more recently olive oil production and tasting in the South Wairarapa town is strikingly resonant of the wealthy ancient Mediterranean in rather fruitful ways (Howland, 2008; Schama, 1995).

It is this middle-class urban culture that Swaffield and Fairweather (1998) argue drove the ‘lifestyle block’ movement analysing the phenomenon through the prism of “arcadia” or a “healthy, peaceful and natural way of life” (Little, 1987, p.186 in
Swaffield & Fairweather, 1998, p.112). Helpfully, Sanson, Cook & Fairweather (2004) conducted a survey on the growth of small holdings in New Zealand so as to explore their significance economically. Of the data Sanson et al., (2004) collected there were 947 usable responses. Six categories were available for land producers to choose from: Lifestyler; hobby farmer; small farmer; farmer; horticulturalist/grower; other (Sanson et al., 2004, p.20). The researchers also drew on the Valuation Roll which, as of August 2004, had assessed 139,868 small holdings. Based on their projected growth of 6,800 annually there is most likely to be well over 200,000 small holdings nationally (Sanson et al., 2004). At the time of the report there were 1,305 small holdings in Tararua, 1,433 in Masterton, 740 in Carterton and 824 in Martinborough (Sanson et al., 2004, p.6).

The survey also helpfully examined rates of production, which, year by year, were recorded as consistent (Sanson et al., 2004, p.26). In approximate averaged numbers, raising sheep earned $3,500 a year. Deer was the most profitable at an average of $20,000. Beef and dairy were also profitable, earning, per year, $6,000 and $15,000 respectively (Sanson et al., 2004, p.23). Notably, even though home kill production was recorded at 45.6% (Sanson et al., 2004, p.25) the survey generally presupposed ‘productivity’ through capitalist earnings so there was no analysis on how home-kill contributed to the economy of each property. Interestingly, vineyards earned $160,000 a year whilst fruit production in general earned $200,000 a year (Sanson et al.,2004, p.24). Unfortunately, there was no data to assess the extent of fowl egg laying or non-animal subsistence production such as vegetables and fruit trees, and how this production, along with home-kill, added economic value to people’s livelihoods. Nevertheless, the survey provides useful materiality to the argument of this chapter that has been about composting arcadia with Wairarapa matter and the matters of Wairarapa histories and land-use practices.

Facing the past

The compost matter of Wairarapa has at times nourished and at other times starved those who have inherited what was before. Inheritances, human and not,
can be risky family makers (Haraway, 2011; 2016) especially when it comes to Pākehā settling. Yet if we face what has gone before, and therefore what we carry in our flesh, response-ably (Bell, 2014; Haraway, 2008; 2016) there may be potential for re-turning the compost into something which reaps ripe fruit. Far from trying to condemn what we Pākehā have done and continue to do, I have tried in this chapter to show on a local grounded scale the deep complexity of what it means to become Pākehā in twenty-first century Wairarapa.

Wairarapa knows its White history well (see Green & Winter, 2012). As I mentioned in the previous section, one only has to perform a quick double take to see the grit of colonial settlement in its towns and rural areas. My own readings have given me access to the stories of large station owners and small farmers and how they have carried the mythologies of arcadia into contemporary farming models in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Minute details of how workers laboured over building a life since first inland arrival left me with a sense of awe over how such gruelling work was completed. But for all the drive for ‘material progress’ (Fairburn, 1989) that, for example, Masters’ worked towards, his own town is now struggling and is far from the arcadianism he envisioned.

This is not to say people do not in small ways feel contentment. The locals I have come across seem to take pleasure in creating their own bit of paradise in their flower gardens or making their stupendous cakes for the New Zealand Cake Decorators Guild competition. In learning to ‘stay with the trouble’ (Haraway, 2016) of Masters’ town, I too have made kin with several cats that have come looking for a home and taken delight in every new ripened vegetable that I have cultivated under Wairarapa sun. My future ambitions as well, mark me as a still settling Pākehā as I imagine owning my own piece of rural land (t)here.

However, for all the apparent corporeal signs of our settler history, we Pākehā have not ‘faced’ our past in this place. The transcendent arcadian veils of romanticism and money-making elide some of the most significant stories in Wairarapa. What and who came before us is scantily understood and how we, as a people, formed relationships with Māori is retold with a sense of White, and not to mention human,
exceptionalism. So then, perhaps learning from Māori may not only help our relationships with iwi but help us see history differently.

There is a whakataukī in Māoridom: Whakatōmuri te haere whakamua: I walk backwards into the future with my eyes fixed on my past (Rameka, 2016). I have often heard this proverb discussed during Māori gatherings especially in relation to deceased ancestors as this whakataukī points to how Māori face their forebears human and not, watching what has passed, whilst heading into the future. This way of viewing is like walking backwards so as to build a care-fully composted future (see Haraway, 2011). This kind (of) response-ability makes me wonder then, if we settlers need to listen to these ways of composting and re-tread the steps taken by those gone before, looking back, rather than forward, to really become Pākehā in Wairarapa.
Chapter 6. ‘Becoming with’ Wairarapa

I ventured out onto the plains today. It was a pull. A pull that urged me. A kin being was calling me.

I came down from the foothills in the Kiriwhakapapa Valley. Farmers were planting trees, feeding goats and chooks. Further north I roamed following ‘my pull’. Women herded sheep and cattle but none of those beasts were calling me. So I trotted in a south westerly direction for the shade and cover, supping from each stream I crossed. I went as far south as Martin’s borough Carter’s town, following the scent. More women, making cheese, olive oil, jam, gardening. One was killing a lamb — was this little babe calling me to save him? No. lifeless he lay and still the pull was inside of me.

Heading back north an urge drove me to Master’s town. I found who was calling me. Hair like a shaggy sheep. I stood at a window watching her clumsily pounding the key board. Head in hands then jolts up to stretch. It just took one glimpse of looking into each other’s eyes, as she turned, for me to possess her. Open her up to become with me, the trees the sheep, the people, who live on this land in Wairarapa (Notes from Pan’s dairy, 2014).

Becoming Pākehā with arcadian land in Wairarapa for this thesis centres upon my exploration of ten women’s fleshly stories who lived (t)here. How I obtained these narratives contribute to a composting of arcadia as much as their stories did. Since the beginning of this doctoral project arcadia has been present. It was one of those terms that kept rising to the surface as I read about New Zealand land and identity — the broad focus of my academic interest. A lot of White men had written about it and I still treasure what they have produced, but I wanted something more. I wanted to not just read about
arcadia but touch it, or see it through my ‘fingery eyes’ (Haraway, 2016). Just as importantly, I wanted to explore the repercussions of how arcadia has actually shaped land practice contemporarily so as to explore the tense issues traced in chapter one from a situated perspective (Haraway, 1991; 2016).

I chose to talk to farmers as I figured these would be people that would possess a practiced understanding of land. But I presumed that asking potential participants about arcadia would not be the best way to make them feel comfortable. It’s a literary and academic term and introducing this word I presupposed, could make potential participants feel unknowledgeable in the company of someone from a university. Therefore even though I have used arcadia from the outset as a way to frame, understand and narrate this thesis, I did not use the term when talking with participants and this is a material limitation to my research that is worth noting.

Given my interest in talking to folk and my penchant for a good yarn, I conducted storied qualitative research that includes, rather than repudiates, the interviewer’s assumptions wants and desires (Fontana & Frey, 2005; Minikel-Lacocque, 2019). As this chapter will reveal, I did not intend using an unstructured approach but, in practice, I was compelled to “go with the flow” and follow (my) interviewee’s lead (Johnson & Rowlands, 2012, p. 107 in Minikel-Lacocque, 2019, p.1040). This was a fortuitous development as it was the open-ended, tailored, adapted or mutated approach to fieldwork that lead me to narrow my focus to Pākehā women participation.

Adjusting interview techniques to suit the context in which I found myself was also how I incorporated a mobile sensual ethnography (Nova, 2015; Pink, 2009; 2013) into my project. I had planned from the beginning to use ethnography as I anticipated walking around participants’ properties and perhaps taking part in day to day activities (see Nova, 2015). Yet it wasn’t until I actually arrived at each place that I felt so affectingly the weather, trees, sweat, mud and smell (see Adams-Hutcheson, 2019). These sensual feelings, in turn, become vital for developing, what I will discuss later in this chapter, a feminist more-than-human ethnography.

What I more or less accomplished then, was a methodology that emerged out of my continuing relationship with Wairarapa and the participants who took part in my project.
Such an intimate relationship required a response-ability that induced me to face some uncomfortable truths like the colonial complicity I enacted during interviewing. Further discomfort lay ahead too as I tried to ‘write Wairarapa’. However, by ‘staying with this trouble’ (see Haraway, 2016) in my office in Masterton with women’s photos and transcripts around me, I started reading creative works of all kinds and began to understand the earthly meaning of geo-graphy.

**Master’s town, Wairarapa**

I ended up in Masterton because my partner had a small two bedroom house (t)here and so it became a place where I could base myself for fieldwork. I never would have chosen to live in Masterton nor the particular place the house I now live in is situated — a hub for the not-so-ideal features of the town discussed in the previous chapter. Even as I write these words I am sitting in my office and intermittently looking out the window onto the street. My words are full to the brim with mixed feelings of resignation, despair and a growing affection. I like watching the kids walk home from school, screaming with laughter and yahooing with each other, showing their individual creativity by the way they wear their uniforms. Their happiness to be free from school for the day is infectious.

Relationships in Wairarapa started with fieldwork. I began getting to know the area and its people by attending local produce markets and going to coffee shops. I also canvassed certain networks such as Willing Workers on Organic Farms (WWOOF) in New Zealand and Farm Helpers in New Zealand (FHiNZ). I had worked for these associations as a gardener and farm labourer so had the contacts for the Wairarapa branches.

What came out of these initial conversations compelled me to take a more fulsome feminist approach to my thesis than I had originally intended. The general conflation of ‘male’ and farmer (see Whatmore, 1991), with whomever I engaged, unquieted me. As a lesbian, I never really considered the dangers of such heteronormative conventions. However, my recent foray into a heterosexual relationship (in Wairarapa) in
conjunction with the gendered culture in this place I was exploring provoked me to
think more deeply on these issues. In public in Wairarapa, I was suddenly a ‘wife’, an
Other, talked to and stereotyped as an attachment for my male partner. These
experiences spurred me to focus on women and women’s perspectives of land and
feminist epistemologies.

All farmers I talked too, including the ones Jo referred me too, were White. This was
another issue I had to confront as I had naively planned to interview Māori. However
as I pondered on my disappointment over the White-centred culture of Wairarapa (see
previous chapter) I realised — uncomfortably — that I was very much a part of this
‘colonising incorporation’ (Plumwood, 1993). That is to say, it soon become clear to me
that by wanting Māori to be in a project about farming, and using very Pākehā
questions to carry out such a venture, I was trying to make Māori fit into a Pākehā
prism. These unwanted insights pressed upon me the realisation that I had a lot of
work to do on what ‘Pākehā’ really meant (see Grimshaw, 2012; Mita, 1992).

Accordingly, I changed my focus during fieldwork from looking for Māori and Pākehā,
male and female, participation, to Pākehā women. The Wairarapa Rural Women’s
Network was of particular help in this regard. All but one member I contacted was
interested in the project and even though not all were able to commit to the project,
after I had talked with all members I soon had a group of Pākehā women who were
keen to show me their land.

The content of emails I sent to potential participants were more or less all the same
and contained an introductory email about the project and three attached files: A
project information sheet; consent form; and the four set interview questions. I
conducted the majority of phone calling and emailing at the house in Masterton. I
arranged access interviews by phone generally although plenty of emails back and
forth were important for when women were too busy to talk. When I approached
potential participants for an access meeting I offered them three options: Firstly,

---

93 See Appendix C
94 See https://ruralwomennz.nz/
95 See Appendix A, B & C
morning or afternoon tea in Masterton; meet up at cafe or public space of their choosing; or I would come to them directly. Most came to the house and appreciated the invite as I conducted most of these meet and greets in winter or early spring of 2014 and many commented that they would prefer for me to see their property or workplace later in the season.

The aim of the access interview was to establish a relationship (Minikel-Lacocque, 2019), answer any concerns or questions regarding the project and generally get to know something of the land and woman in question. Moreover, I learnt during these meetings that the most effective and affective means of communication between potential participants and I, from my point of view, was face-to-face. This perspective appeared mutual as I had very engaging and exciting conversations in access interviews. One reason for this perhaps is because I didn’t need to worry about recording and there was no pressure for potential participants to answer questions. Encouragingly, all women who met with me for morning or afternoon tea chose to be a part of the project until the end of fieldwork.

I followed no formal structure during these meetings apart from re-presenting the information sheet, the interview questions and the consent form. I informed potential participants that they could either sign the consent form presently or sign it when I see them next. Thereafter, I offered each woman a disposable camera (as by then all women had signalled they wanted to be part of the project). I then, in a variety of ways, discussed the fairly laborious process of the interview. I usually left the photography aspect of the project last though as it seemed complicated to burden someone with immediately (Guillemin & Drew, 2010, p.179). My intuition proved accurate as the most common question at these interviews was about photography.

As a novice to visual studies I gave women very few parameters of what to take photos of and how many. I emphasised that participants’ photo-stories were about how they connect to land and that photos could be taken in their own time and at their own pace away from my curious eyes (Beilin, 2005; Drew et al 2010; Killion & Wang 2000). It was only upon collection that I realised how diverse women’s photography could be and I ended up with hundreds of photographs. However, this process wherein
participants could ponder, rehearse and form questions of their own with regards to the research information I had given them was vital. Women’s answers to my set questions were deeply thoughtful, enriching this thesis’ aims of yielding situated partial compost stories (Haraway, 2016; 2019a; 2019b).

**Refreshing developments: Tea, coffee and cake**

Sitting down over coffee and cake established a concentrated space whereby open-ended narrative conversations could emerge (Minikel-Lacocque, 2019; Suárez Ortega, 2012). For me, who had spent so much time reading and writing about land and identity it was wholly refreshing to be able to talk to people about the many topics this subject matter can raise. There were some glitches with access interviews though that forced me to question whether this aspect of research was too onerous for participants. Millie, for example, needed to cancel our initial meeting several times owing to her busy schedule as she was the director of a women’s agricultural development trust and was therefore a high profile figure (hence her name used here is a pseudonym).

Eventually Mille found a gap in her schedule whilst she was in Wellington so we met for coffee at a high-end café in the middle of the city. I arrived early as is my routine with such encounters. Anxious at not being able to locate Millie I sat at a table, for two, facing the door. She arrived more or less on time: Her perfume filled the varnished wooden table top. With immaculately styled hair and long painted nails she placed her bag down and sauntered off to order a coffee. It wasn’t long until we sat face-to-face with our flat whites — Millie looking terribly glamourous and me looking somewhat dishevelled in a second-hand man’s shirt and dread-locked hair.

Millie was a sheep and beef farmer from Alfredton. She and her husband had spent twenty-seven years growing the farm despite Millie having no previous farming experience. Whilst drinking our coffee amidst the central Wellington bustle we discussed how agriculture is an important part of New Zealand; caring for the land is incredibly significant; rural and urban New Zealand need to start to work together more; Māori have a vital role to play in any decision made regarding land in Aotearoa; and Pākehā identity towards land is important to understand. Reflecting on the interviews I conducted with Millie I am glad that I pursued the access interview as it
added a depth to her story that that was worth the perseverance and I am very grateful that Millie chose to give me that time.

One exception to the access interview I had though was with Mary. Mary had been retired for a few years when I met her. She had worked as a microbiologist in Wellington during her career, the place she was born and raised. She became ill during our correspondence and so she allowed me to come see her on her farm and thereby combining the access interview with the main interview. Mary and her husband owned a small holding of about twenty-two acres in rural Martinborough. Together the couple raised Hereford cattle and they had just started raising Murray Grey cattle when I met them. They earned a little profit from the bovines and also ran a flock of sheep for meat. Mary also had a keen interest in planting native trees, vegetable gardening and had a fruit orchard as well.

After she had showed me the farm Mary invited me to sit at the dining room table. She gave me a large black coffee that I was thankful for. Her husband came in soon after and sat down at the table, with Mary and I, and proceeded to play cards, contributing to the conversation intermittently. Mary instructed me to open up her laptop and retrieve the photographs for her photo-story (for example see figure 25) and save them onto my USB (Universal Serial Bus) flash drive. They were many images but mostly different angles of the same scene. I dutifully copied the photo-story, closed down the laptop and attended to the cooled drink. I sipped coffee with my left hand and patted canine Roxy with my right as she came up to visit me. Her age was unknown but Roxy had lived there for a while, freed from her sentence at the local dog pound. About halfway through our interview Roxy — not satisfied with just constant patting — starting licking my hand. Her tongue hot and wet with her ears back, sitting obediently between Mary and I, seemed to be returning my patting gesture.

Mary: She’s a shocker. She came from the Featherston pound (The South Wairarapa District Pound). It was the best day of your life, wasn’t it girl? We’ve had her for thirteen years.

Rebecca: And you said the other two dogs are her pups?

Mary: Hmmm.
Rebecca: What are their names?

Mary: Jem and Tiger.

(Stretched out on the floor they perked their ears and eyes up with the mention of their names).

Mary’s husband: We’re only talking about you, not to you

Rebecca: And are they just house dogs. I mean do they help with the cattle?

Mary: They think they do. Oh, he’s alright (pointing to Tiger). And he’s not bad with the sheep either but they haven’t been properly trained.

Rebecca: They look like they’re mixed with a few things?

Mary: A beardie. Well one of the father’s was a beardie and one of the father’s was a border collie. We think it was a split mating, we’re not sure.

Sitting around a table drinking coffee and tea was a significant part of accessing participants’ stories. What I did not foresee however, was that such open-ended spontaneous conversations were fundamental to the more formalised or in-depth sit-down interviewing that followed the initial meeting. In fact, as interviewing progressed I gradually realised that my semi-structured interview questions were somewhat insignificant. Accordingly, most semi-structured interviews became more like open-ended interviewing, in similar style to that of life narrative research, as women veered off the topics and questions frequently.

Magdalena Suárez Ortega (2012) highlights the advantages of using this latter approach in the context of her work that focused on the life histories of rural Spanish women. For Suárez Ortega (2012) an open-ended, narrative style provides women with a ‘voice’ as they are able to freely and informally narrate their life. For the researcher, these interviews are also beneficial as they illustrate a depth of meaning and autonomy that more structured designs can obscure (Suárez Ortega, 2012). This project did not aim to capture a ‘life story’ and, as such, the full extent of narrative research is not employed here. Rather, I draw on the storied, conversational elements of this method. This partial use of an open-ended approach suited this project well
given my research aims were to collate situated and fragmentary but rich encounters that narrated a sense of everyday routine. Adjusting my interview style did not require me to forgo my original interview questions either: Thankfully, women answered these questions, but then had more to say.

For example, the second time I met Sarah, who lived in the Waiohine gorge (see figure 26), the equinox winds of spring were revelling in Wairarapa. There was no hope of exploring her property outside that day as the gusts reached 120 kilometres per hour (see Adams-Hutcheson, 2019). So, we sat inside her open plan living area. It was decorated with dark grey and deep reds, not a colour scheme she had chosen as I found out. Nevertheless, it felt lovely and peaceful given the conditions blowing against the ranch sliders. The journey to reach Sarah’s place was a little treacherous, the roads were narrow, gravel, and wound around, and up and down. Her long unsealed drive steered me deeper and deeper into the bush laden curves of the Tararua Ranges but strangely was not that protected by the wind. The top ends of her pine and gum shelterbelt that flanked the drive were bent on a horizontal angle. Creeping closer to the house a deep chasm came into view which divided the property from the extensive dense native flora that was the Tararua Forest Park. At the bottom of the ravine was a gushing river that flowed to Carterton.
Figure 25. Mary’s garden and farm. Source: Mary.

Figure 26. Looking out over the Waiohine gorge from Sarah’s lawn. Source: Sarah
Hence, I was happy enough to stay inside whereby Sarah plied me with coffee, crackers, cheese and cake. It probably took less than thirty minutes for her to answer the provided interview questions. Sarah responded to them with rich depth but succinctly. Therefore we spent the next two hours or so talking about her childhood, her time in the military, her family and what she planned to do in the future. She grew up on a “traditional” Pākehā farm in Taranaki with which she still has close ties. Her family had been farming for generations and she expressed a firm loyalty and pride in this history. When she was working as a nurse in the military she met her husband who, at that stage, was still serving. Consequently the family moved often. However, Sarah held to her bottom-line that if she followed her husband’s career around the country, ties to rurality would be compulsory, which is why they were living with their two young boys on a ten acre block in Wairarapa. Their aim, though, once her husband finished service, was to buy a permanent larger block so Sarah could farm what she wished.

There were many other instances whereby the semi-structured questions were answered very concisely making room for much more extemporaneous, open-ended discussion (Suárez Ortega, 2012) that women themselves felt was important, like my interview with Jocelyn. I had met with Jocelyn in Masterton for afternoon tea and so learnt then that her husband had died eighteen months previously. I was taken aback with her honesty but only realised at our second interview the significance of this familial loss. Losing her husband was more than just a grief felt by a wife; it also meant Jocelyn had to transition from being “a farmer’s wife to being a farmer”. For a year and half Jocelyn had been responsible for running a sheep and beef operation over 2,000 acres in size in northern Wairarapa. As she explained, she felt the community she lived in did not take her seriously as a sole woman farmer and subsequently this impacted her ability to farm well.

Compounding this situation was how Jocelyn had “married in” to the Wairarapa area where she lived as she was originally from the Horowhenua where her family had a dairy farm. Thus, despite what some members of her community thought, “farming was in her blood”; evidenced by her family from the Horowhenua having farmed the area since the nineteenth century. Jocelyn related this all to me over coffee she made
me and a deliciously moist cake. Then she made us a smoothie with all kinds of
time delving into gender and farming
politics, child poverty, the state of the economy and society in New Zealand, lamb
prices, regulation issues and much more.

Revisioning arcadia?

Part of the sit-down process of the interviews was to discuss women’s photo-stories. As
mentioned I offered participants a disposable camera to conduct their photo-story at the
access stage as a way to literally revision arcadia. However, most women opted to use
their own digital camera. Consequently, once they had sent me their images through
email, I printed them in colour, on 100 gsm (grams per square meter) paper. I then took
them to the next interview. Exceptions to this routine was Mary, as mentioned, and
Carolyn. In the case of Carolyn who choose to use a disposable, I picked the camera up
from her house when she was finished, developed it in Wellington, and gave her the
unopened package at our sit-down interview.

The initiative to use participant-generated photography was drawn from photovoice, a
research method developed for participatory action research by Caroline Wang and her
colleagues (Wang, Cash & Powers, 2000): “It is a process that allows people to identify,
represent and enhance their community through a specific photographic technique”
(Wang et al., 2000, p.82). A key part of the methodology is that participants themselves
are given a camera to take photographs of their everyday experiences. As an activist
approach there is an emphasis on community based research which is often used to
empower marginalised communities (Wang et al., 2000; Killion & Wang, 2000). This thesis
is not an activist driven project and therefore does not claim to use photovoice as it was
intentioned. Rather, it draws on the techniques developed by Wang and her team to
build a more collaborative element into my thesis and to revision dominant
understandings of an often pictorialised arcadia.

Accordingly I researched other methods that adapted a photovoice approach. For
example, a photovoice method was used in qualitative health research with children
conducted by Sarah Drew, Rony Duncan and Susan Sawyer (2010). Drew et al., (2010) used the methods of photovoice and photo elicitation to explore children’s experiences with managing chronic disease. The focus in this research was individual participant responses in contrast with the community based activism of Wang et al.,’s (2000) research which was relevant for my own research aims.

Writing about the same research, Marilys Guillemin and Sarah Drew (2010) discussed the usefulness of participant-generated photography to evoke deeply meaningful issues and illustrate ideas that are difficult to verbalise (Guillemin & Drew, 2010, p.178). I was drawn to this rationale as the ineffability Guillemin and Drew (2010) discuss resonates with the previous chapter’s deliberation on affect and expressing identification with the more-than-human world (Ottum & Reno, 2016). Specifically, I figured photography could be a useful way for participants to express a more-than-human affect without needing to necessarily explain those sensations. This proved somewhat successful as participants did present photos to me as a seeming replacement for words. In this research then, participant-generated images can be read as affective pictorial narratives (Ottum & Reno, 2016; White & Drew, 2011).

My experience with participant-generated imagery deviated from Drew et al.,’s though in a very practical sense. A key part of using interviewee produced pictures is to sit-down with participants and inquire into why they chose the images they did and what they mean (White & Drew, 2011). Yet, in light of the very ineffability often evoked in such practices, women in my project often could not say what their photos meant or why they even took them. In fact, commonly, there was a poignant dearth of verbalisation at these times whereby I felt participants expected me to ‘know’ just by looking.
Figure 27. Jocelyn’s farm. Source: Jocelyn

Figure 28. Young lamb Yoda with mother. Source: Penelope
For example, Penelope lived on a six acre block with her husband alongside sheep, goats, pigs, geese, ducks, cows, donkeys, rabbits, dogs and cats. Amongst this menagerie were also extensive vegetable patches and fruit trees, shelter belts and a house in the middle where the humans dwelt. Penelope demonstrated this to me before I visited her through her own photography. I was particularly excited about asking Penelope about all the numerous photos she took of baby goats and sheep (for example see figure 28). However, when I asked Penelope why there were so many she responded; “oh, they are just so cute”. In time I chose to interpret Penelope’s pictures as an expression of romanticism (see chapter’s three, nine and ten).

It is notable to point out that my use of romanticism (and arcadianism) to understand women’s images makes this project less collaborative as neither of these terms were discussed with them. This is not to say I somehow disregarded women’s opinions. As intimated, the initial purpose of using participant-generated pictures was to re-see and re-view what arcadia could be in everyday land practice rather than how it is ‘represented’ in well-known artworks (see chapter two, three and four). Women’s own pictures in this regard still delight me; but the way I used this collaborative tool was greatly different from the photovoice practices I had read.

As stated, photovoice comes from a place of activism and keeping with the spirit of this approach, Guillemin and Drew perceived their visual research practises as “enabling and empowering” participants (2010, p.177). Even though to some extent, this latter claim is somewhat relevant to my project, it was not an overwhelming component. It is fair to say that participants in my research were privileged even if some experienced the restrictions that heteronormative conventions can produce. All women owned some kind of land and lived a middle-class lifestyle. They were also, like myself, Pākehā, and therefore held an inherently privileged position in Aotearoa (see, for example, Bell, 2014; Evans, 2007; Fleras & Spoonely, 1999; Wevers, 2005).

To this end, using photo-stories as I did, potentially ‘normalised’ and ‘naturalised’ Pākehā views of land (see Evans, 2007) rather than perform any kind of political revisioning. As surveyed in chapter two and three optical vision can be problematic as a knowledge generating tool. Therefore, photographs taken by participants could be construed as objective forms of truth, reinscribing Rose’s (1993) argument that in
Western understandings, ‘seeing’ is often conflated with knowing. Importantly then, whilst participant-generated photography in this project may support situated women’s perspectives, it may reinscribe romantic arcadian Pākehā views of land. Perhaps most importantly, in asking participants to take photo-stories I was, in one sense, asking women to be complicit in using the camera as a colonising tool to capture ‘truths’ (see Evans, 2007; Hess, 2012; Rose, 1993). More to the point, as the research designer who drove the photo-story process, it was I that was potentially most complicit.

Feelings of complicity started to rise within me as I pored over Lyn’s pictures (for example see figure 29). Lyn lived on a thirteen acre block near Masterton her great grandfather farmed in the 1860s. She ran a mostly native tree nursery business. She also had a vegetable garden, a small orchard, Saanen goats, sheep and fowl. Behind the production of these various species and kinds was the view to the Tararua Ranges and a covenanted patch of bush her great grandfather fenced off when he was farming the land on which she lived. Lyn’s place reminded me of the small arcadian farm that Joseph Masters talked about and it seemed, through the pictures she sent, very appealing.

The way in which I became enamoured with Forest Home (the name of Lyn’s land) caused me to realise the level of complicity I was involved in by, not only enabling the photographic objectification of land but also, ‘naturalising’ and ‘normalising’ Pākehā settlement. It was these kinds of experiences during fieldwork that forced me to understand Haraway (2008, p. 70) more deeply when she says that “acquiring knowledge is never innocent”. Using photography has also highlighted to me its limitations as a way to compost transcendent arcadias summed up beautifully by one participant. When I contacted Sarah for an interview to follow up our initial meeting she had dutifully taken part in the said photo-project. Unprompted she let me know how the process went for her: “I was curious to discover I was quite frustrated taking the photos as they can’t convey the smells and sounds of the land which are so vital in confirming it as a living entity”. Yet for all the issues associated with photography in this thesis, participant-generated photography was a plentiful way for women to express their land to me (see for example figures 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 & 30).
Figure 29. Lyn’s tree nursery. Source: Lyn

Figure 30. Gaye’s property flooded. Source: Gaye
Wet sweaty affects

Sarah’s comment about taking photos confirmed to me the importance of choosing a sensual and mobile ethnography (Nova, 2015; Pink, 2009; 2013). This choice to use ethnography was hardly a choice though: To listen to women’s stories I needed to accompany them on their land. I need to walk and talk with them, help them when they wanted help, do what they instructed me to do and be shown what they wanted to show me. As much as they enjoyed sitting around talking in their respective kitchens and lounges, most women explicitly communicated to me that if I was to understand their land I needed to see and feel it for myself. Armed with my camera and gumboots then I took part in many wet sweaty and affective ethnographies that allowed me to ‘become with’ women and Wairarapa ever more intimately.

Whilst exploring these lands and homes Janet Shope’s (2006, p.164) fieldwork experiences came to mind. Shope, using the metaphor taken from the Zulu proverb “You can’t cross a river without getting wet”, explains her fall from the “dry riverbank” of pontificating “expert” into sodden transformed researcher. In both senses of the adage I become saturated. In the paddock patting goats, up hills to see the view of the valleys below, milking sheep, or wading through water, women were leading me: They were the experts and I was the amateur in these special spaces. It struck me during fieldwork then, that my experiences were not just sensual and mobile but feminist and more-than-human. In that, using my body as a research tool (Longhurst, Ho & Johnston, 2008) to ascertain how I felt encountering land and women led me to feeling feminist concerns of embodiment, domesticity and routine at the same time as experiencing more-than-human affects (see Ottum & Reno, 2016; Plumwood, 2002).

When I first visited Jill’s place it was a strange November southerly. The wind was icy cold and every so often sheets of freezing rain would pour down. Although, it was somewhat of a relief from the otherwise stuffy late spring weather, even if uncomfortable at times. The grass was long. My gumboots bound my feet in warmth and dryness while they swished through the thick green paddock. The rain was insistent and felt heavier as we got closer to the stream which was Jill’s focus. Jill’s purpose, for living on the land was to restore the Mangatarere Stream. She lived on a rural property not far from Carterton.
She was also a rural councillor for the Carterton district council. Her time was split between performing councillor duties, running her Information Technology (IT) business (from home) and working on restoration projects for the stream she lived alongside.

I took my digital camera that I bought for fieldwork. Trying to take photos in the rain and wind while trying not to get the camera wet was difficult. I slung it around my neck and kept it dry by zipping my jacket over it, only pulling it out when there was a small break in the down pour. I could hardly see a thing while doing any of this as my glasses were covered in rain. And through a rain-dropped view, I could see Jill was in the same position as she also donned spectacles. Yet this did not deter her as she bounded about showing me tree after tree she had planted for a riparian zone. I took clumsy shots of the trees and the stream huddling under old willows for shelter whilst feeling embarrassingly pathetic about my discomfort. So I looked up for a moment. The Tararua Ranges loomed at the back. They looked blue amongst all of the green. Willows lined the stream like most of Wairarapa. Some were old and large, some were falling apart, some young and ineffective as rain shelters. Sheep grazed while the rain fell off their backs. In the middle of all of this were neon coloured plastic columns protecting new vibrant growth in the form of kōwhai, tōtara, kahikatea and more.

