

Historic heritage thematic frameworks

Their use as tools for management and
interpretation

SCIENCE FOR CONSERVATION 285



Department of Conservation
Te Papa Atawhai

Historic heritage thematic frameworks

Their use as tools for management and interpretation

Peter Clayworth

SCIENCE FOR CONSERVATION 285

Published by
Science & Technical Publishing
Department of Conservation
PO Box 10420, The Terrace
Wellington 6143, New Zealand

Cover: Tarawera smelter/mine, showing a brick mine shaft boiler and unique brick draft chimney built up a hillside slope in a bush setting on the north side of Isthmus Sound, Preservation Inlet, Fiordland National Park. *Photo: ISU, DOC.*

Science for Conservation is a scientific monograph series presenting research funded by New Zealand Department of Conservation (DOC). Manuscripts are internally and externally peer-reviewed; resulting publications are considered part of the formal international scientific literature.

Individual copies are printed, and are also available from the departmental website in pdf form. Titles are listed in our catalogue on the website, refer www.doc.govt.nz under *Publications*, then *Science & technical*.

© Copyright May 2008, New Zealand Department of Conservation

ISSN 1173-2946 (hardcopy)

ISSN 1177-9241 (web PDF)

ISBN 978-0-478-14406-2 (hardcopy)

ISBN 978-0-478-14407-9 (web PDF)

This report was prepared for publication by Science & Technical Publishing; editing by Amanda Todd and layout by Lynette Clelland. Publication was approved by the Chief Scientist (Research, Development & Improvement Division), Department of Conservation, Wellington, New Zealand.

In the interest of forest conservation, we support paperless electronic publishing. When printing, recycled paper is used wherever possible.

CONTENTS

Abstract	5
<hr/>	
1. Introduction	6
<hr/>	
1.1 Definition of terms	7
2. Uses of thematic frameworks	7
<hr/>	
2.1 Identification of sites of significance	8
2.2 Representativeness	9
2.3 Interpretation	11
2.4 Connectivity	12
2.5 Inclusiveness	12
3. Historic heritage thematic frameworks in an international context	12
<hr/>	
3.1 USA—The National Park Service	13
3.2 Canada—Parks Canada	15
3.3 Australia—The Australian Heritage Commission	17
3.3.1 The New South Wales Heritage Office state historic themes	18
3.4 How effective are the North American and Australian thematic frameworks?	19
3.4.1 The NPS's revised thematic framework	22
3.4.2 Australian thematic frameworks	23
4. The New Zealand situation	26
<hr/>	
4.1 The New Zealand Historic Places Trust experience	26
4.1.1 The Ruapehu-Rangitikei Pilot Project 2003–2005	29
4.2 The Department of Conservation	31
4.2.1 Representativeness of historic sites on public conservation land	31
4.2.2 Historic Asset Management System	33
4.2.3 Visitor Assets Management System	34
4.2.4 The use of thematic frameworks by Southland Conservancy	35
4.2.5 National Heritage Identification Studies	38
5. Discussion	40
<hr/>	
6. Conclusions and recommendations	44
<hr/>	
7. Acknowledgements	45
<hr/>	
8. References	46
<hr/>	
Appendix 1	
<hr/>	
Potential 'sites of shame' or 'sites of conscience' in New Zealand	49

Appendix 2	
Topics that help define the NPS revised thematic framework	50
Appendix 3	
The Canadian National Thematic framework 2000: themes and subthemes	52
Appendix 4	
Historic Thematic Framework proposed by Gavin McLean	53
Appendix 5	
Proposal for a thematic framework for World Heritage identification in the Pacific	55

Historic heritage thematic frameworks

Their use as tools for management and interpretation

Peter Clayworth

Research, Development & Improvement Division, Department of Conservation,
PO Box 10420, Wellington 6143, New Zealand

Email: pclayworth@doc.govt.nz

ABSTRACT

A thematic framework is a device that helps conceptualise history and place sites, people and events in their historical contexts. It has been suggested that management and interpretation systems for historic heritage in the New Zealand Department of Conservation (DOC) would be substantially improved by the adoption of an effective thematic framework. This paper investigates the use and effectiveness of thematic frameworks in the USA, Canada and Australia, and examines how they are used in selecting and managing a 'representative' range of historic heritage sites in these countries. Previous attempts by heritage management bodies to adopt and use thematic frameworks in New Zealand are briefly outlined. Potential problems that may arise from the adoption of models developed in other countries are discussed, along with lessons learnt from previous local applications of thematic schemes. This study found limited evidence of how effective thematic frameworks have been in achieving their stated goals, but does recommend that DOC should adopt a thematic framework for historic heritage. However, DOC needs to be aware of the limitations of such a framework. Any framework adopted needs to be a flexible tool that is used in conjunction with other management and interpretation methods.

Keywords: thematic frameworks, themes, historic heritage, management, interpretation, representativeness, representative range

© Copyright May 2008, Department of Conservation. This paper may be cited as:
Clayworth, P. 2008: Historic heritage thematic frameworks: their use as tools for management and interpretation. *Science for Conservation* 285. Department of Conservation, Wellington. 56 p.

