

Additional points, Anne-Claire Mauger: 23 may 2022

I would like to respond to Mrs Megan Lawrence's report, which is a thorough report of historical features associated with European colonisation within the Smooth Hill area, but does not report adequately of Māori occupation of the area.

My brief of evidence addresses the archaeology and history of a wider window than the Smooth Hill parcels. It addresses the archaeological features in relation to the Ōtokia river that emanates from Smooth Hill, and the associated landscape: hills, marsh and the Brighton township. All the features which will be mentioned in this testimony are physical evidence for archaeological value.

Māori archaeological features in the Ōtokia landscape: ignored or misinterpreted features

- **Sites missing in the archaeological assessment**

The map provided in my brief accounts for archaeological features that were reported along the river by notorious archaeologists in the 1970s and 1980s, such as Jill Hamel or Brian Allingham. During their investigations, areas of previously destroyed umu were also pointed out to them by forestry workers and farmers.

At the time, a paper record of these features were provided to Heritage New Zealand. Some records were deleted following the destruction of archaeological features subsequent to forestry work, some others were downgraded from umu tī to midden in the last 20 years by surveying archaeologists. This is malpractice, and a nationwide problem that is currently being addressed by Heritage New Zealand.

Similarly, since decades ago, eroding midden are observed on the coast stretching from the coastal kainga in Brighton. These midden are regularly uncovered by coastal erosion, and disappear in a few weeks to the next high tide. Most of these middens were not recorded, simply observed.

Artefacts were also found in isolation on the river banks, including several pounamu taonga, which is highly significant in Māori culture. Other artefacts, such as adze and grinding slabs, attest of human activities.

These features mentioned above do not appear in the Archsite online database, only in the literature or in the museum records. **These features do not appear in the DCC archaeological assessment.**

- **Missing features and lack of archaeological interpretation**

The DCC archaeological assessment resumes in half a page seven centuries of Māori occupation of the Ōtokia, and fails to mention any archaeological value, with only the European historical features acknowledged. This report also claims that most features are located on the coast, ignoring the constellation of sites and artefacts reported in the hills. The report only recognizes only one site of occupation, Pā a Tu Pari Taniwha (I44/11), with no mention to the major early kaingā (I44/5) present in the Ōtokia Mouth.

The closest cluster of Māori archaeological features (I45/27, I45/28, and I45/29,) 100m from the Smooth Hill parcels boundaries, are absent from the list of affected features in the DCC archaeological assessment. They illustrate the archaeological footprint left by tangata whenua on the landscape. They are umu tī associated with midden and an adze. Further on the same hill slope, more umu tī and middens (I45/54 & I45/55 absent from the archaeological assessment, and I45/1) are associated with terracing, which suggests the intention of repetitive use. The association of all these recorded archaeological features with features with missing records but reported by archaeologists, create a constellation of human footprint on the Ōtokia map.

Their location on both sides of the Ōtokia river advocate for a repetitive use of natural resources in the Ōtokia environment, through time, by tangata whenua.

The DCC archaeological assessment states (p.30) that “archaeological oven site I45/26 is situated between Ōtokia Creek and its tributaries, and it may reflect the use of the creek to move between the coast and more inland areas of the region”. This statement demonstrates a lack of understanding of tangata whenua’s way of life together with interpretation of the nature of an archaeological feature. An umu tī doesn’t demonstrate the presence of a walking track, but attests of human activities of cooking, tī transformation and natural resources management (mahinga kai).

Cultural landscapes

Definition by Unesco: *cultural landscapes are combined works of nature and humankind. They express a long and intimate relationship between peoples and their natural environment.*

Recording of cultural landscape is a work in progress in New Zealand. Projects are driven by iwi and archaeologists, mostly in the North Island.

In Te Wai Pounamu, the Ngai Tahu Atlas was initiated years ago, and is now being updated as lots of information is missing, as it is the case for Ōtokia and Papakaio/Brighton.

The recording of cultural landscape relies on physical evidence provided by archaeology, coupled with ethnographic evidence, or oral history.

To illustrate that perspective, imagine archaeologists from the future investigating Brighton township then abandoned: recording would address the buildings, but probably not the beach as no feature is visible. But this recording would not reflect daily human activities on the beach: swimmers, dog walkers, surfers, beach volleyers, fisherman, divers,...

The Ōtokia landscape is not an empty archaeological space. It was the place of mahinga kai for the occupants of the Ōtokia mouth kāinga, then a place of wāhi tupuna, mahinga kai and seasonal occupation for tangata whenua established in the Taieri Mouth kāinga and Maitapapa. Unfortunately by 1930, a high number of Māori families had left the kāinga. The marae and mana over land subsequently disappeared, but not all the stories.

By denying any archaeological value to the Ōtokia landscape, the DCC archaeological assessment undermines the effort of Ngāti Mamoe and Tahu scholars (Dr. A. Wanlhalla, M. Dunn) to revitalize Māori Mātauranga linked to the area.

Cultural significance of the Ōtokia landscape

The Ōtokia is a landscape of cultural significance from a tangata whenua perspective, but also from an historical perspective, as supported by the evidence provided in my brief.

Such a significant archaeological and cultural landscape, articulated around wai and mauri of the river would be perceived as affected by the presence of a landfill in the headwaters.

Especially with the risk of poly-phosphate bio-accumulation mentioned during these ORC hearings, and the acknowledgement of annual leachate of toxic waste released in the Ōtokia waters, mauri wai and wahi tupuna are at real risk of rapid and irreparable degradation.

I am concerned the perception of tangata whenua relating to their cultural landscape was not heard.

I am concerned that residents with historical ancestry attached to the Ōtokia were not heard.

I am concerned that mana whenua from te Runaka o Ōtakou was provided with incomplete information relating to the archaeological significance of the Ōtokia landscape.

Anne-Claire Mauger

Ōtokia Creek and Marsh Habitat Trust