The particular way I used my senses beyond sight certainly enabled me to feel the land to a degree which women wanted me to feel. The camera, again, proved to be less useful. I wholly agree with what Sarah said, photographs do not capture the liveliness of the more-than-human. What did help was that after each interview I described in detail what I did and exactly and how I felt emotionally and corporeally during each encounter. I felt this practice was important for attending to the feminist and more-than-human epistemologies I use in this thesis to compost arcadia. By using both these frameworks during fieldwork I have come to realise that —for me —feminism and more-than-humanism cannot be separated, as both worlds encourage knowing with a feeling body and ‘fingery eyes’96 (see Haraway, 2008; 2016; Plumwood, 1993;2002; Rose, 1993).

96 See Whatmore (2012) for an explanation that even in neuroscience now it is believed that the brain does not tell what the finger ‘feels’ but in fact it is the finger that tells the brain what it feels, opening up the possibility of ‘thinking flesh’ and a discussion of where the mind is actually located.
My time with Lynne is particularly instructive here. Lynne and her husband Rob farmed 2,000 acres of hill country in Pongaroa. They ran romney-cross sheep and only recently had secured the property in their own name even though they had been farming the land for seventeen years. Lynne and Rob were a partnership and both worked out on the land together. I caught a ride with Lynne to her farm in early spring 2014 while she was taking her horses to the chiropractor in Masterton. She insisted that I stay at her house the night so I packed my gears. As soon as I stepped out of Lynne’s truck once we had arrived at her home my senses burned. Horses neighed. The sheep on the hill next to me were in a desperate frenzy; ewes called to their lambs, the call deep and long. Lambs bleated back in short, desperate, shrill bouts. The working dogs ahead barked wildly as they yanked at their chains. Dust swirled in the wind from the horses kicking up the ground. Lynne, attending to them, was amidst these happenstances refusing any help from me. She was feeding her equine companions and filling their troughs with water. Above us terra firma folk, a flock of Canadian geese flew over the farm squawking amongst themselves.

These brief moments, which I mentally logged, were followed by a rather intensive twenty-four hours of interviewing and immersing myself in Lynne’s farm which I also recorded as best I could. Once we had finished our coffee at the house I climbed on the back of Lynne’s quad bike and we commenced traversing across the hilly land. We sped past the dog kennels and the familiar smell on New Zealand farms of dried sheep carcass, dog faeces and plum tree blossom. As we ascended I tried to frantically move into a more secure position as I felt myself slipping off the back but I was unable to without risking falling off and tumbling down, what was becoming, a very steep hill.

Relief came as I jumped off at every gate to open and shut it as I had an opportunity to sit back down in a safer position: But the relief did not last long as the steeper we climbed the more I slipped. I dared not say anything to Lynne, as although I felt discomfort and a little fear, I did not want to say anything that would compromise the time Lynne was giving me to understand her land. Over two days we drove to the highest parts of the farm, the views magnificent and the feeling of being on top of the hills, ecstatically freeing. Meaning was felt in our flesh in this moment (Haraway, 2003; 2008; 2016). Lynne was meticulous in taking me to very part of her property that
meant something to her such as the highest point on the farm called ‘the Cracker’ and other places where we could see the area’s peaks like the Razor back, “the Puketois” and the Three Kings.

**Ethical digestion**

Ethnographic encounters like my experience with Lynne were rich in expressing not just participants’ autonomy but the more-than-human voice for this project. Yet by accompanying women, talking to them, being affected by the land and their story I was also wholly complicit in continuing colonial understandings of place. Fortuitously, Sara Kindon (2012) argues complicity can be productive which she experienced whilst researching with Māori. Encouraged by this insight I pondered over how my complicity could be fruitful as well.

For example, during fieldwork it was because I was sincerely interested and excited with what women showed and related to me that enabled them to respond so prodigiously. In turn, such narratives, although problematic, were also full of meaning and vital for any serious interrogation of what it means to identify as Pākehā. In this context, complicity was a generative way to think through, from embodied partial perspectives, Pākehā politics. Despite the ‘productiveness’ of such complicity though I still needed to acknowledge that I was, despite my best intentions of being ‘anti-racist’ (see Ahmed, 2004), I was continuing the colonial project as much as participants were. This was a deeply uncomfortable experience for me which Mackinlay (2019, p.170) creatively sums up very well:

> She tossed and turned, trying to find the comfort that would return her to the deep nothing of her grey sleep. It was safe and warm there in her colonial bed and she was in no mind to arise just yet. The digital clock on the dresser signalled a time and place where her futurity as white settler colonial woman was secure. She laid stone still, her dull eyes focussed on the soft white light of the display, certain in its capacity to lull her back. Wide open, she watched and waited. The seconds became minutes became hours became more and the
restlessness in her mind crept into her feet, entangling her heart and legs in white cotton sheets.

Mackinlay here points to both the restlessness and comfort of being a settler colonial subject. She describes those moments of not being able to sleep yet bound in the comfort of bed. This forcefully spoke to my own fieldwork experience. I was constantly anxious over the ‘normalising’ and ‘naturalising’ I facilitated whilst being with women but I was comforted by their stories because I recognised them as my stories and I, in those moments, “was in no mind to arise just yet” out of my “colonial bed”. In seriously personal and political ways then, when I critique the colonial politics of participants’ stories (visual or textual) — within this project — I am critiquing my own way of seeing and viewing land and, I argue, that of Pākehā culture in general.

Being sensitive to how I tell women’s stories has become important to me as I feel they have implicitly trusted me to respect their narratives given how I have had to do very little to appease their privacy and confidentiality. To be sure, women knew all aspects of the project and signed consent forms before officially taking part\(^97\). However, they were very blasé about these processes and I had to insist that they read the information sheet and sign the consent form even when they were visibly irritated by my requests.

Following Guillemin and Drew’s (2010) advice about being transparent about the ownership, publication and privacy of photos I also ensured that women were aware that their images may be in future articles, presentations or books. Again, women did not appear concerned with this and were in fact quite happy to appear in photos themselves. When they gave me photos with people other than themselves in the frame I asked participants to gain consent from those in question. If they were young children I asked for their parents’ permission.

I do not use many pseudonyms in this research as participants wanted their names attached to their story. The exceptions to this were Millie, Jocelyn and Mary. Millie was a high profile figure so I suggested a pseudonym and similarly suggested pseudonyms for

\(^{97}\) My project was also approved by Victoria University of Wellington’s Human Ethics Committee Ethics in 2014. Approval number: 20667
Jocelyn and Mary because some of the interview content may have offended their local community. Hence, privacy was not a huge issue but I nevertheless kept all material in a locked room in Masterton (to also keep playful felines out) or in a locked filing cabinet and office at the university. Even though participants had a copy of the signed consent form I also kept a copy of each one in a folder in the locked front room of the house in Masterton.

Figure 31. Participants’ images sorted according to theme with Gaye’s at the top. Source: Rebecca
Organising the treasure chests I had gathered from the field was a vital part of my analysis. In fact, the process of transcription was hugely beneficial for cogitating upon potential ideas. Once interviews were transcribed verbatim I printed them out along with participant-generated, and my own documentary, images. I spread the photos on the floor while I read the transcripts. Accompanying me was also my voice recorder that contained my after-interview reflections. “(D)welling within” participant stories was a key aspect of my approach as it enabled me to hear and feel what was around me (Lapum, Ruttonsha, Church, Yau & Matthews David, 2011, p.103). Using this “organic and responsive” (Lapum et al., p.103) design eventually led to a number of common concepts and more-than-human themes.

Specifically, mountains, hills, waterways, pasture, trees and non-human animals, were immediate subjects that arose alongside the concepts colonialism, romanticism, capitalism, subsistence, individuality, family, childhood and ancestry. I first began coding concepts by using Microsoft’s copy and paste function to cut and paste transcripts according to each concept. I then organised printed photos on the carpet into the themes mentioned above (see figure 31). I started with Gaye’s photos as she was the first person I interviewed and I wanted to get a sequential feel for how I conducted fieldwork. This process was time consuming and laborious and was ideal for addressing this thesis’ aims. I needed to slowly turn the material over and over tactilely and mentally and also have it around me in my office. This composting and dwelling process knitted me ever tightly to participants’ stories.

Gaye’s narrative turned out to be an excellent prototype as well as she not only had a very technically mixed farm, but also took photos of such varied production coupled with landscape scenes she could see from her farm. Thus, I had numerous photographs from Gaye that spoke to each theme several times over. Gaye was a storyteller, counsellor, craftswoman and small farmer. She and her husband Michael owned thirty acres between Carterton and Masterton. Their land was rather dry when I was there although it did regularly flood owing to a small creek from the foothills running through their property which is what figure 29 shows. Rows of olive trees dominated the front paddock. The drive way was well manicured and lined with Liquid Amber trees. Giant pine trees towered from the back of the property and bare poplars lined
the creek below. It was a cold August afternoon. Spring was pushing through but winter was pushing back.

Michael had built a bridge to go over the rushing creek. Naked poplars visible from the road lined the creek with willows, flaxes, cabbage trees and tree ferns. The root system of the willows had grown into the creek in places, clogging the flow. There were also many gum trees, for firewood I was told. Over the other side of the creek were three large rectangle paddocks. The grass was short and green. Hens and a rooster were free ranging in the first paddock. Sheep were breaking their way through the fence from the adjacent block into the third. Their faces and wool looked different from the usual Romney-ish look in the Wairarapa region. Their wool was shaggy like perhaps what a mountain goat would don. There was an elegance to their face that prompted me to ask Gaye what breed they were as we drank coffee and ate cake inside. They were Finn-cross Gaye replied which triggered another tangent far from the interview questions but deeply useful for my research.

Trying to analyse such rich and delicious encounters such as the one I had with Gaye proved difficult. I felt inadequate whilst examining images so I read many articles on how to interpret research photography: But even after I had finished reading work by Drew and her colleagues and Rose (2001) I was no closer to understanding individual photos. Consequently, I returned to the coded concepts I derived from transcripts. It was from this material that I began writing drafts of my analysis chapters. Yet, like one of those young lambs Lynne rescued from the binds of a farm fence when I was with her, I became stuck.

(Earth) Writing Wairarapa

During such a roadblock I was reminded of what Sarah Wright (2012) and her research team98 experienced regarding fieldwork with(in) Northern Australia (Wright et al 2012, p.46). Specifically, they commented on how:

98 Kate Lloyd, Sandie Suchet-Pearson, Laklak Burarrwanga, Matalena Tofa and Bawaka Country.
the embodied qualities of research get lost in the writing the story down; readers can’t feel the hot sun on their skin, the cuts from the gunga, the sweat or the sea breeze; they cannot hear the children laugh or squabble, or the sound of the waves; they can’t taste the tea or salt or smell the sea or smoke from the fire

I utterly resonated with this lament as, like Wright et al.,’s (2012, pp.41,46) project, my research was also “embodied, emotional, sensual and placed” thus I attempted to “evoke place through the written word”. But, honestly, my preliminary writing was lifeless.

Serendipitously I found a way forward while reading fiction. Initially, reading New Zealand novels was a way for me to understand, in a more affecting sense, ideas of Pākehā identity and land. As Patrick Evans (2007), Lydia Wevers (2005) and Sarah Dugdale (2012) illustrate, Pākehā New Zealand fiction is a hairy breeding ground for such discussions: Owen Marshall, Eleanor Catton, Maurice Gee and Janet Frame (1924-2004) are just a few Pākehā New Zealand writers that have written stories about affective belonging to land in Aotearoa. Whilst reading these authors’ writing though, I realised that their works had an uncanny ability to express the more-than-human. For instance, in Frame’s posthumous work *Towards Another Summer* (2007, p. 15), the main human character transforms into a migratory bird:

*For so long she had felt not-human, yet had been unable to move towards an alternative species; now the solution has been found for her; she was a migratory bird; warbler, wagtail, yellowhammer? cuckoo-shrike, bobolink, skua? albatross, orange bishop, godwit?*

I have also found succour beyond Aotearoa in Jeanette Winterson’s work, such as her latest novel *Frankissstein: A Love Story* (2019) which questions the centrality of the ‘human’ as one of the book’s main themes. This also led me to the more-than-human romantic affect in the work of Mary Shelley. Encouraged by these finds I thought of ways of how to articulate these affects in my academic work (see also Bawaka Country
et al., 2015; Wright et al., 2012). Whatmore has called for a way to “pungently” express worlds where the human is decentred (1999, p.35), asking geographers to “[...] admit and register the creative presence of creatures [...] and the animal sensibilities of our diverse human being” (2004, p.1362). I have tried to heed this call within this research by drawing inspiration from authors who ‘thickly’ (see Haraway, 2016) describe place.

As such, even though Tim Winton does not directly address more-than-humanism, his description of place is richly sensuous. Feeling the Australian dust in the back of my throat, the sear of the sun, the smell of the sea spray, the taste of raw fish and the sound of the waves crashing against the rocks are affects pivotal to stories like Winton’s *Dirt Music* (2001). As such Winton’s work has also been a great teacher for me learning to ‘write land’.

![Figure 32. Carolyn feeding orphaned lambs on the farm. Source: Work colleague](image)

Yet Whatmore (1999, p. 35) notes herself how the more-than-human is “hard [...] to put into words” and it has taken some time for me to develop a voice with which I am comfortable. In chapter three I argued that one of the salvageable aspects of romanticism may be its potential for articulating that ineffable quality of affecting and being affected by the more-than-human (see Ottum & Reno, 2016). After much practise
and failure (still), a reused and recycled composted romanticism has allowed me — even if momentarily — access to a world where “[t]he text is always fleshly and regularly not human” (Haraway in Gane & Haraway, 2006, p.137). Thankfully the women who took part in this project have helped me immensely in these endeavours. Moreover, I suggest participants’ stories were necessary for my understanding of fleshly text — Carolyn’s sheep stories being especially instructive here.

Carolyn was a stock manager on a small sheep milking farm (see figure 32). Most of the milk generated was made into boutique cheese by the same company. The cicadas were chanting on an early December day in the mid-afternoon sun when I first arrived at her place of work. There was no wind and the temperature was rising. My t-shirt stuck to my back with sweat and my feet burned inside my black gumboots. Thankfully Carolyn guided me under trees to see the farm. The sheep huddled in the shade of the tall pines as we did. The air was dry, smelling of dust and pines. Even under verdant branches the temperature was a suffocating blanket; but the sheep made me smile (see Adams-Hutcheson, 2019).

White and Drew (2011, p.9) argue, “(a)ll ethnographies are in fact constructed narratives, a kind of fiction”. Yet narrating every detail of such encounters is not the burden of the fiction writer and I soon became anxious about relating participants’ stories accurately by using so much ‘creativity’ in my ethnographic accounts. Hence I branched out from reading fiction and began reading creative non-fiction. Truman Capote’s (1924-1984) In Cold Blood (1966/2009; see Leavy, 2012) caught my attention in this regard. First published in 1966 the book is a creatively written account of the true murder of Clutter family members in Kansas in 1959. James McNeish’s (1931-2016) The Mackenzie Affair (1972) too, was a very helpful and, a starkly detailed, well-researched story of settler colonial life in the South Island based on the historical events of the folk hero James Makenzie (1820-unkown).

I stumbled across different ways of writing creative non-fiction as well, such as the fictocriticism of Anna Gibbs (2005) and Stuart Cooke’s (2013) ‘ecopoetics’. Most influentially though has been critical autoethnography. Scholars such as the aforementioned Mackinlay, Anne Harris and Stacy Holman Jones (Harris & Holman Jones, 2019; Holman Jones, 2016; Holman Jones & Harris, 2018), Featui Iosefo (2018)
and Phiona Stanley (2018; 2019a; 2019b) have helped me intersect creativity with academic analysis. What these scholars taught me is that writing creatively, far from being some superfluous flourish, is actually fundamental for writing feminist, more-than-human and queer epistemologies. For me personally as well, creative writing has been vital for expressing Haraway’s ethico-onto-epistemology — a world that she herself has described as “literary” (see Haraway, 2004a, p.333).

Geography has a particular contribution to make here. As mentioned, Whatmore (1999) called for using creative expression in more-than-human geographies many years ago now. Drawing on Winterson’s “‘livingness’ of the world” (1997, p.85 in Whatmore, 2006, p.602; 2002, p.117) Whatmore challenges geographers of all hues to see “earth life” (Whatmore, 2004, p.1362) as their, our, focus. It seems to me there is something implicitly creative about decentring the human and being attentive to this ‘earth life’ (see also Ottum & Reno, 2016). It is in this space that I think geography can make a contribution to writing the ‘livingness of the world’ given that ‘earth writing’ is literally what geography is about, the word geo-graphy, literally meaning earth writing or drawing (Adams-Hutcheson, 2019, p.1018; Springer, 2017).

**After Tastes**

Composting may be seen as a kind of earth writing, compost being both an earthly practice and theoretical story in this thesis (Haraway, 2016; 2019a; 2019b). Composting is also a feminist narrative and a domestic chore (Hamilton & Neimanis, 2018), which I learnt in a house in Masterton that I lived in during fieldwork. The compost bin in the backyard has been filled every few days for a number of years now. It has soaked up the coffee grinds and tea leaves after each encounter I had with participants. On long summer evenings the compost has also been a companion for me as I have spent time thinking through the interviews I conducted with women, strolling in the backyard to empty food scraps. The compost bin in the backyard has also taken part in my practise camera shoots, testing my equipment — although like many of the photos I took they were deleted some time ago now.

At other times though, the compost bin became my enemy. Working through my writhing and restless thoughts about how to communicate women’s stories I have
traipsed to that bin in the rain with piles of vegetable matter. At those times I have hated that compost bin for its lid will never open properly. I have spent many times tearing at the thing trying to get it open, attempting and failing to get to that rich compost material but being denied access to those other worlds, to other words that I needed, to write Wairarapa “earth life” (see Whatmore, 2004, p.1362). Since then I have learnt to twist the lid of the bin before lifting to enter into a compost world. Yet, whether it’s inside a container or inside the pages of a book, becoming compost does not grant one salvation or transcendence (see Haraway, 2016). That would be an Edenic arcadia, not the arcadia this thesis seeks to play with, which is dirty but fertile.

I have become dirty in the seeking of knowledge (Haraway, 1997; 2008). Not only was I complicit in the ‘naturalising’ and ‘normalising’ of Pākehā belonging during fieldwork, I also ‘naturalised’ and ‘normalised’ heteronormativity. I used my heterosexual appearance to elide my queerness. Having a White-looking male as a partner allowed me access to rural Wairarapa that I might not have otherwise been able to gain if I had presented as queer. I used this to my advantage, forming common ground, as I discussed with participants, my heterosexual relationship. Resultantly even the feminist and more-than-human epistemologies used to guide my fieldwork adventures were conspicuously free of queer understandings. Politically too, I was careful not to share my leftist environmental and social concerns with the women I interviewed, most of them being right-wing. These decisions and exhibitions both strengthen and limit my analysis offered in the coming chapters.
Chapter 7. Green compost: Making land-as-home

I have a real hunger
For growing
All the really lovely
New Zealand trees.
— [As the] leaves
Rot and drop on the ground —
We will make a living from our land:
Really tough women carv[ing] a life out.
It’s an excitement really
I think we will see a huge improvement
for future generations
It’s about a partnership;
that’s what a covenant is,
being caretakers.

The first theme that I noticed among the spread out photographs and transcripts on my office floor were trees and pasture: Native trees, exotic trees, an absence of trees. As a way to begin to understand women’s stories then, I drew on the varied relationship participants had to tree planting, bush preservation, deforestation and pasture. Therefore, in this chapter I expand on Lyn and Jill’s stories that resonated with the New Zealand ‘turn’ towards planting native species (Ginn, 2008). I also canvass Carolyn and Lynne’s narratives which spoke to the need for good pasture growth for agricultural production. Then there were the other accounts that make up this chapter that illustrated how participants planted and cared for a range of trees, both native and

---

99 This is a found poem made up of words and phrases from participants’ stories about trees and pasture (see Tarlo, 2009).
exotic, all of which, verdantly traced the tensions between the conservationist and agricultural discourses outlined in chapter one.

Specifically, women’s desire for planting native trees or the need to sow pasture underscored the common Pākehā dualism between practices of restoring the indigenous ecosystem or making a profit from land through farming. However, even though parts of this binary were leafily reified, there was also a vigorous unearthing of this dualism. Moreover, such grounded thought-provoking discussion added a corporeality to the aforesaid ideologies that offered a fecund composting of sign or ‘culture’ and flesh or ‘nature’, a core aim of this research project.

By showing how Pākehā arcadian binaries of agricultural and conservation or ‘exotic’ and ‘native’ ‘natures’ may be troubled through fleshy leafy examples, this chapter also points to one way in which Pākehā may make land into home. In very intimate yet politically charged ways then, women’s treed and grassy lands-as-homes were rich sources from which to consider the ‘naturalising’ and ‘normalising’ of Pākehā nation building (Evans, 2007; Ginn, 2008). Pointedly, the ideas of ‘home’ in women’s stories provided a fresh feminist view on the masculinist notions of the ‘natural’ nation discussed in chapter four.

Fruitfully, these leafy located ‘home makers’ women talked of also became vital in building on Paul Cloke and Owain Jones (Cloke & Jones, 2002; Jones & Cloke, 2004) more-than-human deliberations on trees as place makers. Markedly, such home making did not entail the usual arcadian stories about the Garden of Eden wherein every living being exists in harmony. Rather, this chapter pulls together the practices of slash and burn, opposing politics, frustration over environmental regulation, discord over intensive farming, need for profit, routine planting, seasonal harvesting and sowing, a love and joy of trees and tree growing.

Such leafy composition that reinscribed and challenged arcadian Pākehā discourse, reproduced, I suggest, a green compost pile — by which I mean a compost still fresh and verdant and not quite broken down yet. In other words, there was an entanglement that women expressed in their stories that, in general, lacked an intimacy in their (unripe) home making practices that did not, I suggest, achieve Haraway’s love inf(l)ected
'becoming with’. Yet this point led me to realise that Lyn and Jill’s relations with trees appeared to be an exception to this fertile dearth.

Lyn’s Forest Home and Jill’s Riparian Zones

The name Forest Home gave an apt indication of the density of flora on Lyn’s property, and her love of trees. Lyn’s floral residence, introduced in chapter six, was land that had been owned by her ancestor in the 1860s. Forest Home was located in a valley that led to the Tararua Ranges. The winding road passed through landscaped houses and gardens, rolling pastured foothills and tufts of native bush. The further you ventured, the rougher it became. Forest Home was somewhere near the middle, flanked by large-scale sheep and beef operations.

When I interviewed Lyn at her home it was drizzling. It was warm spring mizzle that coated the leaves of the trees, leaving them shimmering in the breaks of sunlight. The farmed foothills of the Tararua Ranges were shrouded in mist, which could be seen from Lyn’s northwest fence line. It was weather made for bush walking. So we went for a walk.

The damp ground emitted a forest fragrance filled with the scent of composting leaf litter, wet earth and soaked moss, reminding me of the dark treed wilderness arcadias Schama (1995) describes. We walked amongst many rewarewa, tawa, titoki and tarata. Toro and tūrepo were also there. Lyn stopped to show me her favourite spots such as where supplejack or kareao vine had wrapped itself around a tawa tree (see figure 35). She also pointed out a very rare native orchid and indigenous fungi growing on a tree that she thought was “special” (see figures 33 & 34). As we wandered Lyn explained to me how she had enshrined the small block of indigenous flora in a Queen Elizabeth (QE) II covenant managed by the QEII National Trust100:

100 Queen Elizabeth II National Trust is an independent statutory organisation and a registered charity. It was set up in 1977 to “encourage and promote, for the benefit of New Zealand, the provision, protection, preservation and enhancement of open space”. Open Space (as described in the Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act 1977) means any area of land or body of water that serves to preserve or to facilitate the preservation of any landscape of aesthetic, cultural, recreational, scenic, scientific or social interest or value (http://www.openspace.org.nz/Site/About_QEII/default.aspx)
Figure 33. Rare native orchid. Source: Lyn

Figure 34. “Special” native fungi. Source: Lyn
So we had this area put it into a QE II Covenant [...] so the Queen Elizabeth Trust is just trying to gather up different sorts of areas around New Zealand — wetlands and beach areas and bush areas and lake areas and they put a covenant on so it’s protected for the rest of the land’s life. Nobody can subdivide it, nobody can build on it, you can’t fell trees in it. It can be beautified and made better but it can’t be changed in any way. So that’s what a covenant is. You still own the land [but] you don’t pay rates on it and the QE II Trust will pay for fencing, they’ll pay for plant improvement. They do all the pest control and plant control in the area. So, in February 2013 we got the official word that our little area had been approved as a QE II covenant. So yeah, it’s really special. And it’s really nice to think our little bit of land will be there forever.

Lyn’s narrative about the recently covenanted land on her property was an enduring part of Forest Home. Despite its new status as a covenant, this act of preservation was just a formalisation of the conservation efforts that her ancestors instigated. Protective acts like these reflect the romanticism that underpins contemporary Pākehā environmentalist ethics that requires enclosing and regulating ‘nature’ (Hess, 2012; Oerlemans, 2002; see also Ginn, 2008). Thus, there was a potential material and semiotic separation of ‘nature’ and culture in Lyn’s story in the sense that the forest was ‘nature’ that could not be “changed in any way” (and therefore rendered static). Whereas, those charged with the ability to ‘change things’ [humans] — the repositories of culture — were able to move freely in and out of the marked boundary (Haraway, 2003; 2008; 2016; Hess, 2012).
Figure 35. Tawa tree wrapped in SuppleJack. Source Lyn
As discussed in chapter four, such romantic rhetoric finds kinship with Ginn’s (2008) claim that in the past thirty or forty years Pākehā New Zealanders have demonstrated a desire to express the country’s ‘post-colonial’ stance by identifying with indigenous flora. Ginn’s eco-nationalism echoes the humanist trap in which Romantic ideology finds itself. Within the ideology’s claim that (hu)Man has sinned through acts of environmentalist destruction, Romanticism reacts by again centring (hu)Man by telling a story of purification and salvation through ‘nature’ (Taylor, 2013; 2017). From this perspective, Lyn’s narrative could be seen as romantic and eco-nationalist in the way her story reinscribed a desire to conserve the ‘natural (New Zealand) nation’ born in a primeval past before human contamination or sin (Ginn, 2008; Kaufmann & Zimmer, 1998). The ideal of a covenant itself seems to exude a sense of sanctity in the way the trees penned inside are preserved in perpetuity by fences and ideological laws.

Exploring the relationship between Pākehā and trees more intently brings me to Jill’s MRS work and the first main interview I conducted with her. It was a willow tree that I stood under in a strange stormy November southerly whilst Jill showed me her ‘backyard’ for the first time, the site of much riparian planting. As I narrated in chapter six it was raining and the wind was gnawing on my exposed skin. Jill was racing around calling out to me but the onslaught was so intense I wasn’t able to hear her properly. So I ventured over to the stream’s edge. I walked over to where Jill had crouched over a tree guard or growtector. She was excited at the tree growth and directed me to take photos (see figure 36), all the while explaining the importance of growtectors for MRS work. From Jill’s perspective, planting native trees was a priority as the willows that had been planted were not effective plants for the banks of waterways in Wairarapa:

\[
\text{So the willow thing was great when they put them in seventy or eighty years ago for holding banks and erosion but now they are damaging waterways cos they are falling in. And it’s not just erosion and floods but also the wind from the mountains is splitting them}
\]

Jill’s choice to supplant willow trees with natives was rooted in the routine practice of stream clearing and cleaning. The replacement of willows with natives also seemed to figure an eco-nationalist timeline that recognises the past mistake of planting colonially
imported trees like willows and rectifying this error by replanting indigenous flora. Jill’s affective relationship towards her tree planting work didn’t entirely fit an eco-nationalist rhetoric though. For one, her story didn’t really present the overt nationalising Ginn (2008) cites, or Kaufmann and Zimmer (1998) discuss. Perhaps more pertinently, the unrelenting joy Jill expressed over watching each sapling grow diverged from the view of static ‘nature’ within an eco-nationalist discourse. Thus, Jill’s story could be read as leafy beings “constantly in-the-making” rather than being stationary objects (Ginn, 2008, p.336; see also Whatmore, 1999, p.33).

Returning to Lyn’s tree stories adds even more nutrients to this growing story. As mentioned in chapter six, Lyn also owned an informal tree nursery (see figure 37) so I asked about her reasoning behind the venture:

I have a real hunger for growing plants and learning more about each plant. I just love watching them growing and knowing it’s often going to be people who are like-minded who buy them. They want to improve their properties, beautify their properties so I think ahh growing things for other people is really really satisfying for me and so yeah [...] most of the people I think who buy plants from me are doing it because they want to beautify their place or put shelter in, plant around creeks and streams and stuff which is what a lot of the farmers are doing currently to help the waterway situation which is awesome. So I mainly try and stick to natives and I mainly grow what grows around here. Like when I first started I started with quite a few karakas and that sort of stuff but I’ve stopped growing them because they don’t naturally grow around here. So yeah I am just trying to grow what grows in the Wairarapa really. Mainly natives, I do dabble in a little bit of other stuff, but mainly natives. So definitely your kahikateas, your kānukas and mānukas [pause] definitely your tōtaras. Your tōtaras grow really well here, your mātais, rimus, all the really lovely New Zealand trees [pause] just about anything apart from the ones
that grow up north that are frost tender. But yeah I try grow anything and I try source the seeds locally.

As alluded to, Lyn’s tree narratives echoed Ginn’s (2008) eco-nationalist argument. In this excerpt, Lyn expressed how she tried to raise trees that “naturally” grow in the local area, reiterating a belief in the ‘natural’ within eco-nationalist and romantic thought (Ginn, 2008; Hess, 2012; Kaufmann & Zimmer, 1998; Oerlemans, 2002). Contrastingly through, Lyn’s nursery work, like Jill’s tasks, involved regular touching from the beginning of the growth cycle. For example the way Lyn described her seed gathering expeditions, from her local area, plenteously challenged the disembodied view a romantic preservationist and eco-nationalist rhetoric expounds (Ginn, 2008; Hess, 2012; Kaufmann & Zimmer, 1998; Oerlemans, 2002). Perhaps more tellingly, Lyn’s elucidation on her profit-making plans for the native tree nursery expressed capitalist ambitions that disrupted preservationist ethics:

We don’t, but I would like to definitely, one day make a living from our land. But OK so by the time I retire I would like to have a really good plant nursery going and I guess that will be one of my main focusses. We definitely cover costs and make a small profit though.
Figure 36. Tōtara sapling protected inside a growtector. Source: Jill & Rebecca

Figure 37. Lyn’s tree nursery. Source: Lyn
Understanding Lyn and Jill’s tree stories together provide verdant tensions for this chapter and the wider project of composting arcadia. In a general sense these native tree narratives subscribed to some of the aims in eco-nationalist discourse. However, these accounts also contested the Romantic rhetoric within Ginn’s argument by their shared “love” for “watching” trees grow, curtailing the notion that tree ‘nature’ is static (Ginn, 2008; Hess, 2012; Kaufmann & Zimmer, 1998; Oerlemans, 2002). Digging deeper into the ways Lyn and Jill’s accounts reinscribed ‘eco’ or ‘natural’ nationalising is important though, particularly when discussed in relation to ideas of ‘naturalising’ and ‘normalising’ Pākehā belonging.

Specifically, these women’s tree narratives imply that Pākehā have in the past colonised Aotearoa through deforestation and have transitioned into an era that aims to remedy this past by (re)planting native species, an ostensible shift from a colonial to a post-colonial space and time. From Evans’ (2007) perspective, this linear account of cultural ‘progression’ is actually a continuation of the romantic colonial project in its very absence and distancing of colonial politics and things Māori (see also Ginn 2008, p.335). In Lyn’s case this dearth was glaring as she meticulously listed all the Māori names of her trees and the settler history of preservation but said nothing of Māori history and their relationship to the trees she so adored.

As Ginn (2008) adroitly notes this veiling process positions native ‘nature’ as apolitical, and therefore innocent, underscoring its capacity for purification (see also Grebowicz, 2015; 2019; Taylor, 2013; 2017). Ahmed would posit that this kind of forgetting “involves a fantasy of transcendence” (2004, para 54) wherein Pākehā can engage in relating to indigenous flora free from the trouble that provided us with our belonging (see also Haraway, 2003;2008;2016). Strikingly then, far from being apolitical these tree stories partially echoed the puritanical desire, inherited by Pākehā culture, to find or create the Garden of Eden; a ‘cultivated’ ‘pristine’ arcadia free from trouble and sin (see Haraway, 1992b; 1994a; 1994b; 1997; 2016). Yet the way Lyn and Jill’s stories both resonated and disrupted this troubling myth reproduced a particularly valuable way to discuss situated colonial politics and the composting of arcadia — an ongoing theme of this chapter.
Figure 38. Part of Gaye’s olive harvest. Source: Gaye

Figure 39. Lynne’s plantain. Source: Lynne
Reproductive Pastoralisms

Like Lyn and Jill, Gaye too lived with trees on her “piece of land”. In contrast to Lyn and Jill’s properties though, Gaye’s small farm had an intersecting mix (planted by her) of native and exotic species. However, the most prominent kind of tree Gaye grew became vividly present as one came upon her home. Her sea-green paddock of olive trees were planted about thirty years previously. Gaye and her husband Michael had a simple plan: “We had the strategy of they [the olive trees] would either survive or not”. Without any irrigation or overly special care, Gaye’s thinking was that the trees needed to acclimatise to the often harsh climate of Wairarapa and the arid soil in which they were planted. It took some time for the trees to start producing olives but when I interviewed Gaye the trees were then yielding more and more fruit each season. The harvest time for olives is typically at the end of autumn and the beginning of winter and in the spring of 2014 when I interviewed Gaye she was very pleased with that year’s bounty (see figure 38):

*Well it’s quite an excitement with the olives this year because it’s the first year that we have a crop of olive oil that we will be able to sell. So that means two things: One: It means we can do it!! [laughs] — We can make olive oil — even though we have been producing our own olive oil for a few years. But two: It means also now we can count it in as one of our earnings. So we can also count our expenses in whereas before we were just doing that out of our full time jobs or out of our paid work sort of thing. And [pause] so that was quite significant.*

Gaye’s decision to plant olive trees cannot be understood apart from the recent cultural context of olive grove planting in Wairarapa (Howland, 2008; see also chapter five). Part of what Howland (2008, p.77) describes as a Mediterranean (as opposed to a British) arcadia or rather the “original Arcadia, the prototypical rural idyll”, olive grove cultivation has become a fruity symbol of ‘lifestyle block’ ownership in the region (Marr, 2010). Even though it is Martinborough that is mostly dotted with picturesque vineyards and olive groves (Howland, 2008), towns further north have also started growing more
Mediterranean crops (Marr, 2010). Carterton has become one such place, even thirty years ago, when Gaye bought her land (see Swaffield & Fairweather 1998).

Gaye’s olive grove and her recent harvest evoke an arcadia in Virgil’s (2009) Eclogues — tantalising and abundant (see Belich, 2001; Evans, 2007; Fairburn, 1989). In many ways Gaye’s focus on a technically mixed small family-owned-and-operated farm and subsistence production also point to the continuities between the Roman poet’s own arcadian pursuits and the Victorians (Fairburn, 1989; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). The Virgilian theme in terms of Gaye’s approach to growing, seemed to be particularly present though. In that, her low intensity strategy to olive tree growing echoed the arcadian ideals of the land being self-sustaining (Virgil, c.38 BCE/2009, p.19), the “fields pushing up their crops” (Virgil, c.38 BCE/2009, p.12).

Gaye also explained how this farming strategy was often at odds with the views of their agricultural networks. For example, when the trees first started providing olives Gaye and Michael sought other growers out to form a cooperative given the expense it takes to press olives (to make the oil) in Wairarapa. The couple looked for small-scale producers who, like them, could not afford to buy a press themselves. However, after many discussions Gaye and Michael decided not to proceed with the collective as Gaye felt they were too concerned with making money from selling the olive oil and this was incongruous to Gaye’s philosophy on growing as she explained:

> It’s like if they [olives] rot and drop onto the ground does it really matter? I mean if you have enough to use your own olive oil and you’re growing your own garlic, your own food etcetera, and doing most things for yourself, I mean it doesn’t really matter if you don’t get your money back.

In this passage, rather than ‘material progress’-as-abundance, Gaye’s perspective illustrated more of the classical arcadian tenet of ‘natural’ abundance (Fairburn, 1989; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). There is room to read Gaye’s laissez-faire approach as reproductive too, in the way she practiced subsistence farming. Thus, Gaye’s pastoral arcadian story appeared to be in contrast with common farming pastoralism in New Zealand with its focus on capitalist production (see chapter four). However, there was an
“excitement” over earning money from olives for Gaye that pointed to how ‘material progress’ was still important that — in turn — formed valuable links to Lynne’s pasture story wherein she also discussed ‘excitement’.

Lynne’s planting, or perhaps sowing, focus was grass. She had issues with weather on her farm that required action. She had suffered quite a number of droughts in recent years and drought, Lynne explained, meant no grass growth and no grass growth meant skinny lambs. This was not good news as, Rob mentioned, depending on the market price, the couple had sometimes sold lambs below the price of production which resulted in a large financial loss for the farm. Therefore she and her husband had invested a lot of resources trying to buffer the effects of regular drought. One of the projects Lynne and Rob had been working on was the growing of plantain rather than their usual sowing of rye grass and clover. When we reached the flat plantain paddock she killed the engine and invited me to look at the bright green pasture up close (see figure 39).

Lynne: *So this is the plantain we are growing*

Rebecca: *Great. So is it drought resistant?*

Lynne: *It’s more that it’s a very good fattening crop and it grows well, because it’s a weed really! So the idea is really that three weeks on there and a crop of lambs are gone. You know they’ve had good weight gains. So what they’re saying is that this is revolutionary for sheep farmers really. We’ve been a bit slow getting it established, but I think we will see a huge improvement.*

“Improvement” for Lynne was rooted in family commitment that honoured the past but also looked to the future. For one, improving the farm was important for Lynne as she had teenage girls who may eventually take over the family operation so there was an onus on Lynne and Rob to pass the farm on in good condition. Notably though, the ongoing “improvement” of the farm was building on the generations beforehand. Burnt and bright green signs illustrated this past-future “improvement” from up the top of a western slope on Lynne’s land where the plantain outshone the browning hills and a blackened matai tree stump at the bottom of the gully. When I asked Lynne about the
burnt tree Lynne recalled the times when fires had been lit to “burn the slash and stuff”, reiterating the ‘slash and burn’ technique Burns and White (2006) mentioned were used by settlers in the area to produce pasture in chapter five. Lynne was then moved to comment on not the men who performed such labour but the women who ran the homes, raised the children and took care of their husbands:

I mean you have to admire those women that came out here with absolutely hardly anything and carved a life out. They were really tough women. And having babies without too much help and their men would have been tired. They would have been working hard [pause] yeah I think those pioneering women were real tough. And yet they didn’t have much but I think they still thought they had a good life. And I guess that’s what it is. It’s your life and it is what it is [pause] some of them just up and left when times got tough. I guess because of ill health a lot of them had to leave. And like they were coming through in the carts and things and the carts would all get stuck in the winter and all the stock had to be driven out to Pahiatua — like Robert’s great grandfather was a drover — they [the Woodhouses] nearly lost the farm in the Depression and I think both the men went off farm to find work. So that was the last adding on to the farm and then Rob and I bought this bit over here to get ‘our start on’. So it was quite a long period of time until the farm bought anymore [land]. But it’s got to the stage now that we wouldn’t want any more because we would have to employ people. So we need enough to make a living but not so much that we have to have a fulltime person.

Lynne’s unfurling story reached back to the time before the Woodhouses bought the farm, to when many settlers left and then newly arrived settlers in the 1890s bought the available land (Burns & White, 2006), to the Depression of the 1930s (Belich, 2001; Marr, 2001); and then finally to how she and Rob bought the final block of land to add to their operation. It is an affective telling that potently echoed a Victorian arcadian chronicle.
(Fairburn, 1989). In particular, using the descriptor “pioneer” to describe early farming settlers speaks to the arcadian impetus to materially progress (Fairburn, 1989). Yet, progress was significantly muted in Lynne’s account. For one, she wanted the Woodhouse farm to remain family-owned-and-operated and be unencumbered by the regulatory processes of “employing people”. Such ideals seemed to express the common farming settler dream of paradise (arcadia) over progress (utopia) (Belich, 1996; 2001). Even more curiously though was how “improvement” for Lynne also meant something quite different from material accumulations:

“So you know, it’s pretty exciting for us [her and Rob] to know that there’s improvements for not only us but for future generations and hopefully in a way that is not detrimental to the land. You know I talked earlier about us being caretakers so I think that’s important — that it’s good to ‘get ahead’ but not at all costs. You know, I think this pollution in the waterways is going to be a bigger and bigger problem. The Greens and that are striving to have all our waterways fenced! [laughs]. So when that will come in I don’t know [pause]

As a loyal National Party supporter (“I will always go National”101), Lynne appeared curiously resigned to the environmental protection legislation for which the Green Party were, at the time, campaigning. More notably Lynne herself was committed to ‘improvement’ in not just pasture growth and economic efficiency but was aware that ‘getting ahead’ (material progress) ought not to be done “at all costs”, one of those costs, in this context, being the well-being of the waterways.

This tension between capitalist production and care for land was ever present in Carolyn’s story as well as, like Lynne, she showed me up close what pasture she grew for the sheep she milked. Beneath our gumboots were the plants of ryegrass and white clover she had planted. The pasture was bright green but was seriously struggling to survive in the earlier months when there was not enough sun or rain for these grasses to flourish (Brock & Hay, 2001). It was this topic that prompted the first discussion between

---

101 Said in the context of disliking the then National Party leader and then Prime Minister, John Key
Carolyn and myself when we were sitting down on her couch one Saturday afternoon.
We were supposed to be at the farm but Carolyn was not milking because the grass had
not been growing enough, and it was already late October:

It’s been a hard season. Last spring it was really good. It was an
excellent spring last year in New Zealand on the east coast and
we had weaned lambs by now. But [pause] it was good up until
July, mid-July, and then the grey weather started and grass
growth has been really slow. Yeah [pause] Yeah, [so] we haven’t
weaned [yet]. We will probably try and weigh lambs on
Monday/Tuesday when we’ve had some fine weather and try
and wean some. But we really haven’t done any milking. The
last few years we’ve been into it by September [...] but it’s just
you know [pause] not getting away [growing fast] on the
growth of things

The juxtaposition between Lynne and Carolyn’s paddock stories and transcendent
arcadian images of ‘lush green grass’ provided interesting insights into the daily routines
and politics of New Zealand farming (Belich, 2001, p.84; Schama, 1995). In different ways
both women needed good pasture for production. The tensions that were felt in
narrating this drive for production, such as sitting at home waiting for grass to grow,
genealogical deforestation, and strategically preparing for drought facing huge financial
loss, pointed to a desire for production but in the context of ancestry, routine, seasonal
considerations, worry and care that seemed reproductive. Like Gaye’s story then, Lynne
and Carolyn’s pasture stories were, I suggest, reproductive pastoralisms that thickened
often disembodied ‘productive’ capitalist stories (see Haraway, 2008) which provided
potential for composting failure-free visions of a pastoral arcadia.

This sense of reproduction in Carolyn’s story came to the fore when she discussed the
other central leafy beings she planted —trees for shelter belts — a development on the
farm which I very much appreciated during my visit. The sun that day was unhindered by
clouds and so the shade, long lines of radiata pines produced, was immediately and
abundantly gratifying. The radiatas cast their dark shadow over the munching ruminants
next to us as well, and it was this observation that allowed me a deeper access into
Carolyn’s motivation for farming. These tall evergreens the humans and sheep huddled under were important because they sheltered the stock she worked with and talked non-stop about as we walked, all the time pulling me into the “care” the farmer expressed. Thus, the trees seemed to be important makers of land-as-home for Carolyn and the milking ewes with which she worked, that positioned the trees as ‘background’ figures rather than the fully-fledged characters she and her sheep seemed to be (see Plumwood, 1993; Haraway, 2016).

Land-as-home makers

Many of the farmers I talked to, like Carolyn, erected shelter belts for their stock, and like Lyn said, also planted trees “to beautify their place around creeks and streams”. Jocelyn was one such farmer and had planted many trees on her property but still “need[ed] to plant more to provide more shade and shelter so that most of the farm has shade and

Figure 40. Jocelyn’s farm showing some recent tree planting. Source: Jocelyn
shelter, gullies and water”. As part of her photo-story she sent me images of her recent plantings that show, for example (see figure 40) some of the cabbages and flaxes on the south side of her land, boxed for protection from curious grazers.

Millie was committed to tree planting as well. Moreover, she and her husband had “retired” a lot of bush on their hill country farm which meant fencing off patches of native forest rather than felling it for pasture. At the time I interviewed Millie, the farming couple, like Lyn, were going “through the process of gifting an area [of native bush] to the Queen Elisabeth Trust”. Although when I talked to her about what planting she and her husband had focused on, it wasn’t native trees, because her grandfather in-law had already planted many himself as Millie explained:

> It’s really interesting in the three generations, everybody has had a different focus. [My husband’s grandfather] came down here and married my gran and they farmed this farm. And it was really interesting because at the end of his life — well not at the end of his life, but probably at my age having felled everything [natives] as a young man, he started replanting. And he started planting natives which was really quite interesting for a man of that era [pause] but yeah so and then [my husband’s father] was into planting as well and he planted a lot of English trees. And then [my husband] and I are into planting as well but as I said we have planted things more for erosion and things and have planted a lot of trees for drought protection. So in a drought we can harvest willow and things for the ewes to eat. Not last year but the year before we had a really dry season and we were able to feed the ewes before mating by cutting down the branches of the willows and things.

Millie and Jocelyn’s focus on planting and fencing trees, both native and exotic, opened up in interesting and intersecting ways the debate in this thesis between agricultural production and conservation of indigenous flora. Together, these farmers talked about a variety of trees and a variety of reasons why they were either planted or protected. For example, both women had large areas of (exotic) pine trees growing for erosion
prevention. Women too, had planted native trees for absorbing water, heritage protection, and aesthetic reasons, as Jocelyn said of her recently planted trees: “They always look nice too”. Not that exotics were exempt from being planted for beauty as Millie showed me how on one part of her farm her father in-law had planted English trees along many of the farm’s creeks.

On the one hand these two women both used native and exotic tree species on their farming operations, disrupting the native versus exotic ‘natures’ discourse deliberated upon in chapter one. On the other hand, in these tree stories Jocelyn and Millie presented they did make distinctions between the separate categories. For example, even though both women used all kinds of trees for various purposes there was a tendency to position exotics as ‘productive’ and natives as ‘unproductive’. To illustrate, the pine, poplar and willow trees planted on women’s farms were used as shelter or erosion prevention, in other words ‘productive’; whereas the clumps of kahikatea on Millie’s land that were to be put into a covenant were viewed as ‘unproductive’ according to the said farming operations.

Moreover, Millie’s story here also seemed to resonate with an eco-nationalist timeline. For instance the way Millie mentioned how her relative “started planting natives which was really quite interesting for a man of that era” indicated the politics that Ginn raises within his eco-nationalism – that many Pākehā feel they are on a trajectory of becoming ‘post-colonial’ in which they have become “at peace with (their) colonial past” (Ginn, 2008, p.335). This account of Millie’s was also reminiscent of what Sarah’s father began doing a while ago as well, after he had similarly felled trees on his farm to make room for pasture:

\[ I \text{ know my father is into planting natives now but when he was working on the dairy farm it was all about making money} \]
\[ \text{[pause] they [her father and his siblings] didn’t understand that plants planted so many metres out will suck up all the toxins and trees can actually store a certain amount of chemicals and things without been harmed. All they knew was if the land gave them food and stock to sell, they were doing it right and if it} \]
didn’t you weren’t a good farmer. So there was that lack of
deep understanding

Mille and Sarah reflectively raise the point that in a Pākehā past imported trees and
pasture were the focus of agricultural production. They also explained how that, in
different ways, both their relatives began planting natives after they had felled the trees’
kin years before. In one sense these acts focus on a linear progression from coloniality to
post-coloniality. Nevertheless, these men and women still ran a ‘productive farm’ which
presented an important complexity when interrogating eco-nationalism in the context of
agricultural life.

These nuances became clearer to me as Jocelyn explained the tree planting plan for her
farm. Sitting opposite each other in her kitchen Jocelyn hauled a large white folder onto
the table that sat between our coffee and fruit cake. Jocelyn explained how, at that time,
she was in the middle of conducting a Whole Farm Plan (WFP) which was a Sustainable
Land-use Initiative (SLUI) aided by her local regional council, Horizons. A SLUI was an
initiative to help farmers with erosion issues and enable them to bolster farm
sustainability. The intensive exercise required many meetings with the local
Environmental Management Officer (EMO) and filling out stacks of forms that measured
farmers’ soil, fertiliser history, productivity, pasture types, native habitats and so forth.
Despite the arduous process Jocelyn wanted to be part of the (voluntary) plan as the
council helped (through expertise and funding) her with tree planting and retiring some
clumps of native bush, and, as she mentioned she had a good relationship with her local
EMO:

We [her local area] are really lucky that we have the guy [local
EMO] we do from Horizons. Because he’s old-school. Whereas I
think some people coming up with Resource Management
degrees and going into councils who have no farming
background [...] could be very difficult to marry to the [pause]
you know you don’t want to get someone coming in and being
dictatorial about what you can do and that [pause]its

102 For information see http://www.horizons.govt.nz/managing-natural-resources/land
counterproductive. So it’s about a partnership really. You are producing a really good product. And so you don’t need someone coming on to your farm and saying ‘you can’t do this and you can’t do that’. We are getting enough of that interference now starting to [pause] I mean the Resource Management Act (RMA) has its place but it’s over the top — sometimes. You’ve got to have a balance between the economy and your resources. Most farmers really want to leave their land in a better way [than from when they started].

Jocelyn’s opinions here usefully contribute to this chapter’s focus on verdant tensions. Noticeable in her narrative cited here was a fear that environmental regulatory bodies — such as the RMA — may become too “dictatorial” towards farmers who are already committed to tree planting. This fear was foregrounded by Jocelyn expressing her worry that there were an increasing number of regulators who have no “farming background”. These kinds of remarks were potential expressions of the desire for libertarianism or minimalist government intervention or regulation within Victorian arcadian narratives and rural (Pākehā) New Zealand culture (Fairburn, 1989; Johnsen, 2003). Yet at the same time Jocelyn was evidently keen to be a part of SLUI management and dutifully complied with RMA regulation. Accordingly, Jocelyn’s opinions here, by chatting over the routine operation of a sheep and beef farm helpfully disrupted the entrenched binary common to (Pākehā) New Zealand discourse that separates those who desire more regulation and those who desire less. In this context, Jocelyn’s stance holds ripe potential for composting transcendent arcadian political views.
Figure 41. Spring buds on one of Penelope’s fruit trees. Source: Penelope

Figure 42. Planted native trees by Mary. Source: Mary
Mary and Penelope did not have to worry about SLUIs or erosion given they lived on flat blocks. Nevertheless they, like Jocelyn, had an interest in tree planting, both native and exotic. The first trees Penelope showed me as she guided me around her farm was the poplars she and her husband had planted for shelter from the sun and wind. They had bought the land bare and so what they had achieved was impressive. Although it was a typical November day in Martinborough when I visited so, at first, my impressions were a little dampened. The sun was merciless, the wind hot, the surrounding land, dusty and stony. There was no shade to speak of for humans yet. Yet Penelope was building “a good life”.

“Shall we take a look around the farm?” she asked almost immediately after she opened the door to me. So we ventured out under the hot rays, piercing my back as the eczema all over it itched in sweat and heat. I soon realised my black gumboots were a bad idea. Supressing physical discomforts I walked with Penelope around her farm to see, among other things, her tree plantings. She had not only planted poplar trees for weather protection but also native flaxes for flooding absorption during the wet winters. Other trees, she and her husband had all planted themselves, both exotic and native, populated her six acre block. However, her most elaborate tree project was what she called the “Food Forest”. I was mightily amazed at how bountiful this woody area was. Constructed as a mathematical map Penelope had planted many kinds of berry shrubs, citrus and stone fruit trees which were planted within a circular spread of nut trees. She was evidently proud of this part of the farm and as part of her photo-story sent me pictures of fruit trees beginning to exhibit the signs of spring (see figure 41).

Mary also grew many fruit trees. In fact, Mary had a very impressive, dense orchard which provided her with a lot of fruitful fodder. Interestingly, now that she was retired, Mary also “dabbled” in native tree growing (see figure 42). Like Lyn, Mary grew trees from seed and had started planting them out on her farm in bunches which she and her husband then fenced for their protection from grazing stock. Mary’s “hobby” was intriguing in the way it resonated with the stories of Millie and Sarah’s relatives whom also began to plant natives once they had reached retirement indicating native trees were planted for pleasure rather than profit or production.
However, like Lyn, Jill, Millie and Sarah’s accounts, Mary’s interest in native tree planting did not exactly radiate eco-nationalism with fervour given her commitment to agricultural practice and her dedication to growing exotic species of many kinds in her gardens and orchard. Collectively then, these women’s tree narratives disrupted the binaries between eco-nationalism and farming, instead forming an intricate arcadianism rooted in traces of both pursuits. Far from innocent, women-tree-pasture stories still tended to frame exotic species as ‘productive’ and native, ‘non-productive’. The cultural corollary of this of course is a problematic view positioning exotics and farmers as culture and natives as fragile ‘nature’ requiring preservation, illustrated by so many of the planted natives in this chapter being fenced. This material-semiotic separation of culture and ‘nature’ revealed then, how in terms of the wider composting project for this thesis, women’s stories were broadly still ‘green’, not quite broken down, compost.

Nevertheless, drawing on the tree-loving arguments by Coke and Jones, trees and pasture in this chapter were “highly skilful place makers” in their “creative” and “routine” encounters with women (Cloke & Jones 2002, p.8; see also Jones & Cloke, 2004). Furthermore, as agentic beings in regular relation with participants I propose that they were not just place makers, but home makers intimating an ability to, with women, make land-as-home. This domestic, homely, feminist, reading of Cloke and Jones’ work was an important element in women’s stories in this chapter and will be even more so in the ensuing chapters, deepening and broadening the ideas of dominant arcadian expressions through the figurations of home and kinship.
Leaf Litter

I often just go down and sit on the edge of the bridge and look down on the stream and there are all these coloured leaves and often you can get the reflection. But this year it was a bit late so it was just a mat of leaves on the ground (Gaye’s words).

In this refrain, Gaye explained to me how often in autumn when the leaves turn yellow, brown, gold, on the deciduous trees lining her creek, she watches how they fall onto the waterway and also views the leaves that are still on the trees reflected in the water. She took this photograph (see figure 43) as the year I interviewed Gaye she had been too late, so sitting on the bridge Michael built she took a photograph of the leaves that had fallen on the ground into a “mat”. Leaf litter, or “a mat of leaves on the ground” is an apt conclusion for this chapter on green compost.

The central point of this chapter has been to explore women’s stories about trees and pasture and how they intersect with dominant and transcendent arcadian discourses in
New Zealand. From Lyn and Jill’s commitment to tree planting, to Carolyn and Lynne’s pasture sowing, and many women’s tree shelter construction, a dualistic sense between production and protection was, I suggest, present. I know this dualism as I recognise it within myself. For a long time I believed in a ‘pristine’ and ‘pure’ native nature and still struggle when I hear indigenous forest being cleared for farming and perhaps more tellingly, a relief when certain tracts of bush are conserved.

However, by being with women in all kinds of leafy practice caused me to realise how women’s stories were also significant in troubling this common Pākehā dualism which helped challenge my own thinking. Even the tree stories that Lyn and Jill told, as keen native tree conservationists, sullied the purity that eco-nationalism attempts to attain. The section in this chapter on reproductive pastoralisms too, pointed to a reinscription of arcadian discourse that seeks ‘material progress’ through sown pasture or tree crops. But the homely, routine, familial, care-full quality of these stories pointed to more than just a desire for capitalist extraction. Therefore, I suggest that trees and pasture in this chapter were land-as-home makers inescapably entwining their green brown bodies throughout women’s homes that were made on land, politically and materially.

Thus, through both conservation and agricultural production, trees and pasture in this chapter were generative in breaking down the Pākehā binaries that this thesis seeks to trouble. This uprooting could be seen as simply the messy process of the actual practice of trying to make a home out of land. Yet I suggest the politics of such home making cannot be divorced from these practices. As such these stories of growing fruit trees, shelter belts, implementing covenants, and more, could be seen as material domestic acts contemporaneously steeped in the politics of identifying as Pākehā. Importantly, these tales were fairly ‘green’. They held composting potential but were leafy trajectories not quite broken down yet. Yet, like Gaye’s leaves, all greenery dies at some point and so this chapter acts as a fertile beginning for the next few chapters on landhome making.
Chapter 8. Landhome making in Wairarapa

There’s something
very rooted
about having
a piece of land.
It does give you
a place to stand.
It’s my inner feeling,
It’s who I am.

It is where all my family are —
(yes) my identity
would be most influenced
by that piece of land\(^\text{103}\).

Much of this thesis rests upon being “of the land”. The previous two chapters have indicated how participants expressed this, often ineffable, but earthy affect. Trees and pasture pointed to some of the daily routines of living and working agriculturally and the entanglement of plant-human relations. This chapter builds on these stories by arguing when it came to the soil, property, block, piece, ground, that was interchanged with the concept of ‘land’ during interviews, there was an intensity that although colonially problematic expressed a sense of Haraway’s (2008;2016) ‘becoming with’ that offered gritty ways of composting arcadia.

All ten women discussed their feelings towards land at great length and in various and intersecting ways. Spun together, they expressed what I develop in this chapter, landhome making. Landhome making was generated from women’s affection and connection to land which they made, in varying degrees, home. It is a situated mutated natureculture that concomitantly speaks to arcadian narratives and partial ways of what
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\(^{103}\) This is a found poem made up of words and phrases from participants’ stories about land (see Tarlo, 2009).
it means to be a Pākehā New Zealander. As a way to compost arcadia, landhome making troubles and queers the ‘naturalising’ and ‘normalising’ often associated with the term, homeland. Landhome making is also a feminist project that disrupts the often essentialising category of ‘homemaker’ by enabling a space for the women of this thesis to tell their stories of making home on, and with, land. Three intersecting strata will gradually show the significance of landhome making starting with childhood recollections, then ancestry and finally narrations of nationhood.

Childhood stories like Lynne’s recollection of horse riding as a child, Jill’s memories of playing by the rivers in Greytown, or Gaye’s trips to her relatives’ farm, evoked a sense of innocence, innocence being a common trait of any arcadia (Evans, 2007; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). To explore these ‘innocent’ connections with land I excavate women’s ruminations and juxtapose them with Haraway’s noninnocence (2016). Noninnocence vitally challenges the binary between guilt and innocence by positing that nobody is innocent and guilt is unproductive and narcissistic (Haraway, 2008; Ahmed, 2004). Moreover, Haraway’s noninnocence was particularly helpful in conjunction with Lydia Wevers (2005) observations that Pākehā imagining themselves as children on land in Aotearoa, is as an elicitation of innocence (see also Taylor, 2013) that infers an uncontested, and therefore indigenous, connection to that place.

Adding complexity to this discussion on childhood, identity and place in this chapter are stories of ancestry. In varying gradations women recited their genealogy to me. Especially potent were stories recited by Lynne, Lyn and Sarah who felt deeply towards their settler ancestors. Drawing on the mythology of ‘natural’ settlement with their ‘flesh and blood’, these kinds of stories inevitably, and problematically, ‘naturalised’ their belonging to the land they called home (Evans, 2007). Yet the intergenerational narrations of Lynne’s kin stories, Lyn’s connection towards Forest Home, and Sarah’s commitment to her family farm in Taranaki, were also profoundly meaningful. To work through these knots of settling land I draw on Newton’s ever helpful ‘becoming Pākehā’ (Newton, 2009).

Becoming Pākehā is a large part of the wider composting project of this thesis. Therefore, in this chapter I explore it not just in the context of Pākehā ancestry but also in tandem with women’s ideas of nationhood — ideas of ‘New Zealandness’ being an important component of exploring narratives of arcadia in this research. Notably though, even
though women all had ample opportunity to answer in nationalising terms, there was a lack of overt nationalising throughout their responses when I asked them about nationhood, echoing the theme from the previous chapter. However, what women did reply with, I suggest, resinscribed common tropes of a New Zealand arcadia. Specifically, themes such as the harmony between man and land; self-sufficiency; private property; material progress; and the family owned-and-operated farm were all common features of what it meant to be a New Zealander for these women (Fairburn, 1989).

Contemporaneously, women’s narrations throughout this chapter troubled the ideals of a heteronormative arcadia by bending gender norms, pushing the bounds of human exceptionalism, and challenging the stoicism of the settler arcadia or Kiwi Bloke. Such disruptions provided a space for a potent composting and led to questioning the fixed idea of settlement, underscoring how Pākehā are still settling, still becoming (see chapter one, four and five). It was this uncertainty or contingency that positioned these stories as ‘becoming’ and ‘becoming with’ which raised questions of my own becoming that — like most (non)innocent land tales — begins with childhood.

(Non)Innocent Childhods

Most stories of affinity for land participants told began when they were children. Some stories were longer than others and some recounted how they had visited family farms, or lived near agricultural life when they were young, and some women had been raised rurally. As mentioned in chapter six, Lynne was one of those who grew up on a farm and had many fond memories from childhood. One part of her life as young person that she felt particularly affected by was the times she spent horse riding. Her parents gave her a pony when she was four and so had grown up with horses; and once she had learnt to ride, as she explained, she spent most of her spare time with her childhood companion:

*I had a childhood at the beach. I used to ride my pony for twelve miles. You know and my mother never knew where I was when I was on my horse. I’d just say ‘see you later’ and she wouldn’t know what direction I’d gone [...]. So in the morning I’d pack*

104 See appendix C interview question one
lunch, stop at the pub for an ice-cream and I’d arrive at the beach about three in the afternoon. And then my mum says, ‘your pony needs a day off today’ so I couldn’t ride that day. But it was guaranteed the day after that I was [back] on my horse! So I think that’s kind of changed in our lifetime too. You know these kids — our kids — never go riding off on their own.

Whereas my mother never knew where I was!

In this passage Lynne presents an ideal life of riding her horse. She has the freedom of her mother not knowing where she is, and she is in harmony with her horse and her surroundings, demonstrated through her capability of riding, and her knowledge of the route to the beach. An idyllic state of freedom and harmony with ‘nature’ is not only key to the mythology of arcadia (Fairburn, 1989; Ruff, 2015) but — when expressed through childhood memory — is also a myth that exudes innocence (Wevers, 2005). Such innocence, Wevers (2005) argues, holds the potential of being a claim to White indigeneity insofar as ‘innocence’ implies an incontestable relationship to land (see also Evans, 2007). To gain a deeper understanding of Lynne’s connection to land though it is important to illustrate her “passion” for farming which, like horse riding, also began as a child:

I guess my dad had a real passion for farming — my mum was a city girl but dad just loved it and I guess that rubbed off and like we [Lynne and her brother] would always go out with dad when we were around, especially doing the stock work. I was encouraged to stay inside and make beds though. Like my brother fed the dogs which used to make me very cross cos I’d much rather be out feeding the dogs and stuff [pause] so right from an early age there was that affinity with my dogs and my horses. I got my first pony when I was four so that love of horses and animals has been very strong for a long long time.
The “long long time” Lynne had felt strongly towards “animals” was a key reason why she was a farmer. The way she, as an adult, fed her working dogs, orphaned lambs and horses, the way she rode around the farm during spring checking on lambs (a ‘lamb beat’), and the way she mustered sheep for market, drenching them and shearing them, were tasks imbued with significance as they, more or less, mirrored what her father did. Lynne’s feeling towards farming life could be described as deeply affective and almost ineffable (Ottum & Reno, 2016) as she tried to put into words her feelings on the matter: “I guess it’s my inner feeling. It’s who I am” whilst she rubbed her chest. Concomitantly however, Lynne’s stories could be read as an act of indigenising wherein Lynne seemed to know the land and animals around her innocently and deeply (see Evans, 2007; Wevers, 2005).

Cultivating these ideas in relation to Jill’s childhood recollections develops the theme of innocence and White indigeneity. Jill was not raised on a farm. She grew up in Greytown which was where her affection for waterways began. Like Lynne, Jill illustrated a sense of freedom with land when she was young, as her mother also had no idea where she was when she was down at the rivers as a child playing. This freedom also begat a harmony with land (Fairburn, 1989), as like Lynne, Jill knew how to play in the rivers without any safety concerns or requiring parental guidance:

_I was brought up in Greytown and all those rivers [around Greytown] were very much part of my childhood. They were rivers one could get to by bike exceptionally easily. So, they were great, mum never knew where we were! Did you mum? [Jill’s mum was present]_

Whilst conversing about her days growing up in Greytown, down by the rivers, Jill mentioned how she was taught at school that Wairarapa was the one place in New Zealand where there were no wars between Māori and Pākehā; a version, more or less, of the ‘bloodless province’ myth discussed in chapter five. As mentioned in that chapter the most probable reason for the lack of blood spilt was because the majority of Māori land had already been sold by 1853 and so there was little land left to confiscate (Marr, 2001, Waitangi Tribunal, 2010). Nevertheless, the belief Jill had that Wairarapa Māori and Pākehā always related well was important to her:
As children we were told at school how the settlers, how we were all pioneers who fostered great relationships with the Māori. So we were told out of all the different places in New Zealand there were no wars and that was all down to the settlers and how they negotiated and respected all the people.

We were told that. Yeah we were always told that. And I was quite proud of that. Cos all our mates were Māori. So yeah we all got along very well. And I think we always did. And we never haven’t done. So that’s cool. So I think that is kind of important; in lots of ways

Not only her home region, but Jill herself, had nurtured friendly relationships with Māori. This relating was “important; in lots of ways”. One very pertinent way harmonious race relations were “important” to Jill was because of her heritage. As a sixth generation Pākehā New Zealander, her father’s family, the Greatheads — a name she herself carried — were significant in the making of Greytown in the nineteenth century. Jill’s lineage went “right to the beginning. So Thomas Kempton was the first person in Greytown. So he was my great great great grandfather”. Jill correctly points out that Thomas Kempton was one of the first people to arrive in Greytown in 1853 as part of the small farm settlement (Carle, 1946).

However, Jill’s stories of ancestry and childhood coalesced into a potent demonstration of Wevers’ (2005) argument of White ‘nativism’. For one, Jill’s river story expressed an innocent and incontestable relationship with the rivers in Greytown. Jill also pointed to how Kempton was the “first person in Greytown”, expressing a sense of White indigeneity that pictured Māori as not First Peoples and never colonised. What is similarly intriguing in this childhood recounting is at times Jill speaks as if she was herself a “pioneer”: “[....] we were told at school how the settlers, how we were all pioneers”. This comment in the context of weaving her ancestral and childhood stories together, as a way of explaining her relationship to rivers in twenty-first century Wairarapa, points to the possibility that for Jill, there has been an enduring story of settling and pioneering Greatheads.
Chatting over childhood memories with Gaye too, slipped into tales of ancestry. Gaye grew up in Kilbirnie Wellington and frequented the top of the South Island during her school holidays. Her uncle owned a farm in Seddon, Marlborough which had been in the family since the 1860s. As well as being on the farm, Gaye remembered fondly the large bags of potatoes and peas they would receive in Wellington for summer dinners around Christmas time. According to Gaye, farm experiences with wider family members like this was the thing for “kids in New Zealand” to do:

So we always went there [her relatives’ farm] for our holidays
— You know how kids in New Zealand do. So it is [pause] so I think it is a New Zealand thing to do, you know to go and stay with your relatives that live on a farm.

The blend of agricultural produce and childhood holidays within Gaye’s recollections generated an enticing arcadia complete with the tropes of a family-owned-and-operated farm, ‘natural’ abundance and freedom (Fairburn, 1989). Framing her child excursions on farms as a quintessential “New Zealand thing to do” Gaye also echoed the Pākehā ‘normalising’ within Lynne and Jill’s childhood adventures. Carolyn too shared with me how, as a child living in Eastbourne, she used to visit a farm near Feilding. Then, when Carolyn was an adult, and decided to live rurally, it was those memories of childhood that came to the fore as she was looking to buy land in Wairarapa:

As we were going through the Wairarapa we found this one in the window of real-estate shop in Carterton. And we fell in love with it. The house was probably built in the 1950s so there was a lot of rimu in it. And it reminded me of the house near Feilding that I went to as a kid. There was a big shed and a creek out the back

It was the affecting familiarity from childhood that compelled Carolyn to fall in love and buy her first property in Wairarapa. Childhood memories of a particular place also formed much of Lyn’s decision to buy Forest Home. When she was young, during the summer, when her relations owned the family’s ancestral land, she often visited. “In the 1960s an aunt and uncle owned (Forest home) and I used to come and stay here in the
summer holidays so I got to love this place as a child”. Fortunately, Lyn was able to buy the venerated property as an adult which she saw as a blessing:

*We were so blessed. And our boys grew up here and now our grandchildren are enjoying the lovely peace and quiet and the enjoyment of Forest Home [...] so when people come here we refer to this place as almost heaven — no, almost paradise.*

In Gaye, Carolyn and Lyn’s stories, there is a desire for possession of agricultural property that fulfils the arcadian dream (Fairburn, 1989). Drawing on childhood memories to express those affects potentially ‘normalises’, ‘naturalises’ and ‘indigenises’ that sense of ownership or belonging (Evans, 2007; Wevers, 2005) through the veil of innocence, a trait that is also common to the arcadian ideal (Fairburn, 1989; Ruff, 2015). Rubbing up against this ‘natural’ occupancy though, was the settler ethic in which the arcadian dream is reflected in the act of buying a block of land so as to build a farming life of subsistence and a little profit, a pertinent theme throughout the following sections.

**Settling flesh and blood**

In the 1860s Lyn’s ancestors bought a couple of small farms near Masterton (one being Forest Home) buying into the arcadian settler dream of owning a small technically mixed farm for subsistence production and eventually profit whilst earning money in the local township (Fairburn, 1989; Winter, 2014 Pers. Communication; see also chapter five). Lyn too ran a technically mixed small farm and worked in Masterton. The continuities between her ancestors’ and Lyn’s current land practices did not end there either. As
mentioned in chapter six and seven, there was a tract of indigenous bush on Lyn’s land that had been fenced off since her forebears first bought the place:

Mary Agnes who was my great grandfather’s sister on the neighbouring property she — her husband must have been really quite ‘out there’ because he actually put her area of bush aside in her name. [So] he surveyed it off and put that area of land in her name which was pretty radical for the 1860s for a woman to own land [pause]. Yeah, and so my great grandfather Richard Theophilous did the same thing here although I think Mary Agnes’ block has been better preserved than here. But we have certainly [preserved it well] for the last thirty years — there has definitely not been any stock in our area.

Figure 44. Gate to covenant dedicated to Lyn’s ancestor. Source: Lyn
Lyn’s story alluded to the arcadian myth that because she is a Tankersley she ‘naturally’ belonged to Forest Home. Compounding this sense of a ‘natural’ home was a plaque recently erected. It was a carved piece of wood that signposted the covenanted bush. Lyn acknowledged on the plaque that the QEII covenant was dedicated to her ancestor (see figure 44). These images, signs, affects, knitted thick lines (see Bell, 2017; Haraway & Goodeve, 2004; Haraway 2008) to the land Lyn loved reflecting the romantic arcadia of ‘natural’ belonging and the settler arcadia of possession and ownership. By beginning the story with her ancestors as well, Lyn seemed to problematically position her family as indigenous.

Yet like Lyn’s omission that Forest Home was not quite “paradise”, there were a couple of disruptions to this ancestral arcadian narrative that help compost Lyn’s story. For one Lyn had to buy her ancestor’s property from ‘non-Tankersleys’ rather than inheriting the land from her family. In this sense Lyn’s purchase of Forest Home could be read as a naturalcultural inheritance — an inheritance of land through non-heteronormative love and kin making (see Haraway 2003; 2008). Lyn’s openness about having to purchase the property was also a significant uprooting of the romantic ‘naturalisms’ at play in her story. Lyn’s love for Forest Home also unsettled the heteronormative masculinity of the settler arcadia. Lyn is not only a woman, she took the liberty of returning to her maiden [sic] name after she and her husband bought the property as she wanted the family name to be continued. Challenging gender norms was not new within Lyn’s lineage. She herself pointed to how Richard Theophilous put Mary Agnes’ name on the deed for the neighbouring property, an uncommon occurrence in (Pākehā) New Zealand at the time (Belich, 1996).

Lyn’s position as ‘the Tankersley’ living on Forest Home reminded me of Lynne’s unsettling of the heteronormativity in dominant arcadian narratives. As mentioned, Lynne liked to do work that was not in the house, preferring to be out on the farm, not the “traditional” role for women living rurally (Little & Austin, 1996; Little & Panelli, 2003; Little, 2007). Complexly though, like in Lyn’s story, “tradition” was important to Lynne in terms of the lineage of the family farm she ran with her husband. Over a beef casserole, broccoli and red wine, both Lynne and Rob explained to me how the family farm was
established by narrating to me the story of John Garner (or Jack) Woodhouse (1874-1957).

Jack was one of the second wave settlers that arrived in the Tiraumea\textsuperscript{105} area in the 1890s (see chapter five). He was born in 1874 in Wellington and as a landless labourer he travelled to Eketāhuna as a young man looking for work. He soon found a job in a local stables and eventually got promoted to packman; packing meat and other goods on a horse from one farm to another (Burns & White, 2006). The route he travelled on overlooked the farms of Tiraumea and triggered in him a desire to own and farm land himself (Burns & White, 2006). Such a Victorian arcadian ambition was soon realised when a 200 acre section came up for sale in 1895 and the story goes that Jack sealed the deal with a one pound note (Burns & White, 2006; Fairburn, 1989).

Rob, Jack’s great grandson, was determined the carry on the family farm, which is why he and Lynne ended up buying the original property to make land ‘home’, along with the additional paddocks that had recently become part of the enterprise. Back in 1995, one hundred years after Jack first purchased their farm, Lynne and her family inscribed Jack’s details on a plaque and stuck it up on a monument that Rob built out of rocks on top of “The Cracker” (see figures 45 & 46). The Cracker was one of the highest peaks on Lynne’s land and standing on its crown, the valley Lynne lived in could be seen from every angle. Nearly twenty years later when I interviewed Lynne and Rob they still talked of the family event with affection even though an earthquake had dismantled the site. What made the area even more special was that they had both decided — when the time came — to be cremated and their ashes scattered around the peak:

\begin{quote}
That’s going to be our family place. Rob several years ago had them stacked up, but the earthquake — the last earthquake — they all fell down. So they are not quite the pile they were! But when the digger comes home Rob will stack them up again. But yeah that’s pretty intense having your own family place. So I guess that gives you — because your family are here — that
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{105} In which, at time, the area known as ‘Rakanui’ was a part (Burns & White, 2006).
gives you a very strong close tie to the land as well. Yeah. So we will be spread out up there.

Figure 45. Close up of the Woodhouse family plaque on top of the Cracker. Source: Burns and White (2006, p.9)

Figure 46. The Woodhouse family on top of the Cracker. Source: Burns and White (2006, p.9)
Lynne’s story of ancestral settlement and home making on land reproduced a well-known settler arcadian story of the small owned-and-operated family farm whereby a little bit of land was bought so a living could be established (Fairburn, 1989). Such a reiteration of a working-class man who laboured hard to achieve prosperity also recites the arcadian Victorian impetus for ‘material progress’ and private property ownership, which was key to the making of moral men [sic] (Fairburn, 1989; see also chapter four). The origin narrative of ‘Rakanui’ (the name of their farm and former name of the area) and the family monument also affected Lynne greatly and contributed to a deep bond she had formed by marrying into the Woodhouse family.

Lynne and Lyn’s family stories together, revealed how ‘naturalising’ and ‘normalising’ their occupancy to the land they ‘inherited’ was important and it was important because they unequivocally loved the land they lived on. Lynne’s comments “that’s pretty intense having your own family place” and “because your family are here — that gives you a very strong close tie to the land as well” echoed the deep affection for both family and land and how those two are ever entwined for Lynne. Evoking the importance of family within a Victorian arcadia, Lynne and Lyn, potentially conjured the settler trope explored in chapter four — in the sense that their arcadianism was deeply engaged in making of home through stories of familial settlement (Fairburn, 1989). Yet the arcadian settler is fundamentally stoic and heteronormative. In this sense both women not only challenged the heteronormativity of the male settler figure, as mentioned, they also challenged his self-contained body by the deep affect they expressed towards land and their kin — a composting of arcadia that felt fertile.

Tunnelling further into fleshly signs, family and land was Jocelyn and Sarah’s stories of ancestry. One of the first things Jocelyn said to me, and repeated in several variations was: “So I’m a fourth generation Kiwi with farming in my blood. My parents were brought up on farms and I was brought up on a farm and my kids have been brought up on a farm”. The trope that Jocelyn relayed — “farming in my blood” — was not just a figure of speech or a metaphor. Her body that farmed and the significance of that practice were entwined; flesh and sign were one (Haraway, 2003; 2008; 2016). Jocelyn had inherited farming from each generation of her family since they arrived in New Zealand and this
deeply felt affect and commitment to land was always embodied through biological relation and decades of farm work.

It was a similar case with Sarah who expressed a very intense affect towards her “family farm” in Taranaki – ‘family’ and ‘farm’ seemingly inseparable. Fortuitously, in between our interviews, Sarah visited that farm during her children’s school holidays. Unsurprisingly, as part of the photo-story which I asked her to perform, she took several photos whilst visiting the region and her family. It was clear to me that land and history for Sarah were inseparable. On her family farm, and the surrounding locale, she felt attached to the hills, pasture and rivers as much as the family house, bridges and tunnels. There was no ‘nature’ without culture and no culture without ‘nature’, in this place for Sarah, perhaps most richly illustrated by the cemetery (see figure 47) where flesh and sign were bound and her ‘flesh and blood’ were buried:

One of the photos I took was of the Stratford cemetery because all my family are buried there. Everybody is buried there [...] So when you said take photos of pieces of land that were meaningful I thought ‘oh its such a morbid thing’ but I just kind of took a picture [of the cemetery] because it is where all my family are. And my children and my brother’s children can go in and find the same names as them, which is really cool, which is a connection for them. It gives them a depth I guess to your family. So that piece of land, the Stratford cemetery, although it’s communally owned, is significant

Sarah’s long embedded relationship to Taranaki was “meaningful” and “significant”, and bound within the ground, which bore sumptuous renderings of identity making that potentially ‘indigenised’ her belonging through reciting the cultural story of her family first settling in Taranaki:
So Dad’s family came in 1841 and settled in Taranaki pretty much straight away. My mother’s family came a little later in 1860s and they came up through Nelson and then finally settled in Taranaki.

The puissant mix of ancestral burial grounds and settler history in Sarah’s narrative reproduced a compelling sense of belonging, especially in the way Sarah mentioned how her “Dad’s family [...] settled in Taranaki pretty much straight away” which seemed to infer that her ancestors had been in New Zealand for quite some time. And it was this sense of time that contributed to a depth to Sarah’s family settlement story that made, “that piece of land, the Stratford cemetery [pause] significant”.

Figure 47. Stratford cemetery. Source: Sarah
The “connection” Sarah felt to Taranaki was (flesh and blood) matter that mattered, a connection that corresponded to the stories told by Jocelyn, Lynne and Lyn in relation to their land and identities as farmers. As mentioned, one analysis of these stories could be that women’s stories presented an innocence, but in actuality they were guilty of reinscribing the colonial ‘naturalising’ of Pākehā occupancy (Evans, 2007; Wevers, 2005). However, troubling the guilty/innocent binary Haraway (2008; 2016) calls for noninnocent response-ability. Defined as simply, the ability to respond with neither innocence nor guilt, noninnocent response-ability is a valuable part of Haraway’s composting and is useful here for decomposing transcendent Pākehā myths of arcadia with women’s stories taking the lead.

Landhome making: Pākehā becoming

I didn’t ask women to talk about ancestry or their childhood but I did ask them about their New Zealand identity106 as I wanted some way in to discuss cultural politics in relation to land (see chapter six). Of course, I needn’t have bothered as cultural politics saturated so many different conversations I had with participants albeit in subtle earthy ways. Nevertheless, the question of ‘New Zealandness’ did provide surprisingly rich responses on things arcadian. Therefore, in this last section I spend time unravelling these conversations and end up advancing the concept of landhome making as a way to describe the way women, and myself, relate to land as Pākehā.

Walking up Mary’s long, stony, dry, dusty driveway with the sun searing down, causing my eyes to profusely water, I could hear the sounds and smell of rural life more than I could see them. A quad bike made its way across the dry paddocks on my far left; working dogs barked near to me; the distant sound of a baby crying came from my right and milk tankers rolled in the distance from behind. The scent of petrol, manure and pine needles filled my nose. This was not exactly the touristic Martinborough so often touted in brochures and websites (see Howland, 2002; chapter five). As I approached Mary’s house, planted into the dusty green-brown fabric of the landscape, was a carved sign that bore the name of the place in which

106 See Appendix C question one.
she and her husband were both raised as children. I learnt of this detail whilst sitting at the table with them both. Mary and her husband grew up in a suburb in Wellington which, when they were young, was semi-rural. Both of them lived on a route between the local stock yards and the area’s abattoir. Watching farmers mustering their sheep or cattle on horseback along this road engendered in Mary and her husband a desire for farming.

Mary especially had an affinity for gardening as it was somewhat of a family tradition: “I come from a family of gardeners, of vegetable gardeners”. I asked her exactly what she grew on her small farm alongside their cattle and sheep. Amongst a green floral terrain of native trees and exotic flowers, Mary had grown both an orchard and a vegetable garden. In her orchard she produced apples, quinces, apricots, plums, loquat, olives, cherries, mandarins, lemons, limes, raspberries, blackcurrants, feijoas and boysenberries; “and a few deaths along the way!”. Mary also had considerable skills in the kitchen and using her fruit made jams, desserts and bottled olives after harvest. She also pickled gherkins, but as she pointed out, they came from her vegetable garden alongside potatoes, broccoli, lettuce, tomatoes, capsicums, cabbage, cauliflowers - “beans and radishes occasionally. So yeah we are fairly self-sufficient. But you do get nights [pause] it’s hard in the winter”.

Mary and her husband’s goal was to be as self-sufficient as possible for themselves whilst also providing produce, preserves and meat for their children and grandchildren. To this end they raised sheep for meat and also earned a little capital by hand-rearing Hereford and Murray Grey cattle. Drawing on the arcadian tropes of a self-sufficient small family farm (Fairburn, 1989), Mary also saw a connection between her farm practices and her sense of nationhood. In particular, when I asked her if she saw a link between what she practised on her farm and her sense of being a New Zealander she baulked at the question confused as to why she would need to declare what is obvious: “Well that’s not a very complicated question is it? The fact that we [she and her husband] are here, raising animals and producing meat, gardening, producing food. That’s sort of the essence of being a New Zealander.”

Even though Mary and her husband had not been raised rurally, they maintained that the goal of owning a farm to be able to grow one’s own food was, more or less, what
it meant to be a New Zealander. Such Pākehā New Zealand mythologising was brought to fruition, literally. Cementing their home on land Mary and her husband stuck a sign in the ground which, bearing the place name of their childhood, seemed like an act of innocent exploration and possession, a potent ‘naturalising’ and ‘indigenising’ of their belonging (see Evans, 2007; Wevers, 2005). This significant and literal act of ‘putting a stake in the ground’ whilst problematically reproducing arcadian tropes, also pointed to a mythology-in-practise or a fleshly significance, which I suggest, was potentially generative.

Before excavating Mary’s story further however, I would like to bring Penelope’s ruminations into the discussion. Penelope was another small farmer who lived in Martinborough. Comparably to Mary, her reasoning for buying a six acre section was to become self-sufficient. Whilst explaining why Penelope decided to make this move she drew on the old Kiwi adage of ‘a quarter acre paradise’ a kind of twentieth century New Zealand suburban arcadia (Evans, 2007; see also Schama, 1995). “Well what we [Penelope and her husband] do here — cos everyone had the quarter acre section and grew their own food — this is (just) a little bit bigger than a quarter acre but it’s the same idea. We grow our own food”. Evoking the arcadian themes of self-sufficiency (Fairburn, 1989), Penelope also made a point of telling me that these practices were fading in contemporary New Zealand so I asked her why she thought that was the case:

I think that’s just how [young people] tend to be. They can buy a latte and its fine. They can go to the supermarket and its fine. Young people in general don’t tend to think a lot. Because they are too busy with things that are instant and those sorts of things. They don’t think long term. They are not long term thinkers. And I think it’s getting worse rather than better because everything is instant. They don’t grow vegetables. They don’t recognise things in the garden. ‘What’s a potato plant how do you grow beans?’ ‘I don’t know’. And it’s getting worse not better and the problem

107 see for example Austin Mitchell’s (1972) satirical account of New Zealand life in his book The Half Gallon Quarter Acre Pavlova Paradise
108 see Schama’s (2005) analysis on the suburban lawn as an American arcadia
now is that there is another generation of people from the people
who know nothing

Like Mary, Penelope drew on the romantic arcadian tendency to see the past as a site of authentication (Evans, 2007): In this case, she viewed a past Pākehā New Zealander growing their own food, as the more ‘authentic’ way to be. Penelope lamented over the ostensible loss of a culture that knew how to grow vegetables or even how to identify them. This sentiment was reminiscent of Mary and her husband’s thoughts on what has occurred in Martinborough in recent times. As Howland (2002) argues, in the past few decades Martinborough has undergone somewhat of a transformation from a farming service town to a contemporary Mediterranean arcadia which has attracted many urbanites as weekend tourists and ‘lifestyle block’ owners. Penelope and Mary (and her husband) consciously set themselves apart from this culture by acting somewhat derisively about some of their neighbours.

For example, when I asked Mary about the community she lived in her husband interjected: “They stuffed Martinborough up a few years ago when they went and planted all these bloody grape vines”. He then jutted his thumb behind him and declared: “He’s not farming anything. He’s got a few olive trees on it and that’s about it.” Mary nodded in agreeance. These observations reminded me of Penelope’s neighbour who had allegedly altered the land formation on his property which caused her land to flood more regularly. With a similar sense of disdain Penelope commented that; “he only visits his place in the weekends to sit on his (ride on) mower”.

A similar cultural clash between ‘authentic’ and perhaps ‘picturesque’ arcadian modes also sprouted during conservations I had with Carolyn. Part of her job as a stock manager on the small sheep milking farm at which she worked was attending the local farmers market to sell the company’s cheese. The farm sold its products often by showing customers pictures of the East Friesian ewes, whose milk made the cheese. A feature of East Friesian ewes is that their tails do not generally require docking (removing); unlike the more common Romney or composite breeds in New Zealand. The reason for this is because East Friesians do not generally grow wool on their tails (see figure 48) and sheep with wool on their tails can be prone to fly strike, a disease, Carolyn explained to me, usually caused by wool covered in faeces and urine. As Carolyn
explained though, the customers she talked to saw this practice of not docking tails as an act of animal welfare benevolence:

*You get people coming through to the farmers market on a Saturday morning and love seeing pictures of lambs with tails. I mean we, the farm, tries to be animal friendly which I think is cool but you know if they get daggy\textsuperscript{109} [other sheep breeds] and they get fly struck and it’s like then people go ‘oh, how can they let them get fly struck?!’*

![Figure 48. An East Friesian ewe’s tail (wool-less) Carolyn showed me on her farm. Source Carolyn](image)

Tail docking, or not, was just one issue Carolyn raised that divided her, as a farmer, and her customers, most of whom lived in urban centres or small ‘lifestyle blocks’. Carolyn’s narrative in many ways echoed a settler arcadian story. She was speaking from the embodied ‘authentic’ position of the Kiwi Bloke farmer who is immersed in the wool, milk and grass of agricultural production. In this sense she expressed a very intimate view of living in “the country” that is commonly contrasted with ‘picturesque’ ideas of arcadia whose practitioners are seen to be less knowledgeable about farming practices.

\textsuperscript{109} Tails covered in ‘dags’ (manure covered wool)
(Evans, 2007; Hess, 2012; Howland, 2002). This latter arcadian narrative appeared to be present in her customers’ views as they perused the pictures of the ewes in Carolyn’s care whilst buying the cheese that came from them. Despite the differences of opinion though Carolyn was charged with promoting the business and therefore did not openly contest the opinions’ of her patrons:

Now, one, there’s not enough time to tell people this [docking tails and other animal welfare issues] over a table at the farmers market and two I’m trying to sell our products [as sustainable] so it probably not that good to get into it! But you know I have my own thoughts on things and they have their own thoughts on things but when it comes to ‘the country’ they are not thinking it through.

Carolyn, Mary (with her husband) and Penelope’s accounts reified the concept of the settler arcadia but with caring fleshliness. In that, the expressions of a settler arcadianism from these women did effuse the self-contained stoic pioneer but the embodiment common to this figure allowed women to impart a sense of intimate knowledge and care that seemed affective. Not only did Carolyn believe in animal welfare she attended to her sheep with routine embodied attention (see for example figure 9), knowing in detail what the sheep needed and when they needed such consideration. Penelope too conveyed a sense of care in how she referred to her neighbour: “He only visits his place in the weekends to sit on his (ride on) mower”. The fervent message here points to how Penelope — in contrast — was deeply committed to land practice. Similarly too, Mary’s husband rather passionately stated “They stuffed Martinborough up a few years ago when they went and planted all these bloody grape vines”. This expression and Mary’s assent signalled the couple cared rather deeply for Martinborough, and about how it’s land ought to be used. Collectively, I propose, these settler arcadian utterances provoked an affect that was potentially compostable.

I learnt more about these deep affects Carolyn felt by talking to her about her identity as a New Zealander and in particular her response to my question about how her work as a sheep milker related to her national identity:
Well there’s the backbone of the country, salt of the earth, good ol’ girl that can turn her hands to anything! But with the sheep milking you’re also being that little bit edgy! So you’re being different enough but still being ‘of the land’ which I like.

Referring to the common nationalising maxim, “backbone of the country” (referring to how agriculture supports New Zealand economically) and the Christian arcadian dictum “salt of the earth” Carolyn communicated New Zealand as a pastoral arcadia in this narrative in which she enjoyed being a part. Aligning herself to the aphorism “turn her hands to anything”, Carolyn feminised the New Zealand working-class arcadian settler who needed to be capable of many things so he [sic] could run his [sic] own technically mixed farm and be capable of working for others (Fairburn, 1989). Yet there was also a sense — in her role as sheep milker — that Carolyn felt apart from this national arcadian narrative as she herself said, she liked being “that little bit edgy!” which rendered her

---

110 Denoting virtuousness and which has been since interpreted as being virtuous owing to one’s proximity to land (see Fairburn, 1989).
“different” from the average farmer. It was these sorts of articulations from Carolyn that left room for her to express more than just a reproduction of being a settler.

Gaye also saw herself as dissimilar to the common farming fraternity in Wairarapa. She was a member of the Green Party and held environmentalist and animal welfare concerns that she felt contradicted many of her farming neighbours. As she illuminated to me, one dairy farming neighbour in particular, in her opinion, did not take care of his cows very well:

_They look like prisoners of war those cows. And the other day I was driving down and the cows were going really slowly down the road, they must get tired. They’ve just had their babies, had them swiped of them and now [pause] so I was just waiting and this young man on a motor bike said ‘I’ll make a path for you’ and I said ‘no it’s alright thanks’ — ‘I’ll make a path for you’ he said. And he’s going down and he’s actually putting his foot into cows’ faces. You know I don’t know that he was actually kicking them but it’s actually making that gesture. You know and I think, don’t these people [pause] you know [pause] are they blind?_

A highly visible and literal sign of Gaye’s philosophy was the Green Party billboard placed on her property during the 2014 national election campaign. Throughout all my fieldwork excursions this was the first rural property I saw that endorsed the Green Party (most being in support of the National Party)\(^\text{111}\). Despite this alternate position from the ‘farming norm’, though, Gaye had had a “dream” to live rurally since she was a child, a dream that she thought “a lot of New Zealanders have”:

_[I had ] this dream of having a [rural/farming] property and in the weekends [Michael and I] would often drive around and look at other people’s [rural/farming] properties and talk about what they were getting right and what they were getting_"}

---

\(^\text{111}\)Although there were a number of visible Green supporters in the more urban areas of the Wairarapa. For full details of the region’s results see: https://www.electionresults.govt.nz/electionresults_2014/electorate-58.html
wrong. But I think a lot of New Zealanders have that dream and it’s based on those childhood fantasies there’s something very rooted about having a piece of land yeah yeah and it does give you a place to stand.

Gaye felt that wanting to live on a rural property was part of a common New Zealand fantasy many Kiwis had as children. Drawing on the arcadian tenet of aspiring to possess a family-owned-and-operated rural property (Fairburn, 1989), Gaye believed living on a small farm like she did gave her “a place to stand”, an approximate Pākehā translation of the Māori concept of tūrangawaewae. Thus, purchasing this land seemed more to Gaye than just a capitalist exchange in the way it spoke to her identity. Moreover, Gaye had had this desire since she was a child, sparked by her visits to her relatives’ farm in Seddon, Marlborough when she was young. This tradition was important for Gaye as — owing to her status as a small farm owner — she could now provide her family with what her uncle provided for her as a child growing up in Wellington.

So now our nieces and nephews — they’re in their twenties now but when we first came here (to her farm in rural Carterton) they used to come as little kids to give their mothers a break and come out and stay for the weekend. And they tell stories now about how much this property means to them. And so I think that’s quite intrinsic with being a New Zealander.

Despite Gaye’s leftist politics that contrasted with the other women I interviewed, her story resonated with other participants’ tales about how they related to land as New Zealanders. For one the “intrinsic” New Zealandness in Gaye’s story echoed Mary’s story about ‘essentialised’ New Zealand nationhood. Gaye’s evocation of ‘a place to stand’ could be viewed too, as an arcadian trope like the ones present in Penelope and Carolyn’s stories. Specifically, adages such as the ‘quarter acre paradise’ and ‘salt of the earth’, expressed a part of who Penelope and Carolyn were as New Zealanders which, I suggest, was more or less, the function of Gaye’s ‘a place to stand’.

---

112 See Māori glossary
These women’s tales, tropes and earthy belonging is what this chapter is about. It is a venue for expressing connections to land that — although troubling — have the potential to compost transcendent arcadian narratives within Pākehā culture. A way to express these land affects, and the resultant array of coloniality, becomings, and ‘becomings with’ which come forth from women’s stories, is the idea of landhome making. Landhome making illustrates the thick weave between woman and land. Therefore, its purpose is not to remove the colonial veracities embedded in what it means to be living on land as a Pākehā. Rather, the purpose of landhome making is to ‘stay with the trouble’ of colonial settler histories so as to find more response-able ways to become Pākehā in Aotearoa New Zealand (Bell, 2014; Haraway, 2008; 2016; Newton, 2009).

‘Landhome’ is a transposition of ‘homeland’. I sketched in chapter three the importance of ‘homeland’ in the thrust of racist Romantic nation building in Europe and how the term fixed person to place by believing one innately belongs to a certain patch of dirt. I also showed in chapter four how the Europeans who arrived in Aotearoa brought these histories with them that has resulted in Pākehā culture at large inheriting such claims. The nationalising in women’s stories though, as touched on in the previous chapter, did not seem to contain the forceful feel of overt nationalism that underpins many expressions of homeland (see Smith, 2009). Indeed, women pointedly spoke of land before home. Thus, ‘landhome’ seemed more appropriate to communicate a sense of ‘homeland’ but with an emphasis on land.

Landhome — an expression too of what comes after landfall is also a way of queering and troubling the word ‘homeland’ in keeping with Haraway’s ongoing project to queer what counts as ‘nature’ (Haraway, 1994, p.60; Grebowski & Merrick, 2013, p.22; Taylor & Blaise, 2017). In short, landhome is a natureculture (Haraway, 2003; 2008; 2016). Thus, like naturecultures, ‘land’ (or ‘nature’) and ‘home’ (or culture) are inseparable. What is deliberately separated in this term though is ‘home’ from ‘maker’. Homemaker is a patriarchal term that for a very long has ‘naturalised’ women as housekeepers in New Zealand especially in rural areas (Johnston, 2013; Little, 2007) — something that frustrated Lynne so, as a child. I use the term landhome making then, to underscore the making of a home but on land rather than inside a house. Vitally, the ‘making’ is also
used to underscore that such landhomes are always becoming, always “constantly in-the-making” (Ginn, 2008, p.336; see also Whatmore, 1999, p. 33).

An apt example of landhome making in this chapter was Millie’s position as a woman who married into farming life. As someone who knew nothing about farming at all, Millie has gone onto win several awards in the area of agricultural development and, as mentioned in chapter six, had set up her own development trust. She enunciated in great detail how difficult it was being both from the city and a woman when she first married her husband though. For one, she had moved to an area where there were fairly engrained rural heteronormative gender roles (see Frohlick, & Johnston, 2011; Johnston, 2013; Little, 2007) and even though she had a significant profile nationally, she still ran into what she called “traditional” values and provided a poignant example:

So I will give you an example of why it [where she lived] is still traditional. I belong to a Wairarapa group called The Shepherds. It’s a man’s club. It’s an ‘old boys club’ and I was the second woman ever to be invited and they invited me because I was director of the Wairarapa District Health board [some years ago]. So I was the only wife that had been invited in her own right. Yet there were a lot of people who didn’t accept that membership initially because they said ‘well she can just come along with her husband’. Even though I had been the one who had actually built a whole new hospital for the region and really changed the way health services were delivered. But it was like ‘why does she have to come when she can just come with her husband?’ [...] so the first four years we never ever sat together because I didn’t want to be seen as a husband’s wife!

Millie — rather joyfully and definitely determinedly — troubled the staid culture of this “traditional” farming group by positioning herself not as an ‘attachment’ for her husband but a fully functioning being (see Little, 2007; Rose, 1993). This story was indicative of her wider landhome making in that her time since marrying into the land she lived on has been about defying her community’s gendered conventions by situating herself as a farmer and business partner, not a farmer’s wife. She is impatient when
people assume her interest in farming is about relationships and social issues — “I’m a business woman”. Yet, Millie has found an identity in this farming circle having had two children grow up in the area. Thus, she has become very loyal to the rural New Zealand political economy and believed this to be part of the nation’s identity. For instance, during our discussions of cultural tensions between rural and urban populations, Millie responded with a curious view of what it meant to be a New Zealander:

*I feel quite strongly about this. Cos people talk about the urban/rural divide. But in terms of identity I don’t think [the divide is] there because the really funny thing is if you take New Zealanders out of New Zealand, what do they talk about? Inevitably they will talk about farming and rugby. There is a psyche that runs through New Zealanders around identity where we see ourselves as an agricultural nation*
According to Millie, “we” “New Zealanders” view ourselves as an agricultural nation, a default position that supposedly eases any urban/rural tension. Moreover, Millie seems to position this ‘New Zealandness’ as masculinist and Pākehā in the way she points to common discussions of New Zealandness being about, “farming and rugby” — cornerstones to the conceptual Kiwi Bloke (Abdinor, 2000; Bannister, 2005; Evans, 2007). Accompanying this perspective was a photograph Millie took of her husband standing on the hillsides of their farm (see figure 50). Dressed in farming attire, with his working dogs beside him, looking out over the land, Millie’s husband in this moment is illustrative of a settler arcadia or Kiwi Bloke (see Abdinor, 2000; Bannister, 2005; Evans, 2007). Reinscribing gender roles like Millie does here may diverge from her earlier story but it could also be symptomatic of the way arcadian mythology invokes a certain sense of identity. That is to say, to express her connection to land maybe Millie draws on these arcadian affects because that is the way we, Pākehā, have learnt and inherited how to be, or rather ‘become with’ land.

Deepening this theme further was Jocelyn’s gendered farming story. Like Millie, Jocelyn had painfully battled with her community’s assumptions about women and farming. As introduced in chapter six, Jocelyn had a hard time being taken seriously as a farmer since her husband had passed away. For one, the many suppliers she called upon for farming equipment and products rang her [male] stock manager instead of her to discuss deliveries and so forth, even though it had been her husband that had managed this communication previously. She also had issues with her staff not respecting her decisions and found it hard to contradict her manger’s work plan when she did not agree with him. As relayed earlier in the chapter though, Jocelyn was intimately tied to farming and was not about to give up as she was hoping to hand the land over to one of her children when the time came. It was whilst discussing foreign ownership of New Zealand farms — a topic that arose spontaneously — that I began to understand the depth of commitment Jocelyn had towards land:

*I hate this selling of large tracts of New Zealand land to the Chinese or someone else. Because they don’t have that ‘feeling’, that time, they’ll just [pause] they’ll just — if you lease your farm you have to be careful it’s not asset stripped. Like they just*
— they don’t put fertiliser on. They just strip it right back to
you know and they don’t care about their stock and I
don’t see how multinational corporations have that tie in that
individual farmers do. Because we are responsible. We are
responsible for our stock. We are responsible for our paddocks.
We are responsible for our trees and waterways. And if you —
for somebody to be responsible at that level you don’t
get the same level of care. And you certainly don’t with
multinational corporations buying huge tracts of New Zealand
land yeah, you don’t sell your country! You don’t sell
your land, ever!

Akin to Millie’s story, Jocelyn in this excerpt aligned farming and nationhood in New
Zealand, which she inferred was a responsible and caring relationship. There is a framing
here of an ‘authentic’ arcadian New Zealand farmer contrasted with one who is
corporate, Chinese, or both, two elements that have been recent changes in the nation’s
agricultural landscape (Pawson, 2018). Reproducing the romantic arcadian trope of
looking to the ‘authentic’ past, a time where man [sic] and land lived in harmony by
showing her suspicion of the recent shift in agricultural [Chinese] corporatisation also,
implicitly, ‘naturalises’ a New Zealand farmer as White and male. Tempering this view
Jocelyn was happy for farms to be sold to “Māori incorporations” some of which “do a
really good job of farming”, which I suggest fed into her principle that “to look after our
country, to look after our economy, to look after our land, it needs to farmed by Kiwis”.

Comparable to Millie’s remarks, Jocelyn draws on a masculinist nationalising that does
not help her own position as being marginalised as a woman farmer. Yet as I posited,
perhaps arcadian mythologising is the way these women can express the deep well of
feeling they have for land. For Jocelyn, like Carolyn, feeling and “care” was paramount.
In fact Jocelyn framed herself as a “caretaker”; and one which deferred to the Māori
perspective of land: “I’m a temporary caretaker. I mean Papatūānuku has to be
respected. And if you look after it, it will look after you”. In this complex weave of
providing land subjectivity by drawing on te ao Māori, and by also referring to land as
“it”, Jocelyn denotes a sense of noninnocent care that is unable to be categorised within dominant arcadian discourse even if she uses transcendent ideals to convey her story.

A last example of landhome making in this chapter is a follow on from Sarah’s story introduced earlier. Identity for Sarah was tightly knitted to her farming family, which in turn, was connected to herself as a New Zealander. The landhome making Sarah practised was also greatly formed by her experiences as a young person on her family farm in Taranaki. Consequently, there was a fertile thread between Sarah’s memories of being young, her ancestral farming family, and her identity as a New Zealander:

How I see myself would be most influenced by my childhood to my early twenties. And my family’s history, more so than the ten acres I have now. Cos we will probably look at selling it and buying a larger piece. But my identity would be most influenced by my childhood and the fact that I lived on my parent’s farm. And that farm was owned by their parents so that’s how I guess [pause] when I think about my identity, or where I came from, or what it means to be a New Zealander, I have those kinds of thoughts and images.

Alongside other participants’ stories, Sarah decidedly illustrates here that what ‘home’ and ‘land’ meant to her, was inseparable. As a concluding weave for women’s significant material narratives, Sarah’s account of her identity underscored the importance of familial and familiar feelings that often problematically ended up ‘naturalising’ and ‘normalising’ her identity as Pākehā. Yet, the ongoing thread of this chapter exposes how such essentialising generates significant affect. Complexly then, even though Sarah invoked the arcadian ideal of a heteronormative family farm headed by stoic masculinity, her articulations, like many participants’ anecdotes, leaked an intensity that troubled the settler arcadia traced in this thesis.
Un-settling, response-able, Pākehā conclusions

The un-settling quality of women’s stories that were nonetheless doused in arcadian mythology provided generative suppositions for the composting project of this thesis. Women’s stories were luscious and earthly and full of a desire to possess land. Through the signatures of childhood, ancestry and nationhood there was a wealth of essentialising that reproduced claims of indigeneity and ‘natural’ belonging. Whilst interrogating these claims though I recognised that such ‘naturalising’ was common to Pākehā culture at large, including myself.

I grew up in Horomaka, Banks Peninsula. It is a land mass that juts out circularly on the east side of the South Island. It was once a volcano so is made up of bay after bay over each hilly valley. Those farming hills have instilled themselves inside of me. The first memories I have are of sheep and green-brown hills along with the dark grey mudflats in front of our house. Walking from home for an adventure, around a winding road, was a popular pursuit often by way of the rocky sea bank. The real exploit began once the shingle started. I can still put myself there: The smell of pine needles and dust from the gravel road mingled with the scent of the sea, the cry of the sea gulls, the sound of sheep calling. This a romantic settler scene and it is where I problematically ‘normalised’ and ‘naturalised’ my belonging. When high up on ridge I looked across the bay that was my home and believed it was mine: But what gave me the impression that I could claim this land as my own?

These thoughts compelled me to explore this tense affect that made me realise there are no easy or quick solutions to becoming a response-able Pākehā, and for that matter, a response-able researcher towards my participants. As I explore the consequences of these realisations Ahmed’s call for White folk to “inhabit the critique, with its lengthy duration” (Ahmed 2004, para 57) resounds in my mind. Like Haraway’s (2016) call to ‘stay with trouble’, Ahmed is sceptical at the way some people remove themselves from being racist or colonially oppressive so quickly. For example, White ‘lefties’, even if laden with good intentions, often claim an antiracist or decolonial stance that “rushes too quickly” (2004, para, 57) over the critique which can end up concealing both the critique and the rejected racism in question.
Therefore, as vulnerable and uncomfortable admitting to my own colonial complicity feels, if I am to critique women’s stories, and take Pākehā response-ability seriously, it’s only fair that I hold my own stories to the same scrutiny. As Pākehā women (more or less) we, divergently, speak to the knotty trouble Pākehā are in; that is to say, the visceral knot in the thread of becoming Pākehā with land, a knot formed by the intersecting practise of affection and colonial conquest. In this vein, this chapter provides a firm foundation to explore mountains and waterways with R/romanticism in the next chapter.
Women discussed at length mountain and hill ranges and water bodies. In this chapter I draw on these narratives to explore romantic arcadian affects from within the homes, lands and work of participants, revealing a homely romanticism. As deliberated upon in chapter four, mountains and rivers have long been romanticised in New Zealand by Pākehā, greatly contributing to dominant transcendent arcadian discourse (Evans, 2007). Snowy precipices and rushing rivers have been climbed, pictorialised and possessed by colonial settlers — and their descendants — as a way of defining ourselves. As fecund conduits for exploring Pākehā romanticism then, I suggest women’s steep saturated stories reflected traces of romanticism but also something else.

By drawing on Jane Sayle’s (2001) work based on New Zealand women artists and Ottum and Reno’s (2016) Wordsworthian explorations, both traced in chapter three and four, I posit that the romantic stories in this chapter point to a troubling of the humanist

---

113 This is a found poem made up of words and phrases from participants’ stories about mountains, hills and waterways (see Tarlo, 2009).
masculinist tradition of Transcendentalism. As argued in chapter three
Transcendentalism has hitherto largely involved privileged men attempting to reach
beyond ordinary, profane, earthly worldliness. However Sayle’s gendered ‘unsettling’ of
masculinist romanticism in New Zealand and Ottum and Reno’s foray into more than-
human affect identify a porous and impure romanticism that could well be salvageable.

Drawing on these arguments in the context of women’s stories reveal that romanticism is
indeed compostable and that women’s stories show how romantic expression may be
ordinary, comforting, homely. Building on the previous chapter’s considerations, this
chapter shows how composting — a routine ordinary and dirty practice — can render
romanticism a noninnocent but significant way to relate to the more-than-human world.
Returning to Sayle’s (2001) work on building a feminine New Zealand romanticism I
suggest too that the stories told here — that although generative — still carry the burden
of colonialism, marking this chapter’s romanticism an undulant part of the landhome
making project in this thesis.

I begin tracing this homely romanticism in women’s stories with Carolyn, Mary and
Gaye’s mountain scenes. Their photographs pointed to a well-known romantic arcadian
symbol in New Zealand, snowy peaks. Notably, the effect of these images and the text
stories that accompanied them were not ‘ideal’ in the arcadian sense and didn’t reach
the heights of the picturesque or the sublime that characterises so many mountain
scenes in New Zealand either (Evans, 2007). This lack, however, provoked a remarkable
revisioning in the most ordinary way, in that what was prominent in these stories was the
familiar places of work and home.

Connected to the stories of snowy peaks were accounts of, dwelling within and, farming
on hilly places. Sarah, Millie, Jocelyn and Lynne expressed their intimate feelings towards
certain peaks and ranges that were deeply embodied and as Lynne said “heart stopping”.
Lynne’s feelings in this context — as well as Sarah’s and Millie’s — pointed to elements of
the sublime discussed in chapter three. Yet aspects of these stories detract from what
Evans (2007), Sayle (2001) and Hess (2012) call a Transcendental sublime. Core to such a
counter response to dominate New Zealand sublimity was the reference to hills as, or
from, home, contributing an undulant part to participants’ landhome making expressing
A principal aspect of homely romanticism in this chapter was Jill’s long journey-story with the Mangatarere Stream that stretched from the Tararua Ranges to Cook Strait\textsuperscript{114}. The Mangatarere made up so much of what Jill did everyday but at the same time was a stream that provided her with significant spiritual sanctity. However stirring these romantic waters were though, \textit{stirring} them was necessary to get to the fertile spaces of Jill’s landhome making. Lyn’s relationship with Te Mara Stream leaked similar fertility, and in conjunction with Jocelyn and Sarah’s pictures of rushing waters, reproduced a rather compelling homely romantic arcadianism.

Finally, in this chapter, I ruminate on the conversations I had with Jill, Lyn and Sarah about family play by the water. These three women were mothers and Lyn was a grandmother. The waterbodies they had dwelt in as children and had grown up beside, or the rituals and traditions learnt from living on the land, dictated how they taught their children to relate to water. These familial flows generated a fleshly revisioning of Transcendent Romanticisms that richly contributed to the wider thesis project of landhome making. Of course, the ‘naturalising’ of women’s relationships to hilly watery places cannot be washed away. Therefore I suggest that such homely romanticism needs routine response-able composting so as to recognise the ongoing, fraught, noninnocent position of becoming Pākehā. To this end, I also disclose my own romantic tendencies and ongoing ‘becoming with’ women’s stories and the mountainous waters of Wairarapa.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{114} The sea between the North and South Island’s of New Zealand.}
Figure 51. Looking to the Tararua Ranges. Source: Carolyn

Figure 52. The Tararua Ranges at sunset. Source: Mary
Snowy homely viewpoints

At the beginning of each work day Carolyn drove from the south of Masterton to the north. In her car during this routine trip she viewed the Tararua Ranges that could be seen to the west. From her place of work she could see the mountains clearly. She had in the past also been able to see them from her house but her area of residence had been built up with houses that subsequently blocked her view. So it was from the farm she worked on that she took many pictures of the ranges as illustrations of a landscape that she felt was significant to her. Despite this significance, in contrast to her farming arcadian narrative related in the previous chapter, Carolyn potentially expressed a rather disembodied relationship to the mountains:

[This is] looking over to the Tararuas (see figure 51). I mean I still cannot work out which bloody hill is which up there. Like people go ‘Oh I look to the Holdsworth or Mitre [Peak]’ [...] everybody’s like, ‘Mitre is the one that looks like a mitre’ and it’s like I know what a mitre looks like and none of them look like mitres to me! But maybe I have no imagination [pause] So, I’ve never been up walking in them or anything. I appreciate them for being, for being there

Mountains have been a common feature in picturesque and ‘photogenic’ Aotearoa (see chapter four). Pawson (2013, p.158) notes the prominence of pictographic mountains in the nation’s history. He explains that in the first pictorial set of postage stamps in New Zealand in 1898, mountains appeared in just over half of the set of thirteen. Carolyn’s photographs of the Tararua Ranges potentially reflected this pictorialising. In fact, the way Carolyn viewed and pictured these mountains from afar did not just give an impression of a picture or ‘scene’. Rather, with its snow-capped peaks, together with the grassy paddock, indicated a pictorialising of arcadia (Belich, 2001, p.84).

However, the ‘scene’ that Carolyn presented would hardly be used as an advertisement in the 100 % Pure campaign with its concrete road in the foreground, a broken fence and a line of motley housing in the far distance. Thus, whilst reinscribing picturesque arcadian
themes there are signs of the grittiness of Masterton life that suggests something else is going on. Carolyn’s careless way of talking about the various peaks too “I mean I still cannot work out which bloody hill is which up there” spoils the ideal, picturesque view, making this romantic image rather ordinary. Ordinary in the sense that the mountains are common “I appreciate them for being, for being there” but also ordinary in the way they did not seem to be viewed by Carolyn with the reverence or sentimentality so often attached to ‘spectacular’ scenery (see Evans, 2007).

To be fair though, it is difficult to photograph the Tararua Ranges in an ideal ‘pictorial’ state which as noted in chapter five was one of the reasons why the mountains did not become a National Park (Pawson, 2013, p. 172). As Pawson (2013, p. 172) explains, the ranges did not “conform to the ideals [...] that nineteenth century artists, and increasingly photographers, had created as representing ‘New Zealand’”. Despite this assessment most women talked about viewing “the Tararuas” at some stage during interviewing in ‘scenic’ terms. Mary especially enjoyed photographing the Tararu Ranges from her home at sunset and showed me a series of photographs of the western mountains at dusk (see figure 52). For example, the still in figure fifty-one, like Carolyn’s, features the trope of romantic arcadianism with its focus on a scene with snow-peaked mountains at the rear and a paddock at the foreground (Belich, 2001, p.84). Curiously, the way Mary expressed how she was “not a climber or anything” but had a contrastingly embodied relationship with the land she farmed, resonated with Carolyn’s story.

How Carolyn and Mary’s Tararua photo-stories reproduced the ideas of a pictorially romantic arcadia from within their work and home reminded me of Hess’ (2012) exploration of (dis)embodiment. Hess details how John Clare (1793-1864) wrote romantic prose and poetry that in many ways countered the picturesque conventions of William Wordsworth (Hess, 2012). Rather than acting as a stationary gazer, Hess (2012, pp.30-31) describes how Clare related a “kinetic” and multisensory feel within his work. In particular, Hess highlights how Clare, who worked as an agricultural labourer, communicated land as, not scenery like Wordsworth did, but “habitat” (2012, p.31).

On the one hand, Carolyn and Mary present images of — in Hess’ estimation — Wordsworthian stationary gazers. Yet there is more to this story. As discussed in chapter
three, Hess draws on the ‘halted traveler’ to demonstrate how Wordsworth, although a gazer, also wandered, revealing himself as an ‘unmarked’ body (Haraway, 1991; 2018). However, Carolyn and Mary routinely saw the Tararua Ranges from their home and work, echoing Hess’ advancement of the concept “habitat” (Hess, 2012, p.31). Resultantly, Mary and Carolyn’s storied scenes seemed to subvert Hess’ binary between ‘scenery’ and ‘habitat’, which also arose as a theme in Gaye’s story of the Tararua mountains.

As detailed in chapter six, Gaye was a feminist. She was also aware of how Wairarapa Māori saw the western ridges and considered one of these stories a reason why she felt connected to them. In particular, she explained that ‘tara’ that “means peak or mound, was also the name for a woman’s vagina”. Whātonga, the early Māori explorer of Wairarapa was said to have missed his second wife and the mountains reminded him of her, so it was thus called, ‘tara’-rua. Gaye was quick to point out that this was only one version of the story and even in this version sometimes there is no mention of a woman’s vagina. Rather, the most common interpretation of the story is that Whātonga simply missed his wife and when he looked to the Tararua Ranges they reminded him of her. But for Gaye who was a feminist and counsellor, and who treated many women that had experienced domestic violence, it was the idea of living under mountains that were named after “parts of a woman’s body” that was “significant”:

*You know that’s very significant to me and when we first came here I was working a lot with women in violent relationships. And so it’s very significant to me to live under mountains that are named after parts of a woman’s body. And particularly parts of a woman’s body that are related to her fecundity, her ability to bear children.*

---

115 ‘Rua’ meaning two/second
116 Which is the most common story I have come across according to Rangitāne tradition. Although it’s worth noting that ‘tara’ does translate as mound, peak or vagina and nobody that I have talked to has said this meaning is incorrect. The Kahungungu version stems from an ancestor, Rangikaiakore, who broke his spear tip (tara) into two (rua) while hunting. Another version is what DoC have described as “Popular folklore” which has ascribed the name Tara-rua to two specific topographic features; the dramatic steep double peak on the main range, the Tararua Peaks, officially named Tunui and Tuiti (see https://www.doc.govt.nz/parks-and-recreation/places-to-go/wellington-kapiti/places/tararua-forest-park/historic-tararua-forest-park/)
Gaye’s relationship to the mountains through this Rangitāne narrative was a rich counter to the picturesque romanticism that is so often used by Pākehā to gaze upon alpine landscapes (see chapter four). By pointing to a woman’s “fecundity” or “ability to bear children”, Gaye also offered a starkly different view on what is commonly understand as arcadian abundance in New Zealand (Fairburn, 1989). Gaye discussed an abundance that was reproductive rather than productive. Moreover, reproduction in romantic arcadian stories is usually objectified, but Gaye positioned the reproductivity of “the Tararuas” as agential. Lastly, Gaye’s acknowledgment of the Rangitāne maunga history, provided a potent counter to the arcadian narrative that is generally euro-centric (Evans, 2007; Schama, 1995; Ruff, 2015).

On the other hand, Gaye’s photograph of the mountains (see figure 53) seemed to tell a different story. The image presented in figure fifty-two is of a mountain scene that can be viewed from the part of the road directly adjacent to Gaye’s property. It is a picture of the Tararua Ranges in the distance with a generous layer of snow resting on the higher ridges, a similar romantic arcadia to Mary’s picture (see figure 51). Notably, there is a considerable distance between Gaye and the mountains, which could be construed as disembodied gazing (Hess, 2012). Further complicating this visual narrative was Gaye’s accompanying explanation that expressed not a feeling of disembodiment, but a feeling of “home”:

*It’s kind of like coming home. It’s like I’m home then [...] for a long time we could see it from our bedroom window. But it’s not visible now because the pines have got so tall. And in the mornings Michael would get up and look at the view and say ‘another day in paradise’*
The complex mix of the Tararua Ranges as feminine fecundity, snow-peaked object, and signifier of home in Gaye’s story, revealed the layers of her narrative. Like Carolyn and Mary’s snow-peaked chronicles, Gaye’s telling inferred a juxtaposing complexity that presented these three women’s visions as ripe for ‘staying with the trouble’ (Haraway, 2016) of romantic arcadianism. Particularly romantic by their focus on picturesque mountain views and arcadian by their pastoral — and in Gaye’s case paradisial — emphasis, these photo-stories show some of the problematic traditions Pākehā have inherited (see Evans, 2007; Haraway, 2003; 2008; 2016). Curiously though, through expressions of the routines of home and work, these noninnocent, sometimes embodied alpine stories, fell between the binary between homely embodiment and disembodied gazer: And this is what landhome making is about — the affective yet contingent not quite there yet sense that lies in between belonging and coloniser.

Figure 53. “Coming home”. Tararua Ranges from the road adjacent to Gaye’s property. Source: Gaye.
Undulant dwellings

From Gaye’s driveway tracking south west is the road entrance to the Waiohine Gorge. It is somewhat perilous, and as mentioned in chapter six, is where Sarah dwelt. The valley is awesomely deep and thus very steep. It is one of the many entrances to the Tararua Forest Park and, as such, there are many nearby tramping opportunities. Sarah used these tracks regularly. As part of her photo-story she decided to take a photograph of one of the views she came across whilst out walking in the gorge (see figure 54) and related to me why:

So if you tramp to the top of a hill you are never quite sure what the vista will be or what it will look like on the other side so I just love the tranquillity. And it reminds you that there is something so much bigger than yourself. And more permanent than you. Buildings and people come and go. But the land is always there: Ever changing but always there. It’s a constant

Figure 54. View of Wairarapa at sunset in Tararua Forest. Source: Sarah
The poeticism of Sarah’s words struck me first; “you are never quite sure what the vista will be […] so I just love the tranquillity”. However, within the same narrative the feeling of tranquillity is soon surpassed with awe, in the sense she understood land as beyond human and human-made things. This awe — a common expression of the sublime in English romanticism (Evans, 2007; Sayle, 2001) — could be seen as an expression of “nature worship” (Trentmann 1994, p. 588). As discussed in chapter three, both the concepts of sublimity and ‘nature worship’ have been prevalent manifestations of romanticism in Pākehā New Zealand since European settlement (Evans, 2007).

Interestingly, Millie too, in her narration about walking through her farm and taking photographs (see figure 55) raised this theme of sublimity and ‘nature worship’ as she related how trekking through her farm relieved her of stress, positioning the hills on her land as “quite significant”:

*Figure 55. The view of Millie’s farm on top of a hill. Source: Millie*
The hills are quite significant to me because there is just something amazing about that solidness of the hills. And you think they have been there for thousands of years and what do they see? What have they witnessed? You know they are not just [pause] they are living things. So what are — they are like sentinels there observing [pause] observing us [humans] crazily going around [pause] so yeah. You know, if I am stressed with my work I will go for a walk and sit on top of a hill. And it just connects back to what we are here to do.

The agency Millie imparted to the “sentinels”, by the way they could ‘observe’ — like Sarah’s story — seemed to resonate with more-than-human philosophy in the way she inferred non-human agency (Cloke & Jones, Jones & Cloke; Whatmore, 2002). Moreover, the sense of deference that Millie and Sarah felt towards these high places gave the impression they were challenging the narrative of human exceptionalism (Haraway, 2008; 2016). Interestingly however, Millie described the hills on her farm as somewhere she could go to relieve herself of human-induced stress, and be reminded of her role in such a ‘human-centred’ life. Sarah too articulated a similar point by expressing how humans and human made things are temporal in contrast to “land” that is “constant”. Echoing romanticism’s tendency at posing ‘nature’ as a salve from (human) culture (Oerlemans, 2002), Millie and Sarah’s accounts here potentially reinscribe the binary between ‘nature’ and culture.

By hinting at both a sense of more-than-human philosophy and romantic perspectives these local accounts provide insights into the links between more-than-humanism and Romanticism discussed in chapter three. In this previous chapter Ottum and Reno (2016) argued that some Romantics reproduced such intense connectivity with the other-than-human world, that they generated a more-than-human affect. Such agency and affective relationality certainly appeared to be present within Sarah and Millie’s narratives here. Nevertheless, the way in which these two passages separated human culture from ‘nature’ resonates with the romantic tendency to view relation as occurring between already formed human subjects needing reconnection with ‘nature’ (Evans, 2007; Hess, 2012; Whatmore, 2002, p.158; see also chapter three).
This seeming contradiction pointed to the capacity for such stories to compost romanticism that — in line with this chapter’s purpose — does not mean relinquishing the problematic ideology but rather staying with its trouble (Haraway, 2016). The theme of home is an important one here as the hills Millie walks through sit within her home. Sarah too, although venturing outside her home boundaries mentioned the “comfort” she felt living in the gorge and walking through its tracks. Sarah’s narrative also resonated with Carolyn’s phrase “I appreciate them for being, for being there”, in the way she commented “the land is always there: Ever changing but always there”. I suggest Sarah’s hilly stories then speak about mountainous land as a comforting kind of home, contributing to Sarah’s affective landhome making.

Examining these issues with Lynne’s story about the elevated places she called home builds on the complexities presented by Carolyn, Sarah and Millie’s stories. So affected was she by the steep hills on her farm, Lynne took me to every one of them (for example see figure 56). Lynne felt attached to the rolling pasture her sheep grazed on and the higher peaks that could be seen with keen clarity when positioned on top of the highest points of her land. When I asked her if she could describe this attachment she felt, she answered:

They’re just so beautiful. You know, I’ve walked round them, I’ve ridden round them, I’ve driven round them. And I just love it! To be on top of those hills is really heart stopping [pause] it’s just the view from up there [pause] I feel very privileged every time I am allowed up there.
Lynne described her hilly farm as “beautiful” and her experience within them, “really heart stopping”. Both sentiments speak to the romantic expressions of the beautiful and the sublime, the feeling of sublime being that concomitant mix of wonder and terror (Evans, 2007; Ottum & Reno, 2016; Sayle, 2001). Importantly however, Lynne referred to her lofty places as home, once again underlining how women in this chapter render romanticism homely. For instance, when I asked Lynne about the importance of the Puketoi Ranges for her — the hill range dominating the area — she replied with a similar narrative to that of Gaye’s by describing “the Puketoi” as “coming home” (see figure 57):

Well the Puketoi, when we are coming home from Pahiatua — that’s coming home. And from the other way, when you’re coming from Masterton and you see them, that’s when you know you’re home.
The mounting theme here is that Lynne’s evocation of home, along with other women’s assertions, speak to a romanticism that evokes an affect that could be used for composting transcendent, masculinist romanticisms. Importantly, these routine affects also speak to the centrality of land in women’s home making, thereby building on the previous chapter’s foray into landhome making by suggesting that romanticism is key to this kind of Pākehā becoming and the politics of arcadian settling explored in this thesis.
Figure 58. A farm Creek. Source: Jocelyn
Stirring romantic waters

Like Lynne, Jocelyn also loved her hilly home and considered “the Puketois” as a significant presence as they lined her undulant farm. The local mountains and farm hills provided Jocelyn with rivers and creeks that poured forth and meandered down onto the flats of her land. Figure fifty-seven shows one such creek. Flanked by mānuka and mossy rocks, this particular waterway runs clear in this picture but quickly floods during the winter season when there is a deluge of rain. As Jocelyn explained however, this is not really an issue as the water drains quickly and it means it’s abundant enough to be a water source for stock during the summer when drought is common:

*The water in the creeks and the rivers are the lifeblood for us in the summer. You can see the little creek through here [points her finger out the window] (see figure 58). Even though it floods in the winter it’s still really important water for sheep. We have springs that occur naturally in the hills and we can tap into them for our water supply. So I’ll take you up to the water supply that [my husband] put in [for stock]. It just comes from a spring but it doesn’t run fast enough in the summer now [so we are] in the process of putting in a dam.*

The waterways that ran through Jocelyn’s property were significant to her. They were the “lifeblood” of the farm as they kept pasture healthy and stock hydrated. Even though these uses were very practical, the way Jocelyn described them seemed to generate an affect beyond just pragmatism. Her comment that “springs [...] occur naturally in the hills” pointed to the common romantic arcadian tenet of ‘natural abundance’ (Evans, 2007; Fairburn, 1989; see Chapter three and four). Indeed, the very image of springs spurting from the ground underscores a ‘natural’ arcadian story and myth (Evans, 2007; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995; see Haraway, 2004; 2016). In very saturating ways then, mythology and materiality merged (Haraway, 2003; 2004; 2008; 2016) as did romantic sensibility and the veracities of everyday life, situating Jocelyn’s romanticism as somewhat homely.

Jill’s story about the Mangatarere stream expressed similar themes to that of Jocelyn’s and is worth detailing here. Another hot and restless night leached into another scorching
day in early November 2014. I pulled my shorts off the line and put them on under the early morning sun. Sweat had already started to form on my forehead. Armed with a camera and old walking shoes I met Jill at her house in rural Carterton. As soon as I arrived Jill launched into a discussion on water quality. Jill lived on a ten acre block and the reason I wanted to interview her was that she had founded a community organisation to “clean up” the Mangatarere Stream that ran through her property. Through “dreadful” dealings with district council processes and her fellow rural councillors Jill decided to form the non-government, community-based Mangatarere Restoration Society (MRS). My final main interview with her was to join her on a ‘stream ramble’, which as I discovered, was exactly how it sounded.

Henceforth I knew Jill as both a river rambler and environmentalist, pursuits steeped in the R/romantic tradition (Evans, 2007; Hay, 1988; Hess, 2012; Oerlemans, 2002; Trentmann, 1994). Jill’s rambling exploits reminded me of the rambling Trentmann discusses in relation to what he calls ‘neo-Romanticism’, foregrounded in chapter three. As he explains, British men of the early twentieth century took part in these journeys for reasons “(m)ore than a simple escape from the smell and noise of urban life, rambling was believed to instil in the rambler the pure, life-spending energy of nature” (Trentmann, 1994, p.587). The spiritual tone Trentmann (1994) implies was present in such adventures resonated with Jill’s narratives as well — particularly whilst elaborating on two photos she took of the stream which she named “Babbling Creek” and “Serenity” (see figures 59 & 60).

117 She was a councillor for the Carterton district council (will be introduced in methodology chapter)
Figure 59. Babbling Creek” Source: Jill

Figure 60. “Serenity”. Source: Jill
I describe it as more of a spiritual relationship rather than anything else [...] There is just so much serenity and peace down there. So it’s a place where you can just go and get rid of all that stuff [stress from work] all your worries are gone [pause] so that’s the kind of relationship.

Using words such as “spiritual”, “cleansed”, “serenity and peace” lucidly evokes the spiritual aspects of ‘nature worship’ (Evans, 2007; Hay, 1988; Hess, 2012; Oerlemans, 2002; Trentmann, 1994). Moreover, restoring the Mangatarere Stream provided Jill with a “serenity and peace” in her otherwise busy, stressful life, which reinscribes the romantic ideal of escaping culture or the city so one may be reconnected with ‘nature’ (Oerlemans, 2002; Trentmann, 1994). Thus, comparable to the way Millie and Sarah sought the hills for escape from their human-dominated lives, Jill also seemed to split ‘nature’ from culture here by using the Mangatarere as a site of purification (“cleansed”) from her other more ‘people centred’ work (Haraway, 2003; 2008; 2016; Taylor, 2013; 2017; Trentmann, 1994; Whatmore, 2002). Yet also like Millie and Sarah, Jill expressed an affective more-than-human (Ottum & Reno, 2016) relationship with the stream that is worth exploring, particularly as this intense relationship Jill had was an act of home making, on land.

So, Jill led me over a farm fence near midday under the glaring sun and cerulean sky with not a cloud in sight. The farm was owned by the restoration society’s current Chairman and was a well-known local dairy farmer. We traipsed through long brown grass to get down to the stream. I listened to Jill intently as the long grass itched me. I was scorched whilst I shuffled through the dry prickly pasture. Jill was leading me towards the water, which I was aching for, but she stopped short of the bank. In grass nearly tall as Jill herself she managed to push enough back to reveal very unwell looking saplings. Weeds had suffocated them and then grass had grown above them. With no shade and sweat pouring I pulled back the grass back while Jill ripped the weeds out around the trees. It was an untended riparian zone that Jill assured me “would come right” once the trees had room to breathe and grow. Red faced and enflamed by sun and prickle we helped tree after tree.
Eventually we tumbled down the bank onto grey pebbles. The water rushed rhythmically. My virgin step into the Mangatarere felt holy. The bliss started from my feet and then cool joy surged up my body. I obediently followed Jill and started taking pictures under the shade of willow trees as Jill wanted a chronological pictorial account of the stream for her work with the restoration society. After a few minutes of walking she turned to me: “Isn’t it so peaceful?” My honest reaction was that I was too filled with relief and joy to feel peace but I nodded and smiled anyway. For three hours I followed Jill upstream until we ended back at her place. I took 267 photos that day, mostly for Jill, but I also kept copies for myself. This was one of the many stream rambles she had conducted up and down the Mangatarere. As a co-founder of the MRS, stream rambles, like the one I completed, were an essential part of educating people about this waterway that ran from the Tararua Ranges into the Waiohine River, then into the Ruamāhanga, and finally, into Cook Strait (Marr, 2001). Rambles were not new to Jill though. When I asked her to

118 We drove to a certain spot downstream before rambling upstream to Jill’s house
describe her relationship to the Mangatarere she explained that these formal rambles were just an extension of what she has always done:

*I’ve been walking the rivers [in Wairarapa] for decades. So when you say what’s my relationship [to the Mangatarere Stream]? To me I look at something like that and you want to explore it. You know you want to explore it. So I have been doing that for a long time. So I guess the stream rambles are just an extension of what I have always done anyway. So I always had that ‘bent’.*

This stream story contains more than just trickling water and cooled feet. It is a story about who Jill was: Jill has become with waterways in Wairarapa since she was a child and continues ‘becoming with’ (Haraway, 2008; 2016) the Mangatarere Stream as she routinely breaks the flowing surface and immerses herself within the descending tributary. Vitally, this immersion is brimming with meaning and significance underscoring that ‘becoming with’ is always about imploding significance and flesh (Haraway, 2003; 2008; 2016). Together then Jill and the Mangatarere compost disembodied romanticisms like the ‘halted traveler’ (Hess, 2012) rather movingly.

However, there were ripples in Jill’s ‘becoming with’ that warrant attention. For one, Jill’s romantic expressions that helped her shape meaning from her rambling relationship with the Mangatarere Stream, was also used to ‘normalise’ or ‘naturalise’ her connection. For example her comment that “stream rambles are just an extension of what I have always done” seems like an apolitical comment but romanticism never is, particularly in relation to settler colonial societies (Bell, 2014; Evans, 2007). Thus, while this comment does not overtly point to colonial violence, it positions Jill as a ‘natural’ and ‘normal’ occupier of Wairarapa waterways, pointing to how romanticism, like arcadia, is a potent font for projecting a veil of ‘innocence’ whilst the dirty business of colonisation proceeds (see Evans, 2007).

In Jill’s story there was also the seeming contradiction too, that despite the embodied relationship Jill spoke of, ‘nature’ to her, was still both separate and idealised in relation to human culture, in the way she used the Mangatarere to ‘cleanse’ herself from the
pressure of peopled activity. Accordingly, Jill’s story here speaks to the theme of this chapter and women’s landhome making at large in the sense that the romanticism¹¹⁹ she expressed was, both troublesome and generative, and culturally important for how she related to waterways.

Deepening the flow of romantic landhome making was the relationship between Te Mara Stream and Lyn which, like the Mangatarere, descended from the Tararua Ranges until it met up with the Ruamāhanga River, the main river in Wairarapa. It was a stream (see figure 62) that was “very special” to Lyn, as it ran through her property and until a rain tank was built, was Forest Home’s only water source. Te Mara stream was also of interest as it had been marked by Water Wairarapa as a site for dam construction¹²⁰. If Te Mara had been chosen, a dam would be built “just up behind” Lyn’s property¹²¹. Lyn was in two minds about the proposal. On the one hand, as a land lover, she was terribly sympathetic towards the people who would lose their land to flooding during construction: “I know it’s going to be devastating for the people who are going to be affected by the dam. I know and understand that people will be devastated by the loss of their land”. On the other hand, Lyn spoke of how the flooding she had to contend with would be potentially solved by the dam construction. “We [Forest Home] won’t be affected by the dam. But one thing that will happen is that we won’t have floods anymore so for me that will be great”.

¹¹⁹ For a romantic looking picture she took see figure 61
¹²⁰ See http://www.wairarapawater.org.nz
¹²¹ See http://www.wairarapawater.org.nz
Figure 62. Te Mara stream. Source Lyn
Te Mara Stream and its surrounding flora was important for Lyn. A dam could help regulate the flow of the stream and thereby prevent flooding which disturbed water quality and decimated plants on the banks. Nonetheless, Lyn was also sceptical about how the dam construction (if it went ahead) would benefit the region economically. The Greater Wellington Regional Council (a large player in the project) maintained that storing water in the form of a dam would enable much more land to be irrigated which, in turn, could make the region more agriculturally productive and therefore prosperous. One of Lyn’s main concerns was the project’s prediction that building the dam would enable more dairy farming. Even though Lyn was willing to support regional initiatives that would support job growth, she was worried that this move would encourage more dairy farming conversion similar to that of other regions that have suffered in terms of water quality (see chapter one; Le Heron, 2018):

*This [dam construction] is going to be a bandage on a problem so I think farmers really need to look at their individual cases. They need to figure out how they are going to store their own water [...] I just think they should be doing that as individuals rather than a huge big thing so yeah that’s just me. And I think whatever we do needs to be really carefully planned and there needs to be lots of rules in place if we are going to go dairy. Because when you look at other parts of New Zealand where dairying has been done there’s been a lot of damage to water ways. I would like to see the Wairarapa take more of a lead [...] And I think there needs to be – I mean I would hate to see intensive dairying but I think if it was controlled numbers I think it would be alright. But yeah, oh no, anything for growing the Wairarapa like jobs, more job opportunities, definitely, but yeah [pause] yeah we need to be very careful because even though New Zealand has this ‘clean, green’ image often it’s not a ‘clean, green’ image. But compared to other countries we are*  

122 see [http://www.wairarapawater.org.nz](http://www.wairarapawater.org.nz)
[pause] and that’s fantastic and we need to look after that and preserve that for future generations.

Lyn’s impassioned opinions here were soaked in the national (Pākehā) politics outlined in chapter one. Lyn was somewhat critical of the ‘clean green’ image (see chapter one and four) the country portrayed itself as, yet admits it holds some water when compared to other countries. Lyn used a “we” here to speak on behalf of Wairarapa and then New Zealand and it is in this latter part of the extract that she claimed “we” as a nation need to preserve what is ‘clean and green’. Lyn’s central imploration is that “we” should introduce “lots of rules” so “we” can “preserve” such an image for future generations. This narration follows common eco-nationalist and romantic lines about the ‘purity’ of ‘nature’ being outside human culture even though it is human culture that needs to save it (Ginn, 2008; see also Hess, 2012; Oerlemans, 2002; chapter seven). The picture Lyn composed of Te Mara stream as part of her photo-story, seemed to reflect this position as well, by the way it evokes a romantic arcadia from its leaf speckled sunlight to its meandering flow of water, shaded by arching trees (see figure 61).

Contrastingly, even though Lyn expressed the importance of preservation of fresh waterbodies, she remained supportive, if cautious, of the dairy industry creating jobs for the region: “I think if it was controlled numbers I think it would be alright. But yeah, oh no, anything for growing Wairarapa like jobs, more job opportunities, definitely”. These kinds of juxtaposing positions that Lyn expressed, uprooting fixed ideas of romanticism, is what is so potently compostable and was a routine theme in Jill’s story, which at this juncture, is worth exploring more deeply.

There was also a proposal by the council to construct a dam in the Mangatarerere Valley, up near the stream’s source, which Jill had a lot to say about. To build a dam in the Mangatarerere, like in Lyn’s valley, would have required flooding several properties. Accordingly, Jill felt the MRS needed to stay publicly “neutral” on the issue. She felt very deeply for people who may lose their land during the necessary flooding to construct the dam. However, Jill recognised the benefits of a dam in the valley and as someone who

123 Both proposed sites near Jill and Lyn’s homes have been deemed unviable. For the latest update see https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/national/407449/battlelines-drawn-as-council-backs-latest-dam-project
was concerned about water wastage, and who was also an entrepreneur, she acknowledged the advantages of a large water storage plan for the wider region:

*My feeling is that we need to store water. Because if we don’t we are going to find with climate change issues, we are going to run out of water. And a lot of people are saying if we have a big dam we are going to have a lot more dairy, well, if we have clean dairy it’s not really an issue [pause] I mean obviously it would depend on stocking rates and all of that but you can be sensible. I mean you have to because we are all reliant on the dollar. And a lot of stuff wouldn’t happen if we didn’t have the dollar.*

Comparable to Lyn’s views, Jill had sympathy towards both conservation and economic concerns within the debate over the dam construction that valuably contested the rather dualistic discussion at the time. To elaborate, the argument between opponents and advocates of the proposal tended to over simplify the detail of such a project. For example, the council, in an effort to convince locals that they needed such a dam, boasted about how much economic prosperity would be gained through such a venture. On the other hand, opposition to the dam more or less reduced the project “as bad news for the environment” (Harris, 2015, para. 1) without considering possible benefits. Subsequently, when affected land owners learned of the prospect of losing their land many became very vocal within both local and national media (see for example, Fensome 2013). Over the period of debate a community organisation was even formed. *The Dam Free Mangatarere Society Incorporated* argued a dam built in the Mangatarere Valley would be “unsuitable and potentially dangerous” (Farmer, 2015, para. 4).

However, it appeared that by understanding both sides of the debate, Jill opened up other possibilities for discussion. For instance, Jill suggested that the idea of water storage could still be planned while avoiding the invasive techniques of large dams by perhaps building “many mini reservoirs”, “canals” or “water courses”. As Jill explained, these constructions would not just provide economic opportunities while causing less land-use change than a large dam, they would also prevent much of the fresh water in the region ending up in the ocean: “There is so much water coming off those Tararuas all
the time. So ninety-five percent of our water that comes down through the hills will go out through Lake Ferry [next to the ocean].”

Jill also pointed out a further complexity to the issue of dam construction. Similar to what Lyn mentioned, Jill explained how building a dam in the Mangatarere Valley could help control the flooding that destroyed so many of her plantings (she had recorded eleven in 2014). Furthermore, Jill described how flooding flushes out toxic algae bloom, a common issue during Wairarapa summers in the Mangatarere and many other waterways (Wairarapa Times Age, May 7 2015; Jan 20, 2016). Algae bloom arises regularly with warm water temperatures, slow flows and a surplus amount of nutrients like nitrates and phosphates, which are commonly used for increased fertilisation (Foote; Joy & Death, 2015; Wright, 2012). As Jill pointed out though, if floods were able to be controlled by a dam than maybe the bloom could be flushed out when necessary.

Like the braided, sometimes forceful, sometimes trickling waterways descending from Tararua Ranges, Lyn and Jill composed an intricate interlocking map of water politics that was romantic, homely, routine, domestic. Filled with Pākehā politics of what to do with water, these home-bound accounts told compelling complex situated feminist stories of the oversimplified public fractious debate between agricultural production and environmentalism. More than this, Jill and Lyn’s perspectives shifted and disrupted the contention of what counts as ‘pure’ and ‘impure’ water use, so ensconced in romantic and environmentalist thought; underscoring again, how homely romanticism is a fertile composting approach for this thesis.

Shifting the course of this discussion in a slightly different direction will add a final intricacy to this section of women’s water stories. As intimated Sarah was a loyal daughter to a “traditional” Pākehā New Zealand farmer. She was well versed in the nitrate and phosphate inputs for increased agricultural production that Jill discussed. In her life time her parents had converted from dry stock farming (sheep and cattle) to dairy farming. Sarah understood the need for agriculture to make a profit but also equally cherished water quality. In fact, she expressed her disappointment over how the waterway issues were being addressed in Wairarapa:
The Wairarapa is a little slow to catch up. There is a dairy farmer here that walks his cows about 900m up and down the road, and this is a road for tourists! He lets them walk through drains and everywhere. So I hope as a council [Carterton] we’ll catch up here. I like how strict they are Taranaki. Like all the waterways are planted, you can’t just have cattle cramming everywhere over the road [and] none of the farmers in Taranaki have gone broke. Nobody has had to sell their farm they have had for a hundred years because Fonterra said this. If Fonterra came to the party [here in the Wairarapa] — like dad said they grow hundreds and thousands of native trees [in Taranaki] and then give them to farmers for free to line their waterways. So there are lots of really cool things happening

Sarah has not just had experience with farming country in the lower North Island either. Owing to her husband’s military career, she and her family have moved around Aotearoa frequently. Thus, she had seen first-hand the varied use of water in agricultural production from region to region. She was especially astonished at the recent irrigation and intensification of the Makenzie Basin which she observed living in Oxford in rural Canterbury for a time (see chapter one; Le Heron, 2018; Thompson, 2011). Sarah made clear to me that this was not a farming strategy that she agreed with:

So we went from Taranaki where there is miles of rain in winter so much in fact you were complaining about it to Canterbury and you know the only days they wouldn’t irrigate was when it bloody snowed! It was shock for me. You know, I thought this was not good. We’re altering — you know water is a finite resource on this planet. I mean I know it’s cyclic and It goes round and round but It’s like I’m not sure about this [pause] I guess big famers would just want uninhibited access to land and water and all sorts of things! But because I am a greenie at heart I don’t think big farmers should have it. So that’s probably an unpopular view by big farmers. I think that the government
Sarah’s perspectives helpfully deepened the deliberations over water tensions Jill and Lyn’s stories exposed. Like Jill and Lyn, Sarah unsettled the nationalised binary between those agitating for environmental protection and those wanting to continue intensive agricultural production (Le Heron, 2018; Thompson, 2011). As someone from a long line of farmers and who also ran a small farm herself, Sarah supported environmental regulation when it came to water quality and agriculture. Moreover, in her support of environmental regulation Sarah’s narrative seemed to carry with it, a romantic belief in ‘pure’ water and possibly even ‘pure’ farming as she described how her family farm in Taranaki is “strict” and “all the waterways are planted”. For all their reinscription of a ‘pure’ watery New Zealand though, I suggest these three women’s narratives yielded a fluid ‘becoming with’, through kinship and family making; a final example in this chapter of homely romanticisms.

Figure 63. Lyn and her grandchildren. Source: Family member.
Familial Flows

The flow-on effects from talking about the importance of waterways with Sarah, Lyn and Jill resulted in a procreant dialogue about their children and grandchildren. These three women also showed me many pictures of their children or grandchildren playing with water (see for example, figure 63). Such photographs were not surprising as a large part of these women’s relationship to land intimately involved their children, and their children’s children. For instance, Sarah’s explanation of the image (figure 64) below where her two sons and her dog Phantom are playing in the Waiohine River, demonstrated the “privileged lifestyle” she and her family led:

That’s the boys doing ‘pretend fishing’ and the dog thinks there’s a fish in there too. So this is what you do in the country when you don’t have a two dollar shop or MacDonald’s [...] our boys live, compared to many children, live — although we are not very wealthy or anything like that — live a very privileged lifestyle in terms of being able to run around. They have pets, they can come and go as they please, they can make fires — they can do what they like basically. A lot of children don’t have that sort of freedom or the opportunity to [pause] I guess to [pause] yeah the opportunity to be on the land and to develop skills that you get off the land. So yeah

The “freedom or the opportunity”, in the context of rural living, which Sarah’s sons possessed, reflected the common arcadian tenets of freedom and opportunity that also often speak to what it means to live rurally in New Zealand (Fairburn, 1989; Johnsen, 2003; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). Such expression of arcadian ideals was reiterated by Sarah’s position that living rurally taught her children “resilience” (Johnsen, 2003) as she explained the routine slips and flooding that occurred on the only road to town from her land (see figure 65). Resilience could be read as an arcadian principle of self-reliance and libertarianism too, ideals common to rural living in New Zealand (Fairburn, 1989; Johnsen, 2003). Notably though, Sarah did not evoke the settler arcadia who would ‘battle’ with such land issues (see Abdinor, 2001; Evans, 2007). Instead she deferred to
these situations as “Mother Nature” and concluded the matter by telling me; “we think we can kind of control [her] — but at the end of the day, it’s up to her”.

Jill emphasised the proximity to waterbodies, rather than living rurally in itself, as a chance for childlike freedom and play. Conversing with me over the volunteering effort involved regarding MRS activity she detailed how school groups from around Wairarapa would come and learn how to plant trees and get to play in the stream. Akin to my conversation with Sarah, Jill explained the fundamentals of spending time down at the stream; lighting fires and being free to play without parental guidance. These were activities Jill could relate to as well:

> You know like [when you were] a child, you want to get in and swim and potter in [the water]. You know when kids come it’s amazing. They’re yelling and they’re screaming and they’re chucking stones. And my kids used to go down there every weekend. They would make their own fire. So they would put in some kindling, some matches and some paper, frying pans and stuff and you wouldn’t see them for eight hours. Those were the days!

Figure 66 presents Jill’s son and his friend helping out and playing with the children from a local school during a MRS volunteer day. Jill reflects nostalgically on when her sons were younger and they used to camp out on the banks of the Mangatarere. She enjoyed being able to facilitate this tradition for younger children as well, as her own children grew older. Her comments about freedom and playing by the water also reminded her of her own childhood, discussed in the previous chapter. In this context, Jill echoed the innocence and freedom (and self-regulation) of the romantic arcadian ideal, by idealising the past (“those were the days”), playing near waterways and making fires, and being unrestricted by rules or regulations (Ruff, 2015; Fairburn, 1989).
Figure 64. “Pretend fishing with Phantom”. Source Sarah

Figure 65. “Mother Nature”. Flooding near Sarah’s house with her and her two sons. Source: Sarah’s husband.
Figure 66. Jill’s son and his friend camping by the Mangatarere Stream. Source: Jill

Figure 67. Williams’ ripples. Source: Sarah.
Sarah too seemed to idealise the past as she told me about the river she used to play by as a child in Taranaki. One of the games she and her siblings played was throwing stones at a particular rock in that river (see figure 67). When she returned to Taranaki with her children during the school break she informed her sons that every generation of the family has thrown a stone at this rock. Then she initiated her children into the ritual. One of the photos she took was of the ripples one of her children made during his stone casting as she explicated: “So every generation throws stones at that rock. It’s always been there and that’s Williams’ little rings beside that rock so I thought that was kinda cool. It’s a huge rock. It will never wash away. It’s been there since the 1800s”

Sarah’s elucidation here hinted that there was a connection between the rock and her family that went beyond just throwing stones. Her explanation that the rock in the river had “been there since the 1800s” mirrored her own family’s settlement of the area detailed in chapter eight. Hence, water for Sarah, through the rock in Taranaki, the flooding in the gorge, and her children playing in the Waiohine River, was inextricably familial and therefore, I posit, deeply meaningful, importantly contributing to Sarah’s landhome making.

For Pākehā, through the romantic arcadian tradition we have all inherited, there is a well of temptation to ‘naturalise’ belonging through family, especially when it comes to forming relationships with land or water, so-called ‘natural’ bodies. Indeed, the concept of ‘family’ and ‘water’ have been, and still are, often repeatedly understood as ‘natural’ throughout Western culture (Haraway, 1997; 2003; 2008; 2016). What makes it more difficult to resist these seductions is that through the myths of romantic arcadianism, sincere meaning is made. Such meaning in women’s water stories here both compel and divert the flow of these commonly held Western views on what counts as ‘natural’ and the importance of (heteronormative) family.

Family and water flows will probably be always important for the women presented in this section, as it is for many Pākehā who recite a belonging to, and love for, land. Given this, rather than damming (or damning) women’s stories and casting them as unsalvageable White ‘naturalising’, there may be space to see something different. For one, the routine and common affects nestled within participants’ narrations effusively interrupted “the solitary individual” who seeks to transcend ordinary life (Trentmann,
1994, p. 588). This masculine Romantic figure desires to purge the homely sounds and sensations of children playing and wants to unburden himself of the domestic role of parenthood, maintaining that ‘pure’ and purifying ‘nature’ is beyond the domestic.

In stark contrast, participants in this section demonstrated a homely romanticism that was filled with the children and grandchildren they were bound to in the significant flesh as the waters from and near their homes spilt over them. Therefore, far from sitting in a transcendent self-contained space beyond the everyday, women expressed stony shifting veracities, positioning their stories as potent candidates for ‘staying with the trouble’ of Pākehā romanticisms (Evans, 2007; Haraway, 2016).
Figure 68. Water coming from mountain side in Waiohine gorge. Source: Sarah
Familiar, familial romanticism

Women’s stories about high and watery homes revealed a complex romanticism that in turn became useful conduits for furthering the reach of landhome making in this thesis. By following their narratives, pictures and footsteps through the Tararua and Puketoi Ranges, their hill country farms and waterways they cherished, I sensed an affect that was romantic and more-than-human (see Ottum & Reno, 2016). ‘Staying with the trouble’ of this seeming contradiction helped me realise that women’s ‘becoming with’ the streams and hills of their home positioned them as becoming Pākehā (see Haraway, 2008; 2016; Newton, 2009): Landhome making indeed.

By drawing on the grittiness of work life, the “serenity” at the water’s edge or the making of home with children, women in this chapter have troubled and queered the self-contained Transcendentalism so common to Romantic philosophy by making it comforting, affecting, homely, ordinary, familiar and familial. The familiar, familial and homeliness then, has become a powerful way to rebuke not just the transcendentalism derived from Europe I discussed in chapter three, but the ongoing masculinist colonial fantasies in New Zealand, exampled by the cultural nationalists surveyed in chapter four. To be sure, women’s stories here reinscribed a certain ‘naturalising’ that is implicit in Pākehā romanticism at large but the porousness of these narratives in this chapter enable them to be turned over and composted more easily than the masculinist and nationalist romantic accounts presented in this thesis.

Understanding this homely more-than-human affect is an important illustration of how difficult it is for Pākehā to relinquish romanticism as a way to love, adore, be with, land. Sayle (2001) agrees and to this end has proposed a feminist New Zealand romanticism focussed on local women artists that both challenges and retains romantic ideology as a way for relating to the more-than-human world. However, rather than simply posing a feminist romanticism because my participants were women, I suggest a feminist romanticism emerged here because of the emphasis women put on family, home and routine — those definably feminist, earthly composting matters that self-contained Romantics wish to purge (Haraway, 2008; 2016; Plumwood, 1993; 2002). Therefore, I
suggest women’s stories in this chapter are swelling examples of the composting of romanticism I suggested in chapter three, and so is mine.

I am a romantic Pākehā. The stream ramble I took part in with Jill opened me up to Wairarapa as ‘glistening waters’. The photographs Sarah showed of the Waiohine gorge stirred in me a desire to be in those places (see for example figure 68). Through this romantic wandering with women I became with them and Wairarapa ever more tightly as their stories and trails prompted me to navigate, like a coloniser, the tracks and the rivers of the Tararua Ranges.

During summer in Wairarapa, it is hot. I get hot easily even in cooler weather and in Wairarapa there are not many trees left to buffer the incessant heat: The sweltering baking oven-hot heat. Fortuitously, by learning from women about the gorges and valleys within the bushy mountains, I have found places that ease my suffocating discomfort. After sweaty tramps through the Tararua Ranges I experience the abundance of this glistening watery place. Taking of my boots and my socks I submerge myself in the deep waterholes along the many different streams and rivers. The water is ice-cold, shaded by trees and having flowed from the still-snowy reaches in the mountains. It is clear and green like pounamu. I drink mouthfuls of it as I let their cool body press the heat out of my back, face, feet and then slowly seep into my skin.

The felt ecstasy is ineffable. I want to cry out at the pleasure of this sensation and at the fact this is a Pākehā privilege. Like most state parks in the Western world, Tararua Forest walks are spaces for White bodies (although, to be fair, slim, middleclass and heteronormative bodies too but my queer fat working-class body still gets to enjoy these enveloping torrents) (Grebowicz, 2015; 2019; Stanley, 2018; 2019a; 2019b). The affect I feel in these sublime aquatics is deeply romantically troubling. In these spaces it is so seductively easy for Pākehā to irresponsibly forget what this place was, and who it was ‘with’, over hundreds of years (Evans, 2007; Marr, 2001; Waitangi Tribunal; 2010). We have created veritable paradises that ‘normalise’ and ‘naturalise’ our belonging, anesthetised by beauty and succour. Yet it is within these very sublime and affecting places that I propose a troubling and queering can occur, as I have tried to illustrate through this chapter and a theme that will be continued in the next.
Figure 69. Milking time on Carolyn’s farm. Source: Carolyn & Rebecca

Figure 70. Ewes being milked on Carolyn’s farm. Source: Carolyn & Rebecca
Chapter 10. Animalia in Arcadia: Using, killing, caring kin.

A good farmer
Has to be
Conflicted.
Responsible —
care to the end.
Full circle [means]
Killing everything.
Skinned and gutted
[to] feed our family.
Full circle [means]
Cuddling.
Taking care.
We love animals.
They have a really nice life.
We can live here quite happily.¹²⁴

The non-human animals I came across during fieldwork added much liveliness to my adventures (Wolch et al., 2003). I stroked, patted and talked with sheep, goats, cattle, ducks, hens, geese, rabbits and more. Women were very devoted to the animal kinds they kept and were keen to show me many photos of them, only some of which fitted in this chapter. Such haptic visual tales raised rich responses to capitalist agriculture, instrumentalism, self-sufficiency, ‘killability’, and family making that provided fresh troubling thoughts on transcendent understandings of arcadia, a point that will be turned over here in each section. The themes of home and family making also appeared in women’s stories yet again, building on previous chapters’ compost matters. Therefore, in

¹²⁴ This is a found poem made up of words and phrases from participants’ stories about animals (Tarlo, 2009).
this chapter I will consider the ongoing thickening of landhome making in this thesis, in the context of animal relating.

Carolyn’s life was filled with sheep at her home and on the farm where she worked. Thus, she was immersed in the world of dairy farm practice and sheep care, but her relationship with the woolly creatures, with whom she worked, indicated a disruption to dominant practices of farming in New Zealand, such as how she cuddled and talked to the ewes she milked. As Carolyn herself pointed out, she was able to provide this kind of attention because of the size of the operation. Carolyn’s expression of affection also resonated with Gaye and Penelope’s pursuits, wool spinning and egg production as they both ushered me through the process of both practices. Importantly, these rural customs were not just for profit, they were feeding their families too. Thus, I draw upon Haraway’s (2008) ‘lively capital’ to understand these stories more deeply but mutate her fleshly ideas to include non-capitalist production; an alteration that positions ‘reproduction’ as significant for this thesis.

The production, whether for profit or food, of farm animals was inescapable in this chapter. Killing and death left bloody traces throughout women’s tasks and accounts. Some talked about slaughter readily whilst some were more reticent. Sarah was a participant who was very comfortable talking about dispatching stock for meat. She was raised on a farm that performed home-kill routinely. At first glance, these scenes of killing and butchering did not resonate with commonly held views of the pastoral ideal. However, farmers’ discussions on death and killing provided this chapter with surprisingly abundant arcadian themes, raising the idea that perhaps, death too is in arcadia (see Schama, 1995, p. 519; chapter two).

Guiding how death and slaughter can figure in arcadia, I employ Haraway’s (2008) ponderings on the notion of killing and ‘being killable’. Amidst ruminating on the ethics of bloody relations, Haraway (2008) emphasises how close nurturing is to death. Interestingly, women’s own utterances of death often reverberated with Haraway’s ponderings: As Lynne declared to me when we entered her sheep paddocks in spring; “where there is life, there is death”. Resultantly, the penultimate part of this chapter on animal tales will detail the cuddly, bristly, woolly encounters that spoke to kin making (Haraway, 2003; 2008; 2016) between human and not so human. Wholly disrupting the
heteronormative self-contained settler arcadia, such family making provides a rich telling of cross-species arcadian kinship (see Haraway, 2008; 2016) that includes both love, use and death (Grebowicz & Merrick, 2013, pp. 96-98).

A potent sign of this love seemed to be firstly, the process of women taking photographs of farm animals that sometimes they themselves were figured in; and then secondly showing them to me and explaining all the hairy capers in which all were involved. Like Carolyn said there was “care” in these human non-human relations and “responsibility”, a word which Jocelyn and Sarah used repeatedly, expressions that echoed Haraway’s (2008; 2016) response-ability. Moreover, Penelope talked about “conflict” which was a wonderful tool to hold the tensions of use, slaughter and family making together. The nexus between use, death and kin making care are the cornerstones for any compost pile (Haraway, 2016). These women’s stories of landhome making then, exhibited potent composting potential and that far from being innocent or evading death, these narratives indicated how we, Pākehā, may see death as not an opposition to life but an ongoing composting (Haraway, 2016).

Bleating, quacking, laying: Lively reproduction and the value of encounter

As described in the preceding chapters, the farm Carolyn worked on she had developed by growing pasture and planting shelter belts for the sheep she milked and cared for. As a small-scale sheep dairy operation, ewes were milked during certain periods and ‘dried off’ when grass growth was slow. During my time with Carolyn, it was the ‘milking time’ performance that she most wanted me to see, hence us waiting for the grass to grow until I visited the farm. I arrived well before milking time at around two o’clock on the day in question as I was keen to see (and Carolyn was keen to show me) the farm in its entirety.

Crowded under the pine shade multiple conversations transpired as mothers and babies bleated to each other. Motherless ewes watched us too and talked amongst themselves at the same time. When the time came to three-thirty in the afternoon the ewes moved knowingly. Carolyn only needed to gently persuade them by calling and guiding (see figure 69). Pushed up against each other in close quarters of the moveable pen amplified
the bleating as I stood on the other side talking to, and patting, them. It was a frenzied occasion but not an anxious one.

The milk the small flock of ewes provided was mainly made into boutique cheese — the sheep dairy industry still being a minor agricultural player in New Zealand (Peterson & Prichard, 2015). As introduced earlier in this thesis, Carolyn often worked selling this cheese at the regular farmers market in Wairarapa and the business’ cheese shop in Masterton. Significantly, the company itself drew on common ideas of romantic arcadianism in its advertising. In particular, the farm was framed as “idyllic”, the cheese making ‘artisanal’ and handmade, and crucially the sheep “happy”¹²⁵. In fact, following the link to “Happy Sheep” was an arcadian vision of ewes peacefully grazing on lush green grass with the Tararua Ranges in the background ¹²⁶ (see Belich, 2001, p.84).

Drawing on pre-capitalist European artisanship culture whereby the product is made by hand and sold by the maker was a convincingly milky version of the Martinborough arcadia Howland (2008) described in chapter five. Educing Virgil’s arcadia too, the company touted how “(t)he sheep are very friendly and seem quite content to give up their milk”¹²⁷; redolent of the poet’s Eclogues wherein the land ‘naturally’ provides and the farmer does not have to toil (Virgil, c.38 BCE/2009). Accompanying this idealism on the company’s website, was the proclamation that sheep “skip to the milking everyday”¹²⁸ again echoing Virgil’s own account of the milking time in the Eclogues when “[g]oats shall walk home, their udders taut with milk and nobody/ [h]erding them” (Virgil, c.38 BCE/2009, p. 18).

As inferred in chapter eight, there are aspects about this kind of advertisement of the farm that Carolyn was willing to promote. She believed in “care”, “cuddles”, knowing the ewes intimately and had developed herself a routine for milking time that required no shouting, whipping or herding with a dog (see figure 69), elements common to large-

¹²⁵ See https://www.kingsmeadecheese.co.nz
¹²⁶ see https://www.kingsmeadecheese.co.nz/shop/category-2
¹²⁷ See https://www.kingsmeadecheese.co.nz/home/sheep-milking
¹²⁸ See https://www.kingsmeadecheese.co.nz/shop/category-2
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scale cow dairy farming that she had experienced as a share milker. In this sense she echoed that Virgilian theme of stock walking happily to the milking station.

However, even though she preferred to work on farm small operations she still had sympathy for large-scale farmers and, as also mentioned in chapter eight, was rather sceptical about urban views of rural life. For example when I probed her further about agriculture being “the backbone of the country” (see chapter eight) she commented on how there was presently a lack of understanding of rural New Zealand by urban New Zealanders:

When I was a kid in the holidays we went to the farm [near Feilding] and ran round and probably got in the way and stuff but nobody [pause] people don’t have that anymore. You can see that in the letters to the editor and stuff. There was one in there in the Dominion [Post] this morning about the price of beef. It said something like ‘why have the farmers got the price of beef up?’ And it’s like, the farmers haven’t got the price of beef up! Farmers aren’t selling it direct! So yeah I think there is a massive gap [between urban and rural New Zealand].

Carolyn straddled — like she did her sheep — a significant tension within dominant understandings of arcadianism. On the one hand she saw value in working for a farm with “animal friendly” values but she also felt loyal to the large-scale farming fraternity and even identified with this culture. In her response to an urban person’s opinion on beef prices Carolyn invoked the New Zealand arcadian mythology that extols a time where New Zealanders were rural and if they weren’t, they knew someone who was (see Evans, 2007). Akin to her own self-description in chapter eight of being “of the land”, such a narrative infers an intimacy with, and understanding of, the land and things rural that has been ‘lost’; a cornerstone to transcendent arcadian narratives (Evans, 2007; Fairburn, 1989). In bestriding these two ideas of arcadianism from within the context of “care”, Carolyn presented a compostable ideal that was both knowledgeable about the land and concerned for the well-being sheep; a noninnocent, fleshly arcadia.

129 Someone in the dairy sector that owns stock but does not own a farm
As I was taking photographs of the shed and the sheep, Carolyn called me over. First she showed me a solution she was making up which contained iodine and glycerine. After every milking she rubbed the liquid gently on the ewes’ teats after they had been milked to prevent infection. Then we turned to the bowl of grains each ewe ate whilst being milked. The milking shed design was a common herringbone type with ten each side. The ewes’ jaws gyrated as they chewed their nutrition mix (see figure 70). When they looked up from their food they were inquisitive, sniffing and bleating. By this time Carolyn was down in the pit (the place to milk from) milking and muttering that her staff the previous day had not done their job properly.

Once I had taken my photographs Carolyn instructed me to come down to meet her and milk a sheep or two myself. I jumped into the pit next to Carolyn. We both stood there short sleeved and hot. Our pink flesh was strikingly similar to the ewes’ undersides before us. I could feel the heat coming of their round pink udders in front of me. I turned to see Carolyn busily pulling compacted manure off a ewe’s tail. Her hands were dark green, covered in the extracted debris of the tail. It was also in her nails. Hearing a splashing sound, I turned back, and caught the ewe mid-flow: A cascade of warm urine fell in front of me spraying all that was near. Carolyn laughed and the tension on her face evaporated. She was as patient as the ewes as she showed me how to milk.

Carolyn’s practices warmly and effusively illustrated Haraway’s (2008, p.46) ‘trans-species encounter value’ and lively capital as ways of ‘staying with the trouble’ of industrial capitalism (Haraway, 2008; 2016). Trans-species encounter value is steeped in Karl Marx’s analysis. Building on Marx’s contention that “analysis of the commodity form into exchange value and use value were crucial to freedom projects”, Haraway (2008, p.65) introduces the axis of trans-species encounter value to the critique of capitalism. Whilst challenging Marx’s human exceptionalism, but praising him of his sensuality, Haraway emphasises the value of encounter present within capitalist commodities, producers and consumers. Far from rescinding capitalism, Haraway’s (2008, p.45) trans-species encounter value makes capital livelier, “in spite of all the inherent dematerialization and objectifications in market valuation”.
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Figure 71. Finn-made cloak for Gaye’s public storytelling. Source Gaye & Rebecca

Figure 72. Wairarapa river stones made from Finn wool. Source Gaye & Rebecca
Carolyn and her sheep care-fully performed such lively encounter value, providing woolly, urine-stained, green-manured embodied responses to “the inherent dematerialization and objectifications” (Haraway, 2008, p.45) of dominant capitalist narratives. Far from being a care that is part of a feminist utopia wherein women are ‘naturally’ nurturing, non-violent and anti-capitalist (see Haraway, 2008; Plumwood, 1993) Carolyn’s care was exploitative and was a job that earnt her money. It is these tensions through Carolyn’s sheep relating that perform seriously reproductive work towards ‘staying the trouble’ (Haraway, 2016) of arcadia and animal use in New Zealand.

Carolyn’s lively sheep milking excursions also correlated with Penelope’s and Gaye’s reproductive farm animal stories. I went to visit Gaye for the third time in a terrible westerly. I found her in her studio and because of the wind we spent the time talking inside while trees shook and light weight objects threatened to take flight. The yarn began with her Finn sheep and turned into her showing me her craft work. I followed her into a walk-in cupboard where there was piles of different coloured felt, wool and knitted clothing. She then pulled a tall clear plastic bag out to let me feel the unspun wool. It was soft, white and dirty with debris through it. There was the inescapable smell of sheep that diffused fragrant visions of walking through a paddock on a sunny day with wisps of wool blowing around and clumps of manure dotted throughout. In Gaye’s opinion the Finn wool was ideal for weaving and knitting, as it’s a “beautiful long fine staple. So it’s quite like merino. So it’s quite soft”.

Gaye then showed me a felt cloak she had made; “so this is felt made from our Finn wool which I made for a (public) story I was telling and I had to make a white cloak for the main character: Its very water proof, it’s quite dense”(see figure 71). Gaye then presented me with two very impressive rugs that were made from her wool supply one of them being an illustration of Wairarapa river stones (see figure 72).

Like Carolyn, Gaye sold her wool products at the local market. Also like Carolyn, Gaye demonstrated a relationality between the sheep she lived with and her “craft” weaved in her studio that also emphatically countered “the inherent dematerialization and objectifications in market valuation” (Haraway, 2008, 45). Indeed, Gaye’s material was material. She bought Finn sheep specifically for their wool and took the time to show me in its sheepish form, and told tales with its spun staple, binding text with wool. Gaye then
performed her public stories, turning these mats into woolly semiotic materialisations, essential ingredients for re-examining the New Zealand arcadian political economy (see chapter four) as both lively and reproductive (Haraway, 2003; 2008; 2016).

The routines Penelope enacted with her feathery companions were another rich transfiguration of Haraway’s (2003; 2008; 2016) fleshly material-semiotic encounter value. I heard the birds Penelope lived with before I saw them. We were conversing with the goats — or rather one big masculine goat called Leonard (see figure 73). He had retired from siring and as I patted his bristly head Penelope was explaining (loudly so as to speak over top of the birds) how he was kept on the farm because he was “beautiful”. As we moved closer towards the bird noise, behind the goats’ quarters, the cacophony of sound became louder and louder. Suddenly I could see entangled together, a gaggle of geese, a brace of ducks and a brood of hens. Most birds were cross-breeds although there were some especially bred such as white Silke Bantam and black Orpington hens, which were happily clucking laying and scratching with their hybrid counterparts of all feathery kinds.

Penelope received “twenty-four to thirty very fresh and beautiful” eggs per day from her fowl and showed me “what an egg should look like” (see figure 74) by giving me a photograph of one cracked open from one of her hens. In the main she sold eggs through her work in Petone near Wellington city: “I have to take five dozen to work tomorrow and two dozen the next day.” Penelope’s small free-range egg trade generated enough income to cover costs and to invest something back into the poultry side of the farm. It was one part of a small business that operated alongside farm tours, fruit preserves, ice-cream (in the summer) and cheese from goats’ milk.
Figure 73. Penelope & Leonard. Source: Penelope & Rebecca

Figure 74. "What an egg should look like". Source: Penelope
Jocelyn too used free-range eggs as part of her business. Alongside her farming operation she had chickens that provided her with eggs for the travellers who stayed in her backpackers’ accommodation. It was whilst negotiating this accommodation with her that she also plied me some fresh ‘reproductions’. I insisted that I pay and she refused to take my money. So I ended up staying at Jocelyn’s accommodation just down the road from her farm after I had interviewed her that day. As I poached my eggs the next day it occurred to me that I was taking part in the mythology Jocelyn was selling. The “soft rain” as Jocelyn called it, gently quenched the hills and rested on contented sheep’s backs as they grazed, all in clear sight from where I stood drinking my coffee. I felt the romantic arcadian vein of ‘natural abundance’, peaceful pastoralism and an ostensible harmony between human and hen.

Even though Jocelyn ran a large-scale farm based on capitalist productivity there were instances that resonated with Gaye and Penelope’s practices, as well as Carolyn’s. Collectively, through sheep and fowl these women reflected the settler goal of ‘material progress’ associated with farming in New Zealand (Fairburn; 1989; Pawson, 2018). Complementarily, the small-scale, free-range element of their production presented women’s feathery stories as romantic in that a sense of harmony between farmer and stock was educed (Fairburn, 1989; Ruff, 2015). I was also a part of this narrative as I became seduced by the smell of wool and the rich taste of free-range eggs. To work through this settler arcadian drive to earn money or make food — that potentially positioned stock as instruments — and the more romantic arcadianism that ‘softens’ such practices, I first turned to Plumwood.

Plumwood (1993, p.53) explored the issue of instrumentalism comprehensively as a ‘logic of colonisation’. From an instrumentalist Aristotelian view, the “dominator” often forms a veneer that shows the relationship between him [sic] and the “dominated” as mutually beneficial. For example, in women’s stories there was an emphasis on the ruminant and feathered creatures being well looked after which in turn creates a “good product” made with “care”. However, Plumwood points to how such a relationship actually centres on the dominator’s needs and wants and therefore the needs and wants of the dominated are always understood and expressed through the dominator. In human exceptionality, the human is ‘naturally’ the ‘dominator’ whilst the dominated
(non-human) is merely “useful, a resource” (Plumwood, 1993, p.53). The corollary of this contention is that ostensive ameliorating factors involved in instrumental relating, such as employing practices of “love”, and “care”, which women (and I) performed, does not shift the Master/Slave ontology but simply reacts to it (Plumwood, 1993). In other words, Plumwood argued it doesn’t matter how much “love” and “care” humans bestow on non-human animals in the context of production, the desires of humans will always be paramount.

Haraway more or less agrees with this analysis (2008). She too goes back to the Greeks and the Self/Othering dualisms that were formed by Plato and Aristotle and subsequently inherited by British Victorian colonial culture (Evans, 2007; Haraway, 2003; 2008; 2016; Plumwood, 1993; 2002; see chapter, two, three and four). In this vein, Haraway would posit, women’s reproductive stories cannot be understood outside of the foodstuffs and financial gain they have received from their lively encounters. For Haraway (2008, p.55) though, disrupting this modern Western ontology is not about equating the subjugation of humans with the use of farm animals. Importantly, she argues, non-human animals cannot be compared to human slaves or wage labourers and “it would be a serious mistake to theorize their labor within those frameworks” (Haraway, pp.55-56). Haraway goes on to explain, such an approach to treating non-human animals in human terms uses a human-centric framework of production to understand non-human production. Reinscribing the ontology of human exceptionalism, this romantic approach positions the desires of human beings at the centre just as instrumentalism does.

Haraway (2008; 2016) in no way suggests exploitation does not exist between human and not, but to understand more deeply what the needs and wants of a sheep, duck, goose or hen, are, a much deeper shift is required. Such a shift does not necessarily require abandoning instrumental relations, although ‘multispecies justice’ certainly needs attention within the global capitalist production of all sorts of lively critters (Haraway, 2008; 2016). What Haraway offers is a different kind of worldliness, an ethico-onto-epistemological ‘re-worlding’ and practising that involves rescinding the philosophy of human exceptionalism. She also thinks there has been too much critique
on “instrumental human-animal world makings” and less exploration of “what else is going on [...] and what else is needed” (Haraway, 2008, p.74).

The ‘what else’ is key here and women’s stories in this section hint at how entangled care, joy and pleasure are with the animalistic world of instrumental relations. Indeed, women’s narratives presented a composting of the binaries between the capitalist production of animals and a romantic kindness towards non-human critters, largely through the notion of reproduction. To elaborate, women expressed a way of using farm animals but in a way that understood and respected the cycles of reproduction that allowed a noninnocent ‘getting on together’ (Haraway, 2008; 2016; 2019a; 2019b). Pressing this issue further, I care-fully continue to explore these matters in the following section drawing on women’s views of farm animal slaughter and death.

**Death: Et in Arcadia Ego (and I (death) too was in Arcady)**

Whilst feeding Lynne’s working dogs cold slippery hunks of hogget meat, her statement earlier that day — “where there is life, there is death”— came to fruition for me in the bloody flesh (Haraway, 2003; 2008; 2016). We had spent the day surrounded by urgent new born woolly vivacity and now I was seeing how things typically ended for older ewes on Lynne’s farm. Death and killing was a feature common to women’s stories of animal production. Killing for food, money or efficiency, and premature farm death, were important strands to this research regarding the routine makings of home on land for participants and it also crucially raised razor-sharp questions about the pastoral ideal. Therefore this section will probe the very aged question of the presence of death in arcadia (see Schama, 1995, p.519; chapter two).

On a particularly still cool spring evening I sat on the back of Jocelyn’s quad bike while she drove down a sealed road parallel to her farm. It was the second long hard day of farm interviewing on very little sleep. She drove slowly so did not compel me to wear a helmet which was a huge relief. I let the refreshing breeze alleviate me from the heat of the day and relax my body. Pregnant ewes munched away on the paddock fodder or rested under trees next to us. As we turned into a drive and over a creek we ascended steeply as Jocelyn wanted to show me the farm from her landing strip. Around a corner a
few metres from the top a pregnant ewe lay slumped in a ditch. Jocelyn turned off the engine and hastily approached the sheep. I, unsure of what to do in such circumstances, dithered behind her and then moved toward the ewe too. We both seemed unsure about what to say. Her face was full of worry and concern. “I am a good farmer” she stated quietly. It was a fact said softly but firmly: “Of course” I offered weakly.

Jocelyn took two legs of the ewe and I, keen to help, took the other two and together we rolled the carcass down the hill to an easier access point where Jocelyn said she would deal to it later which she did when I was safely in the confines of her backpackers. Her wool was thin where I grabbed, that place just above the well-worked muddy hooves. Her pink skin under her coat was visible. It was cold as I wrapped my hands around her legs. Her head fell to the side, her belly full with pregnancy. She was heavy but we carried her over to the edge of the hill easily and then let go. Her body and head were at complete odds as she awkwardly tumbled down to the gully below. Such an encounter could not have been predicted; and even though this ewe did not earn Jocelyn the money she wanted, she(ep) — and her babies — certainly provided me with valuable revisions of pastoral arcadianism.

The image of peaceful flocks of sheep grazing on lush green pasture are fundamental to ideas of the New Zealand rural idyll (Belich, 2001, p.84; Evans, 2007). The image of an abattoir, dead lambs lying in the paddock or a dead pregnant ewe slumped in a ditch coldly disrupts the warm sun of this arcadia. Yet in the thrust of farming life, as Lynne said, there is always slaughter and premature death. From this perspective it would seem the mythology of arcadia and the visceral reality of farm life are vastly different. Howland (2008, p.87) illustrates this disparity quite potently in his research as he explained how a group of Wellington tourists visiting Martinborough were so “alarmed” at seeing a dead lamb next to a vineyard they were visiting that they did not taste the wine on offer as they were afraid of “contamination”. An interviewee responded to Howland’s suggestion that all farms endure death by stating; “that’s not the point, it is simply bad marketing to have a dead lamb lying there” (2008, p.87).

Arcadian pictorialising of farm land and its occupants has obscured the bloody stench of death and animal slaughter since colonial settler society (Evans, 2007). Idealising literature, paintings and then photography were vital in not just advertising the colony as
a rural paradise, but important for concealing the grim farm work of dispatching animals or the smell of dead carcasses (Evans, 2007). As I explored in chapter four, such romantic Victorian veiling became a significant part of popular pictorial culture in Pākehā New Zealand such as the yarn Evans relayed in the conclusion about viewers’ complaints about seeing butchery on screen.

Helpfully the way women discussed animal production added a complex flavour to these issues. For one, Lynne seemed to express a similar attentiveness to farm death to that of Jocelyn. On entering the “lamb paddocks” she instructed me that, one there would be dead lambs as I accompanied her on her “lamb beat” and two, I was not allowed to take any photographs of any deceased beings. There are a couple of reasons I can think of as to why Lynne requested this instruction of me: She could have been trying to ‘cover up’ scenes which could be interpreted as objectionable (Howland, 2008) or this could have been a mark of respect. Another comment Lynne made later on helped me further understand her position whilst she compared indoor farming and hill country farming (which she practised):

*It’s a pretty blah life for them [the stock] really. I mean [pause] I sort of try not to think too much about the fact that they have a life! I mean they are bred for a purpose. And you know when they go off on a truck [to the abattoir] I try not to think about [pause] I just try to think that they have had a really nice life — well we’ve [she and Rob] tried to make it a stress free life as best as we could [pause] and remember that they were bred for a purpose and try not think much more about it than that really.*

Lynne’s remark here that inferred she didn’t really like to think about sheep ‘having a life’ or the process of slaughter could be interpreted as not wanting to ‘face killing’ (Haraway, 2008). Her comments could also be seen as a veiling strategy, conjuring a romantic arcadianism that presents farm animals as having “a really nice life” munching their way across the hill country — a stark contrast to the images of dead sheep in an abattoir (Evans, 2007). Yet in her tone, and within her words, Lynne expressed a deep affect. It seemed Lynne didn’t want to ‘face killing’ because she felt for them. This sensibility insinuated an unease over needing to dispatch stock, which Lynne conciliated by
believing she provided her sheep with a “stress free life” (as much as she is able). It is this affect that I suggest something “else is going on” (Haraway, 2008, p.74) in the instrumental connecting Lynne performed on her farm.

Sarah too, in very affectual ways discussed animal slaughter on farms. In particular she relayed to me during a sit-down interview that she and her family have routine “killing days”, a practice that was very much part of her childhood. Even though she did not live on the family farm in Taranaki anymore, her father still came to stay on the small holding she owned in Wairarapa and helped her with the dispatching and butchering of the animals she raised for meat that included goats, sheep, cattle and chickens. To provide me with more of a context Sarah explained in detail about her family tradition of “killing”:

All your aunties would come round and your uncles and you would kill everything — well everything that needed killing — killing everything sounds terrible! You would kill a beast and we would be there grinding the mince and there would be a pig done at the same time. And the aunties would usually do half a dozen of the old roosters. And then it would all be divided up and put in everyone’s respective freezers. So yeah you’d stock up all together. My father, although seventy-six, is very good at killing sheep — a little bit brutal — the SPCA might be after him! But he was fifteen when he had to start killing two hoggets a week for the house and all the farm workers. And he was fifteen when he did it on his own, skinned it, gutted it, cut it up for the house. There were bullet shortages so he used a really sharp knife and does a ‘no bullet used’ killing. But he is really good at skinning and I will probably get him down [from Taranaki] cos the boys are dying to have a sheep skin each. So dad is pretty handy with that so he can come down and show us the finer points
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Animal slaughter was a core part of Sarah’s making landhome making. Like Carolyn’s narrative of sheep milking — through the characterisation of her father — Sarah educed a settler arcadianism that was steeped in the skills of both bushman and farmer (Abdinor, 2000; Evans, 2007). Markedly, such arcadianism lies in contrast to the picturesque arcadianism just discussed. Rather, invoking images such as on-farm slaughter and skinned stock, Sarah’s story here reverberated the “reeking sheep skins” and “blood-stained scaffold” on the farm in settler Cantabrian George Chamier’s arcadian novels (Evans, 2007, p.118).

Despite the macabre tone, Sarah also inferred that not “anything goes” (Haraway, 2008, p.79). Like Lynne she potentially tempered the “killing days” by her mitigating comments; “killing everything sounds terrible!” and “the SPCA might be after him (her father)!” Interestingly, Sarah’s stories also elucidated the arcadian tropes of self-reliance and self-sufficiency that point to a romantic idealisation of rural life; a potential rationale for the slaughter of farm animals (Evans, 2007; Fairburn, 1989; Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). Such romantic evocation was again implied in the way Sarah contrasted self-sufficient farm life with mass production and urbanisation, symbolised by the supermarket:

> My brother for ten years or eleven years owned a supermarket; having [him] in the food business and telling me about forced meat and re-blooding meat and all the horrific — and meat glue — and all the stuff they do, I was quite horrified: It’s like I wouldn’t feed that to my dog!!

> You know?

The practice of home-killing by Sarah and her distaste for supermarket-bought meat is also intriguing to read in the context of Haraway’s call to “get better at facing killing” (Haraway 2008 p. 81). Sarah in these narratives infers that she is capable of the kind of relationship with killing Haraway is talking about. Significantly, Haraway (2008) is not just asking us to literally face killing but face it as ideology, a counterpoint to so many transcendent arcadias that censor discussion of, and the actual act of, death. Far from celebrating killing of non-human animals Haraway asks us to uncomfortably understand that humans, along with the rest of the world’s critters, “live in and through the use of one another’s bodies” (Haraway 2008 p. 79). Facing killing for Haraway (2008; 2016)
then, is a way of ‘staying with the trouble’ that the practices of ‘becoming with’ demand — practices that respond to the Western cultural fantastical desire to transcend death (Haraway & Goodeve, 1999, p. 116).

Unsurprisingly, Haraway (2008, p.105) rejects “exterminationist nonsolutions” like closing down all animal farms and promoting compulsory veganism, although she certainly commends veganism as a feminist practice. What the philosopher does propose is an understanding that “killing and nurturing” are interconnected cycles of human and non-human life (Haraway, 2008, p.105). Dominant Western ideologies, she denotes, have not grasped this perspective and instead promulgate the religious commandment turned secular instruction: “Thou shall not kill” (Haraway, p.105). The human exceptionalism in this directive is evidenced by how the term ‘murder’ is reserved for human victims of killing (Haraway, 2008). Haraway (2008, pp.105-106) is not advocating that every critter that is killed be understood as ‘murder’. What concerns her is the ideological acceptance that if one is deemed ‘not human’, then ‘it’ becomes ‘killable’ and all the associated Otherings and subjugations that come with being not human and eligible for being killed (Haraway, 2008). Thus, Haraway calls for a reworking of the commandment to “thou shall not make killable” (2008, pp.105-106).

Haraway’s (2008) point is that if a sheep or a cattle beast becomes not killable, than to kill it demands entirely new response-abilities. Sarah’s own thoughts on “responsibility” more or less demonstrated this point. Sarah believed “that if you take care of stock the food will taste better” and then she added, “I like that it’s [raising stock for meat] not just purely functional”. What Sarah meant as being “not[…]purely functional” is that the ongoing relationship with the farm animals up until slaughter is significant; and in Sarah’s world, this was a family tradition that she felt was important to pass on to her children, as she conveyed:

*So I kind of like that full circle view that it [raising stock for meat] gives children. And also that they have a responsibility. You know if you get a pet lamb that you have to take care of it, you can’t just turn it off like a video game or your laptop. You can’t just put it on charge for a while and forget about it.*
The responsibility Sarah shared with me in her fleshy narrative, along with Lynne and Jocelyn’s, echoed Haraway’s (2008; 2016) response-ability. The philosopher’s response-ability, raises important ways of understanding non-human animal slaughter. Namely Haraway’s response-ability is a relentlessly relational act that demands those who are willing, to relinquish certain Western myths of killing and rewrite new ones. For example, rather than view animal slaughter in the fixed trouble-free binaries of, pretending one’s meat does not come from animal death, or making farm animal’s ‘killable’, Haraway (2016) offers a space to thrive outside of these options which requires ‘staying with the trouble’ and facing the idea that slaughtering an animal is necessary for eating meat.

Jocelyn and Lynne’s unease over sheep death and Sarah’s responsibility, to a degree, seemed to ‘stay with this trouble’ of killing. Resultantly these women’s stories pointed to ways in which an arcadia may encompass slaughter, pointing to how the presence of death may be found in the so-called paradise (Schama, 1995, p.519; see also chapter two). A final story that crystallises this argument of ‘facing killing’ and ‘staying with trouble’ was Penelope’s own views on the “conflict” she felt over killing and eating:

Anybody who grows meat is conflicted. Any good grower. Because if you are a good grower you care for the animals, you do all the right things and then you kill them [pause] it is a conflict, but I eat meat, I am a meat eater. So it’s got to come from somewhere. So if I do it myself I know what’s in it, what sort of life it’s had — that it’s had the freedom to do what the donkeys do like rolling in the dust [...] the first time we had animals slaughtered I went out. The second time I was home but I was in the kitchen. But it’s [the conflict] always there. But my overriding thing is we give them a good life. I thought about it in the early days and now I know I am conflicted and it’s just [pause] a good farmer has to be conflicted. In order that he cares enough. If you don’t care, you’re not really a good farmer. You have to be conflicted. By definition you have to be conflicted I think. Or not eat meat.
In contrast to picturesque pastoral scenes, death in arcadia taps into the bloody messy materiality of farm life that could be seen as a settler arcadian exploit. Both of these arcadias are problematic and, in varying degrees, expressed by women. Yet there was composting potential in women’s stories that recognised the reproductive cycles of farm life like the previous section touched on. This, I argue, injected a kindness in killing here, a responsibility that showed fleshly bloody signs of being response-able. In a compost pile life and death are entangled without innocence or harmony but with a certain flourishing (Haraway, 2008; 2016). Participants’ stories showed this composting in their killing stories, a composting that was intimately connected to how they made family with the non-human creatures residing on their landhomes.

Making cross-species Animalia kin

For most participants, the relations between human and farm animal were a very animated part of making home and family with land. Through this kinship making I posit a kind of “love” materialised: “Not an ideal love, not an obedient love, but one that [...] recognize[d] [...] the taste of blood” (Haraway, 2008, p.85). Lynne’s story of orphaned lambs is demonstrative here. Fortuitously I visited Lynne when she had two orphaned lambs bleating next to her house. So, at the end of a day of riding up and down the hills of her farm I accompanied Lynne on her task “to feed the animals” which that day mostly meant feeding the working dogs and the lambs. In an uneasy but generative act, signalling Haraway’s (2008) call to see the interconnectedness between nurturing and killing, I left the dogs chewing on their hogget meat (see section two) while I went to collect the milk to feed the orphaned lambs.

The sky was slowly turning pink and Lynne was at the sink making up two formula milk bottles in the kitchen. I waited on the verandah that faced the lamb’s paddock. The two lambs paced up and down their fenced pen crying, desperate and rhythmic as their noses searched through the wooden slats for the venerated teat. Their knees were stained with dirt and grass, signs of determined and vigorous feeding. Once Lynne was finished she gave me a bottle and she kept a bottle for herself. As we moved closer to the woolly creatures their small cloven hooves pounded the soft ground reminding me of the images of cloven-hoofed Pan (Ruff, 2015; Schama, 1995). It was September and the patchy,
scrubby grass was moist. Dinky was the older of the two lambs we approached. His wool was white with black patches. His compatriot, who was much smaller, was completely white. Their wool was soft and tightly curled. Their bodies were warm and their noses were eager to touch us. I let them climb over my gumboots and nuzzle into my legs.

Lynne told me to feed the new one without a name. He was so forceful and urgent with his feeding I knelt down to his height while Lynne, accustomed to the routine, stood to feed Dinky.

Caring for orphaned lambs as a busy farmer was a curious pursuit. Lynne was open about the need to work within neoliberal economics where time and overhead costs are crucial in order to make a profit (see Johnsen, 2003): But singularly bottle feeding lambs is not profitable. Her response to me pointing this detail out to her was simply: “Oh no, I wouldn’t be without my pet sheep”. They are, as Lynne called them, “pets” until they are reintegrated into the farm where they become meat. Yet even when they are reintegrated to the main “mob” they don’t behave like “normal” sheep. So during tasks like drenching or crutching, they always needed special attention that made each job for Lynne more difficult.

The way Lynne treated these lambs interestingly disrupted Plumwood’s (2002, p.160) contention that Western culture has come to separate non-human animals as either “pet” or “meat”, touched on in chapter three. A major concern of this dualistic thinking argues Plumwood (2002), is that some animals are objectified and some become privileged or ‘honorary’ humans. Lynne conceivably conducted this privileging as only the “friendly” lambs were able to become pets which demarcated farm sheep and “pet sheep”. Yet in serious ways these human-sheep encounters problematised the binary between what counts as ‘pet’ and what counts as ‘meat’ by proposing that some sheep could be both. Promisingly then, Lynne’s orphaned sheep story spoke to Haraway’s (2008) discussion on the intersection between caring and killing that pointed to new ways of perceiving and practising kin making.

Carolyn kept orphaned lambs as well. When I arrived at her house in Masterton I could hear the lambs bleating amongst the budgie chirping and the dogs barking before I got past her gate. Sitting down on her canine hair covered couch we could still hear the lambs bleating. “Shut up” Carolyn cried in mock anger and then laughed. Then she pulled
out some old photographs of lambs she had kept at her home over the years. Two that she remembered fondly were Boris and Lambie that both regularly inhabited her house. Lambie (see figure 75) is pictured here stealing the dog biscuits one night whilst Carolyn was sleeping but subsequently got woken to the noise, and Boris is presented here looking out the window on the coffee table (see figure 76). Carolyn showed me many more photographs of kid goats (from when she worked in Waikato on a goat milking farm) and lambs. She pointed to some pictures that had ewes dressed in hats, fake pearls and dresses: “This is what happens when you only employ women. They dress the sheep up! Sheep like being dressed up”.

The act of donning sheep with human clothes, accompanied with the statement, “sheep like being dressed up”, raises the issue of anthropomorphism, which is the representation of nonhuman others with human traits, or in this case, apparels (Plumwood, 2002, pp.56-61). Interestingly though, both Plumwood (2002, pp.56-61) and Haraway (2008, p.242) both ponder how the ostensible problematics of anthropomorphism can be fruitful, and I would argue, (re)productive. Haraway readily concedes she anthropomorphises the relationship she had with her canine companion Cayenne and insists that not to anthropomorphise runs the risk of “being both inaccurate and impolite” (Haraway, 2008, p.242). Plumwood (2002) suggests that another term for forceful human desires on non-humans may be more accurate, namely ‘anthropocentrism’, a practice she argues, is not generative. In contrast, she posits that anthropomorphism could be useful depending on three main questions: How damaging is it? What is its meaning? And what practices could counter it? (Plumwood, 2002, p.58).
Figure 75. Lambie stealing dog biscuits. Source: Carolyn

Figure 76. Boris. Source: Carolyn
Carolyn’s anthropomorphism perceived through these questions is revealing. Firstly, dressing sheep up in human clothes (or even ascribing human traits such as “naughty” in the case of Lambie) is not damaging, although not “ideal” (Haraway, 2008, p. 85). More, importantly, Plumwood’s second question about ‘meaning’ was connected to the philosopher’s third question. To elaborate, I suggest the meaning behind Carolyn’s anthropomorphism was care, evidenced by her ‘taking care’ of orphaned lambs from her place of work. Intriguingly, illustrating this ‘care’ in her rationale for taking in motherless lambs she also demonstrated knowledge of the hierarchical human-sheep difference on a working farm:

> When you find an orphaned lamb in the paddock you decide then whether to pick it up or leave it. If I leave them I will forget them. But if I pick it up, that’s it. I have to care for it until the end, until it is big enough to be reintroduced to the farm.

Carolyn’s touching remark illuminated the affective tensions in a world of animal use and slaughter that inferred a response to Plumwood’s third question — that her anthropomorphism was curtailed by the realities, like frequent death, of farm life. In other words, the knowledge of being a stock manager clipped Carolyn’s ‘pet play’ with her sheep. Perhaps then, the care she felt towards those sheep that led to her dressing them up, revisioned with ‘fingery eyes’ (Haraway, 2016), the heteronormative self-contained male featured in dominant transcendent settler arcadies (Abdinor, 2000; Bannister, 2005; Evans, 2007).

The caring of farm stock (anthropomorphically), using that stock instrumentally all the while knowing death is close by, affectively and recurrently spilled like milk during interviews with most women. Lyn and Penelope’s discussions of their goats were instructive here. Both women kept Saanen breeds on their land for their milk and Penelope bred Rāwhiti goats for meat. The two women also bred Saanen goats. Although at the time I met Lyn, her children had left home and she was working fulltime, so she didn’t milk her goats anymore but this did not mean she was going to give the hoofed creatures up:
Figure 77. “Last seasons kids with LYN”. Source: Lyn’s husband

Figure 78. Penelope with baby Saanen goat. Source: Penelope’s husband
I love my goats [...]. We have had Saanen goats for thirty four years. I have milked them in the past but with working fulltime I now don't have time. We have them now for their personalities, ease of care and they are great eating all the weeds like the blackberry: Our kids were brought up on their milk.

This last phrase “our kids were brought up on their milk” in the context of this photograph of Lyn cuddling two Saanen offspring captioned by her as “last season’s kids” (see figure 77) illustrates a white milky trans-species encountering that looked very much like kin making in several ways (Haraway, 2008; 2016). For one, the blurred boundaries between human and goat ‘kids’ wherein she used the latter to feed the former was one strand of family making. Then there was how Lyn enacted a kind of ‘human-to-goat mothering’ which, together with the first strand, formulated a rather queer, convoluted weave of goat-human kinship that disrupted the self-contained male figure in settler arcadian representations (see Haraway, 2008; 2016).

Curiously, kin relations between human and Saanen seemed to be also be present in Penelope’s story. In contrast to Lyn, Penelope still milked her Saanens (her husband milked the Jersey cows they kept). Comparably to Lyn though, as part of her photo-story Penelope too sent me a picture with her cuddling a kid Saanen goat (see figure 78) so I asked her how many of the white-haired goats she kept and milked:

We have five does. We have five white Saanens that we milk.
And at the moment we have five babies — so what’s really important is my animals and being able to feed ourselves and our family.

Within this this last comment Penelope made — which seemed like a generalised rationale as to why she used her time milking goats by hand — could be read as an expression of instrumentalism or using goats to support Penelope’s family. Returning to Haraway’s (2008, p.74) invitation to review instrumental relations is helpful here. Specifically, the way Penelope mentioned “what’s really important is my animals” in conjunction with her cuddling a baby goat, I suggest, resonated with the “what else is
going on” aspect of Haraway’s probing (2008, p.74) in that the proximity to her human family and goats seemed materially and semiotically rather intimate.

Adding to Penelope’s kin-trotting stories was her affinity with donkeys; “I just always wanted donkeys and I never really thought in my younger days how I would achieve donkeys”. Fortuitously, Penelope’s life as a small farmer afforded her the opportunity to keep donkeys and at the time I interviewed her she lived with two which, as she explained, were siblings:

*They’re brother and sister. They are the most lovely creatures.*

*They groom each other but they need a little brush. They’ll happily walk on a lead. You can’t take one away with the other (see figure 79). And he’s the dominant one. So you can’t cuddle her without cuddling him*

The donkeys provided Penelope with pleasure and kinship, and that was, more or less, their only role. They were not working donkeys although it could be argued they helped make Penelope’s farm tour business more inviting especially given their beautifully large soft ears that I stroked, an act that Penelope encouraged me to do. It was this stroking, patting, cuddling, that did not necessarily require farm animals to do much else — but be available to touch — that reminded me of the discussion of Perkins (2003) and the Romantic Movement in chapter three. The Romantics not only called for a return to self-sufficient small farming which can be seen woven through women’s stories, but they also promoted a culture of kindness towards non-human animals that has founded the Western practices of pet-keeping.

Women’s intimate stories of animal relating (Haraway, 2008) have reinscribed some of this romanticism at the same time as challenging the “pet” and “meat” binary that so often beleaguer the West (Plumwood, 2002, p.160). Therefore, I suggest, through work, death and play in this chapter, women’s yarns here re-inscribed common cultural ideas of what it means to be romantic and arcadian but also ‘something else’ (see Haraway, 2008, p.74). Indeed, it was the flesh and bloody link between use, death and care that produced a queer cross-species kinships with non-humans (Haraway, 2008; 2016) that fattened the working concept of landhome making.
Figure 79. Penelope’s donkeys. Source: Penelope

Figure 80. Jocelyn’s cattle. Source: Jocelyn
Fledging, fleshly thoughts

The working, killing, eating and family making with non-human animals were intimate and routine ways women made land their home. The context in which these practices played out also spoke to the traditions of capitalism, industrial farming, boutique production, self-sufficiency and pet-keeping, which all in varying ways have shown how furry, hairy, bristly and animated women’s landhome making can be. Thus, continuing the theme of this thesis’ analysis, participants’ narratives in this chapter illustrated the speckled and mottled ways everyday land practice was fruitfully political and affective. Resultantly, Animalia landhome making has fed thick creamy ways to the wider thesis project of composting transcendent arcadies.

An example that sums up the point of this chapter was Sarah’s farm animal keeping. She raised fowl, goats, sheep and cattle so she and her family, from her perspective, could eat more “responsibly”. She told me how it was “really satisfying to sit down and on your plate everything has been grown or raised (yourself)”. The ‘natural abundance’, self-sufficiency and self-reliance Sarah’s comment here is suggestive of Victorian and classical ideas of arcadia. However, this practice, like many others of this chapter, illustrated a care towards stock that resituated her arcadia as potentially “response-able” even if bloodily noninnocent (Haraway, 2008; 2016).

Potential response-able and noninnocent arcadies proliferated throughout Carolyn’s sheep milking work and boutique cheese making, Penelope’s small-scale egg production, Lyn’s stock keeping and Gaye’s wool crafts. Lynne and Jocelyn too, related to me loving ways of farming that felt to me like response-ability, demonstrated, too, in the kind of photographs Jocelyn took of her cattle which she “loved” (see figure 80). Response-ability is an essential ingredient in Haraway’s and this thesis’ composting. Response-ability in these women’s stories therefore provide affecting, reproductive ways to compost transcendent understandings of arcadia that rely so heavily on the thin uncultivable myths of self-containment. These furry hairy tales also open up space to dig over this thesis’ compost for the following final re-turn in the next chapter.
Chapter 11. Making compost kin

Women herding sheep.
Farmers planting trees.

Responsible
Caretakers,
Ancestors,
Very rooted.

Really tough women
Cuddling
New dropped lambs:
Sheep love
Divinely spun love

Joy
---

Killing a lamb.
Skinned and gutted.
Her tears fell plenteously.
Conflicted.
Pandemonium
Becoming perilous
Drunkenness and violence

Tree stumps
Clouds of ash and dust.
---

The other side of the hill:
Fertile abundance
Life blood:
Mud trees and water.
Home.
A piece of land
A place to stand
Heart stopping fecundity.
Quite significant.
Very significant.

This poem was written with the aim of loosely tying the threads of this thesis to make compost kin (Haraway, 2016). It is strictly fragments from the diary excerpts of Pan and the found poems presented at the beginning of chapters two to ten in this dissertation. The poem’s purpose is to reuse the words already written in the previous chapters but compel them get somewhere else, rather than just a reproduction of what has gone before (Haraway, 1994; 2016). In Barad’s (2014) terms, this poem is not a return to previous chapters but a re-turning of those chapters’ words: A composting. The ambiguity of the poem, whether it is fact or fiction, ‘real’ or not, ‘nature’ or culture, is also deliberate, for I cannot ethically make any firm conclusions. This is both a limitation and a strength of my work here. What I ought to come to some conclusions on though are the research questions I posed at the beginning of this thesis, and which have guided me throughout. Accordingly, I will now re-turn to them one last time.

*Inheriting arcadian histories response-ably*

By tracing the histories of arcadia since antiquity, partially and fragmentedly, I hope to have shown ways in which Pākehā culture have inherited ideas of the pastoral paradise and Pan’s realm. Writing against universal, ‘natural’ and ‘normal’ arcadias that made New Zealand so much of what it is on a grand-scale, I would like to posit that women’s stories, with their love, ardour, grit and sweat, have made necessary fractures and fissures in this myth. What women’s stories have accomplished then, together with Pan and myself, is show in this thesis that response-able inheritance involves complicity, touch and routine land practice. These response-able inheritances, I postulate, are inheritance ‘in the flesh’ (Haraway, 2003; 2008; 2016).
Of flesh, signs and naturecultures

Fleshly inheritance composts signs and bodies, cultures and ‘natures’. Fleshly signification nurtures that “nasty developmental infection called love” (Haraway, 2003, p.3). “Care”, care-fullness, worry, affect, potently erupted throughout women’s stories. Jocelyn steadfastly stated that “farming was in her blood”. Lynne rubbed her chest when she described to me how much the land she lived on meant to her.

For the women of this thesis, significance was inseparable from the fleshly relationships they had with their landhome and this marks these stories as earthily feminist. See for example Penelope’s fingers that had been cleaned for a sit down interview (figure 81). The soil of her land will never be washed away. Each day traces are left. There is no transcending the dirt here. The reason why Penelope had her fingers in the dirt though, and for that matter, the reason why Carolyn’s hands were often covered in sheep
manure, is because they loved and cared for their land, sheep, family. These feminist stories were queer too. The routine breaking down between human body through soiled hands, milking hands, guiding hands, legs that walked through water, the daily digestion of food reared and harvested, changed these women permanently, queering the boundaries of the self-contained human.

‘Becoming Pākehā with’ arcadian land

Fleshly significance in this thesis encouraged a ‘becoming with’ steeped in the principles of family and home making, love and care. In fact, I would posit that Haraway’s ‘becoming with’ requires commitment, love, care and response-ability as these are what compels us to encounter, to ‘become with’. Women were discerning in this regard whilst following faithfully the ideals of arcadian rurality. Participants showed me how Pākehā cannot ‘become with’ anyone everywhere. Similarly, far from advocating for a universal One-Big-Happy-Family, Haraway is asking all of those who live on earth to ‘become with’ through our situated shifting, loving, hating, naturalcultural positions and partialities, that changes every time we touch. Inevitably, this kind of ‘becoming with’, through the practices of arcadian landhome making, creates boundaries between what constitutes ‘home’ and ‘family’ and what does not.

Suffice to say, becoming Pākehā with arcadian land in this thesis is not an innocent, or even desirable, story to tell. It is a way of showing how ‘becoming with’ land for all Pākehā in New Zealand is situated, contingent and excluding. I think being response-able requires us to stay with this trouble, stay with the ‘arcadian’ and ‘romantic’ forgetting, recognising it as geographically and historically Pākehā so perhaps we may see beyond our own gaze and fantasy.

Pondering on this issue I am again reminded of Sara Ahmed’s call to not “rush […] too quickly past the exposure of racism [or colonialism]”. Rather, she implores us White folk to “inhabit the critique”, “with its lengthy duration, and to recognise the world that is re-described by the critique as one in which [we] live” (2004, para.57, original italics). This “hardy soiled kind of wisdom” (Haraway, 2016, p.117) which is about narrating “good stories that reach into rich pasts to sustain thick presents to keep the story going for those who come after” (Haraway, 2016, p.125) is about composting.
Composting transcendent arcadian myths to make kin: Fleshly situated stories

To conclude, I suggest it has been familial love, commitment, care, worry, joy, lust, that has been how women’s tales, Pan, and myself, have composted transcendent myths of arcadia in this thesis. Through significant inheritance in the flesh, women’s stories have offered a ‘becoming Pākehā’ that makes compost kin. Women’s stories troubled the transcendent desire of capitalist wealth, to get beyond necessity and the dirt of earth. Their stories of failure, hardship and subsistence dispelled the visions of efficient neoliberal agribusiness markets. So too did women’s stories wholly soil the purity of the picturesque rural idyll and the vision of ‘pristine’ ‘untouched’ ‘nature’. With Pan, I have shown how these Pākehā stories are both feminist and queer. Troubling and troubled. Fragments and fragmented. Joyful and hurtful. ‘Natural’ and cultural.

Naturalcultural geographies: Contributions

This thesis heeds Whatmore’s call for “cultural geographers to get all agrarian and dirty-handed” (Lorimer, 2005, p.85). Hayden Lorimer here is paraphrasing Whatmore’s (2003) editorial, referenced at various points throughout this dissertation. In this piece, Whatmore is expressing her concern over the gulf between culture and ‘nature’ in that somehow a focus on things literary are far removed from things soiled. One of the fruits of this thesis has been the ongoing weaving between literature and soil, text and flesh, mind and body, culture and ‘nature’. Such ontological ruptures are compulsory for any serious challenge to human exceptionalism: A narrative that positions humanity as the only species capable of literature, text, mind and culture (Haraway, 2003; 2008; 2011; 2016; 2019). Accordingly, I propose naturalcultural geographies, an academic medium for exploring the inseparability of text and flesh, ‘nature’ and culture and I wish to frame my contributions from within this context.

As I have shown throughout this thesis, there is already precedence in geography for the kind of naturalcultural epistemological exploration in which this project is engaged. There is of course Whatmore’s (2002; 2003; 2006; 2013) more-than-human geographies and what she has framed as ‘culturenatures’ (2003) where she lays bare the division between ‘nature’ – a focus for physical geographers and culture – ostensibly what human geographers study. Therefore, as I mentioned at the outset of this project, I see this
research of mine as building on geography’s ongoing traversing of the nature/culture terrain. However, I think my close reading of Haraway would benefit the discipline as even though she is cited prolifically by most male geographers canvassing the ‘nature’ culture debate, her work is often not intimately or thoroughly explored or even understood. Therefore I think this thesis, seriously committed to ‘nature’ culture discussions, contributes an intimate, comprehensive interpretation of Haraway’s philosophy that is fertile fodder for the discipline of geography.

As I have turned over these matters I have come to realise that the dirt of earth words in this thesis is a worthy contribution to literary and religious studies, history, and the wider discipline of the humanities on which I have drawn. Scholars such as Evans (2007), Newton (1999; 2009) Bannister (2005), Wevers (2005), Belich (2001) and Schama (1995) have been enormously stimulating and have to some degree at times, expressed the feel of soil on the leaves of paper I have read. Nonetheless, the preoccupation on culture within the humanities that these authors write from constructs a fairly wide gap between text and flesh (Haraway, 2016). Consequently I propose from this thesis not only a practice of ‘earth writing’ for the humanities but for this ‘earth writing’ to resolutely decentre the human in this branch of scholarship which Haraway (2016) has (re)coined the ‘humusities’.

One of the enduring pulls of this research has been the possibility of contributing to what could be loosely described as ‘New Zealand Studies’ wherein ideas on Pākehā–Māori relations, settler colonialism, land and literature are all companions. I have drawn rapaciously from scholars or commentators in this field (for example Abdinor, 2000; Bannister, 2005; Belich 1996; 2001; Dugdale, 2002; Evans, 2007; Fairburn, 1989; Grimshaw, 2012; Mita, 1992; Newton, 1999; 2009; Wevers, 2005) and similarly devoured countless novels based on similar issues. I still feel fed and nourished by this loose collective but I would like to contribute by way of introducing Haraway’s ‘becoming with’ to ponderings on Pākehā identity arcadianism and romanticism. Such mutations historically and geographically situate a ‘becoming Pākehā’ which is always about human exceptionalism, colonialism and heteronormativity.
What is not kin here: Limitations

There was a lot I didn’t do in my thesis. My first disappointment in this regard was my inability to enrol the non-human as a research participant (see Bawaka et al., 2015; Whatmore, 2012; Wright et al., 2012). For one, the humanist design of universities and ethic committees in these institutions meant this was one area I could not proceed. In addition, on a more personal ethical note, the issues in terms of representation in the area of more-than-human research remains uncharted in Western bodies. That is to say, owing to the lack of a coherent Pākehā kinship with land I am not sure we are ready to interpret the more-than-human like other peoples such as Māori (see Thomas, 2015) or Indigenous Australians (see Bawaka et al., 2015; Wright et al., 2012) can.

Related to this point I concede there is a dearth of things Māori in a thesis that claims Pākehā is constituted by tangata whenua. I also anticipate that Wairarapa and Taranaki Māori, in particular, may feel culturally unsafe reading my work. I am aware that I have allowed Pākehā to speak about their identity as ‘natural’ and ‘normal’. In this vein this thesis may also fuel the already entrenched narcissism within White identity studies providing ‘us’ with even more space we already occupy (Ahmed, 2004).

The women who took part in this thesis were privileged, racially and economically, and were not in need of emancipation. Therefore, this thesis is not an emancipatory project even though feminist and queer traditions came out of activism (Showden, 2012). In this sense there is a lack of utilising these epistemologies in the spirit of why they came to be (Showden, 2012). This thesis also does not in any significant way conduct a class analysis, another activist branch that I don’t draw on. I have been much inspired by David Harvey’s (1996; 2005) work in the area of Marxist geographies. I am also keenly aware of the sharp edges of class in New Zealand having been raised in chronic poverty. However, despite being a key focus of Fairburn’s (1989) arcadia, and indeed what it means to be Pākehā, class issues in this research are rather muted.

Science too is absent in this thesis despite using a philosopher (Haraway) who is a scientist (more or less), my argument for cross-disciplinary practice, and belonging to a discipline of science. Haraway has long argued for the hybridising of science and the humanities (see also Whatmore, 2012) but this thesis does not include any in-depth
understandings of agricultural science, biology, physical geography that would be relevant to many of the issues raised in this dissertation.

There are also academic limitations within the visual component of my thesis. I largely interpreted the images in this thesis by drawing on ideas from literary criticism or art history rather than closely following well-known visual scholars such as Rose (2001) and Pink (2013). As intimated in chapter six, women’s photographs were taken from all kinds of different machines and at all different time scales so issues of composition were not analysed. Consequently, the visual assessment in this dissertation is confined to the themes of arcadia and romanticism within this research and the methodology I used would probably not be applicable to future visual research design.

Finally, and perhaps most noninnocently, has been my unadulterated use of Haraway in this project. I was propositioned, courted and then wholly seduced by her world. When I could have gone wider I did not. Other theorists that decentre or queer the human were neglected, such as Jacques Derrida (1930-2004), Gilles Deleuze (1925-1995) Félix Guattari (1930-1992), Giorgio Agamben, Judith Butler and Isabelle Stengers. Queer feminist philosophers such as Karen Barad and Sara Ahmed were also not thoroughly engaged with in this project. I have inhabited Haraway’s world which she herself says comes out of her bodies and the bodies around her that she loves. I am happy in this far from innocent — almost illicit — transmogrification; but as her situated knowledge’s (1991) teach, all knowing is partial and my partiality for her work has required me to limit my exploration of other philosophers and scholars.

Future research: Making new kin

Building on my work with Haraway’s worlding I think any future research coming from this compost pile needs to be situated and naturalcultural and practised through a hybridised discipline. The hybridising that I envision (through my ‘fingery eyes’) does not make academic research more general, more universal; it makes it more diverse, differentiated, smaller, partial and located (Haraway, 1991; 2016). I am moved by small thick stories that have the potential to be thickened by care-full academic approaches.

For one there is an absolute dearth of common knowledge about Wairarapa Māori relationships to the Taraura Ranges. From my routine touching of the ground on which
generation after generation have trod, I am compelled to understand these stories more fully and would encourage any research in this area which would begin by talking to iwi.

Following the lead of Bell (2017a) and the late Peter Wells (1950-2019) (2018) — and the stories by the women of this thesis — I would also suggest conducting more research into Pākehā stories of settlement that are response-able, not nostalgic sentiments. I am interested here in the small stories not the grand narratives about Cook. Cook as a trope is about the self-contained European male at the centre of settlement. He has become a trope because he is, still, used by many Pākehā to idealise colonialism with his apparent noble title of ‘explorer’ accompanying him (see for example Matthews, Oct 2019).

But how are we Pākehā ever going to be able to learn response-ability unless we engage with the partial, located, meaningful journeys and narratives that arrived us here through our bodies and our touch with O/others? I like ‘big ideas’; like ‘arcadia’ ‘Romanticism’ and colonial settlement, I think it’s the masculinism inside of me. But I have learnt from this thesis the futility of those far-reaching storylines without the complex, ordinary, difficult veracities of situated lives, human and not which entail — if one is Pākehā — reciprocal relations with Māori. Therefore, I would like to pursue any future research from within this context.

Taylor’s (2017, p.62) terms, “prosaic” and “political” are fitting here. She suggests these means as a way to approach one of the grandest narratives being bandied about presently through the ‘educated’ world: the Anthropocene. Building on Haraway’s (2016) critique of this latest human-centric analysis of ‘earth life’ (Whatmore, 2004, p.1362), Taylor (2019, p.1) points to how the ‘Anthropocene’ literally means the ‘epoch of Man’ and, as the translation suggests, the Anthropocene positions (hu)Man at the centre of things. The Anthropocene has been proposed as a geological epoch that defines how humanity have impacted the earth in an unprecedented way, that for the first time humans have actually changed the earth’s geology and ecosystems (Haraway, 2016; Taylor, 2017).

For me the Anthropocene continues the project of White human exceptionalism. The sweeping universalism of ‘all humans’ not only glazes over the science that evidently positions this geological shift as a result of the Western industrial era, it denies the non-
human worlds their opinions on the matter. Earth systems are collapsing. Coral reefs are bleaching. Inuit and polar bear habitats are melting. Mass extinctions, biodiversity loss, increased drought and floods are all too material occurrences. But as Haraway (2016, p.101) warns (drawing from Marilyn Strathern): “It matters which stories tell stories, which concepts think concepts [...] it matters which figures figure figures, which systems systematize systems”.

This quote comes out of Haraway’s (2016; 2019a; 2019b) advancement of her ‘Chthulucene’, a worlding that builds a kinship of chthonic ones. I want in on this Chthulucene with the bats, spiders, stray cats. The Chthulucene worlds worlds (and words) that are feminist, “prosaic”, “political”, queer, complicit, not innocent, not done, ongoing. The Chthulucene makes trouble and has the ability to reuse and compost worlds such as the Anthropocene (Haraway, 2016; 2017). Therefore I would like to close this thesis with the possibility of more compost stories made from within the Chthulucene (Haraway, 2019a; 2019b) “to keep the story going” (Haraway, 2016, p.125).
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Appendices A, B & C

Appendix A: Fieldwork information sheet

Participant Information Sheet for the Research:
Exploring land-use in the Wairarapa

Rebecca Ream, PhD candidate
School of Geography, Environment and Earth Sciences,
Victoria University of Wellington

I am a PhD research student from Victoria University interested in local land users and agricultural and scenic landscapes in the Wairarapa. I wish to explore the relationship between personal and landscape by listening to peoples’ stories and using photography.

My aim is to investigate how landscapes such as farms, orchards, bush, beach or mountains and the relationships Wairarapa land users have with them are different or similar to traditional or popular ideas about agricultural and scenic landscapes in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

Currently I am interviewing Pākehā women who practice routine land-use or work with land based production in some way.

If you’re interested in taking part, the process will firstly involve an initial interview whereby all the information of the project is discussed. At this stage I will provide you with three documents; an information sheet (what your reading now), a consent form and interview questions. I will explain what the main interviews will entail and you will have the opportunity to read over the documents at this initial meeting and decide to join the project, or you can take the information away and think it over. If you wish to sign the consent form at this stage I will offer you a disposable camera to use and further explain its purpose.

I anticipate there being two main interviews. If consent forms were not signed at the first meeting they will be signed before the first main interview starts. I hope to conduct these interviews wherever you practice land-based production. Dates, times and locations can be worked out at the initial interview or later through phone or email.

With your permission I will interview you individually using a digital voice recorder and digital camera (to take pictures of land and animals not people), otherwise written notes will be taken. At any point during the interview, feel free to not answer any questions you don’t want to talk about and inform me of any issues you prefer not to discuss. You may also request some or all recording devices to be stopped. To compensate for time lost and to show a measure of appreciation I will offer a few hours of work on your property.
Interviews will be later transcribed (oral recordings), processed (photographs) and analyzed. Should you feel the need to withdraw from the project, you may do so without question at any time before 30 June 2015.

You will be given a copy of all textual and visual recordings from your interviews and copies of analysis that involves them. You will also be given a copy of your edited textual and visual narrative which will appear in the thesis.

Outcomes of the research will be published in a PhD thesis, parts of which may also be used for journal article(s) conference presentation(s) and in the future, book(s). A copy of these outcomes can be sent to you if requested. Any textual and visual recordings that are in my possession and not used in the PhD thesis will be destroyed after the thesis is published to preserve your confidentiality.

Unless you choose explicitly otherwise, results of the research will be compiled and written on a confidential basis. If you choose your name to remain confidential, pseudonyms will be used. If you choose explicitly to be named, your opinions will be attributed to you using your name. Photos will not contain any identifying features of people.

It is important to note that the combination of photographing parts of your land and your verbal narratives discussing that land may identify you. If you feel this risk is a possibility, we (you and me), can discuss how to prevent this from happening.

All material collected will be kept secured and only my supervisor and I will have access to it (our contact details are below). Recordings and other materials will be kept in a locked cabinet and/or password-protected file.

This project has been approved by VUW Human Ethics Committee (Number: 0000020667). If you have any questions or would like to receive further information about the project, please contact:

**Rebecca Ream**, PhD candidate
Email address: Rebecca.Ream@vuw.ac.nz OR rream@gmail.com
Phone number: 027 300 4394

**Assoc. Prof Sara Kindon**
Email address: sara.kindon@vuw.ac.nz
Phone number: 04 463 6194
Appendix B: Copy of a blank consent form used for fieldwork

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH:
for the Research:
Exploring land-use in the Wairarapa

I have been given and have understood an explanation of this research project. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I may withdraw from this project before 30 June 2015, without having to give reasons. I also understand that during the interview I am free not to answer one or more questions if I choose to do so. I also understand that I can mention issues I’d rather not discuss in the interview, or request that recording of any devices be turned off and photographs not to be taken of certain sites.

I understand that any information I provide will be kept confidential, the published results will not use my name, and that no opinions will be attributed to me in any way that can identify me unless I choose otherwise and state so in this form. I understand that the results of this project might be published as journal article(s), book form/chapters or conference presentation(s) and that I can be given a copy if I request it.

☐ I understand that I will have an opportunity to check photos, transcripts of interviews, analysis and any narratives I am mentioned in to be published, before publication

☐ I understand that the information I provide will not be used for any purposes other than what has been stated in the information sheet and this consent form

☐ I would like to receive copies of future publications emerging from this research

☐ I would like my identity to be disclosed and my opinions to be attributed to me in the research report and any further publications (DO NOT TICK IF YOU WISH YOUR IDENTITY TO REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL)

Signed:

Name of participant:
Date:

Contact details
Email address or postal address:
Phone number:
Appendix C: Copy of the interview questions I gave participants during fieldwork

Interview Questions
for the Research:
Exploring land-use in the Wairarapa

1. Can you explain if how you make a living through land based production reflects how you see yourself as a New Zealander?

2. Can you describe for me the relationship you have with your land (including particular trees, waterways etc) and your animals?

3. Can you tell me a couple of stories to help explain your relationship to particular landscapes you see as special in the Wairarapa?

4. What changes would you like to see that would help improve things for the land you work on and the landscapes you treasure within the Wairarapa? a. Economically and b. Culturally?