1. Introduction

The Department of Conservation (DOC) is charged under the Conservation Act 1987 (section 6a) ‘to manage for conservation purposes, all land, and all other natural and historic resources, for the time being held under this Act ...’. The Department’s Historical and Cultural Framework of July 2006 stated that DOC’s role in managing historical and cultural heritage may, where appropriate, ‘also involve active conservation and interpretation of a representative range of historical and cultural heritage ...’ and ‘telling the stories of these places to increase public understanding of our heritage’ (DOC 2006a: 2). In the same vein, DOC’s Statement of Intent (2005–2008) identified the following as an intermediate outcome: ‘a representative range of historic and cultural heritage is protected, restored and interpreted’ (DOC 2005: 37). Although the question of what constitutes a representative range of historic and cultural heritage is still being debated in New Zealand, the Statement of Intent defines it as ‘... securing protection for examples of different types of historic and cultural places to adequately reflect the history and cultural character of our country and tell the story of important events that shaped its development’ (DOC 2005: 48).

It has been suggested that the current state of DOC’s systems of management and interpretation could be substantially improved by a number of measures, including the adoption of a framework of historic themes (Warren-Findley 2001; Nightingale 2004). McLean (1996) and Egerton (2001) have looked in more detail at thematic frameworks and how they might be used effectively in New Zealand. Egerton’s paper is particularly valuable, as it analyses the practical use of a thematic framework in Southland and suggests ways to deal with problems arising. It has also been suggested that ‘managing historic heritage within a thematic conceptual framework which places particular areas in their context’ will increase the value New Zealanders see in the conservation of their historic heritage (DOC 2006a: 6).

In the current report, the use of thematic frameworks in the management of historic heritage is discussed and the question of whether frameworks allow a more representative sample of historic sites to be managed is considered. A comparison of how thematic frameworks have been applied in the USA, Canada and Australia, and a summary of their effectiveness is included. The previous and current use of thematic frameworks in New Zealand is then summarised and the question of whether any framework adopted in New Zealand in the future should be a general copy of the systems used in other countries or a unique system is considered. From the study, recommendations are made about whether DOC should adopt similar systems to those examined.

1.1 DEFINITION OF TERMS

Themes are defined as key ideas for describing major historical processes. In the context of this report, themes are used to show how local fabric and stories fit into larger historical processes¹.

Thematic framework is a structure that uses themes to help conceptualise past events and to place sites, people and events in their historical contexts.

Fabric refers to the physical remains of human activities on the landscape, be they buildings, archaeological remains or the ‘scars’ on the landscape itself left by human actions.

Site refers to a range of things, from the spot where a plaque or story might record an event, through to buildings, ruins of buildings, archaeological remains of villages, forts, gardens, etc., up to the level of historic landscapes such as the Shotover River system, where much of the present-day land formations and vegetation were shaped by previous human activities.

2. Uses of thematic frameworks

Thematic frameworks have a number of largely interconnected uses in the management of historic heritage. All of these uses are based around the idea of how particular sites or groups of sites fit into broader stories of regional, national and world history. Feller & Miller (2000) stated that thematic frameworks are ‘a necessary tool both for a comprehensive, contextual overview of cultural resources and for the comparative analysis of the relative significance of individual resources’. Thematic frameworks can be used to:

- Help determine a site’s comparative significance in a local, regional, national and international context. This aids the process of determining which sites should be protected and which of the protected sites should be actively managed. A framework can assist in deciding the level of resources that should be devoted to protection and management, although such decisions may be more influenced by the level of conservation need in relation to the physical condition of particular sites.
- Examine the question of ‘representativeness’, and identify and manage a range of sites that represent aspects of local, regional, national or international history. Gaps in the historic stories of particular regions can be identified, facilitating the management and interpretation of additional historic heritage sites. The idea of representativeness can also be used as a tool to select the best examples of a particular type of heritage fabric, given that resources for the management and interpretation of historic sites will always be limited.

¹ When used in the context of ‘thematic framework’, this is a more accurate definition of ‘theme’ than that used in the DOC ‘Interpretation Handbook and Standard’: (‘main message or moral and presents the viewpoint of the story’; Colquhoun 2005: 7), which was derived from Sam Ham’s ideas on interpretation.

- Allow greater depth of interpretation. A variety of stories can be told about most sites and a thematic framework can be used to identify the different stories, as well as provide some basis for deciding which stories should receive most attention in the interpretive material.
- Allow historic sites to be connected to wider historic stories or events, illustrating the fact that New Zealand history was not a series of isolated incidents. Via this process, historic sites around the country can be linked together, aiding our understanding of the place of individual sites in a broader historic context.
- Help promote the inclusion of the stories of minorities or overlooked groups in the interpretation of sites and ensure the representation of sites that might otherwise go unrecognised. It must be noted, however, that a thematic framework only promotes inclusiveness if it is designed to do so. McLean (1996: 11-17) sets out a more detailed listing of the uses of thematic frameworks.

2.1 IDENTIFICATION OF SITES OF SIGNIFICANCE

Using the significance criteria set out in the Historic Places Act, almost any place in New Zealand could have a case made for its heritage value (Egerton 2001: 94). The areas that are protected and conserved are often those for which there has been some form of public lobbying, often on the grounds of perceived aesthetic value or recent or more visible cultural significance, rather than wider historic significance. An example of this can be seen on the Wellington waterfront, where the brick waterfront buildings have been preserved, while the many wooden and corrugated iron sheds, which are of equal historic importance, have been removed. While this may lead to a waterfront with visual appeal to a certain aesthetic frame of mind, it does not give an accurate view of how the waterfront looked at different stages of its history. If the perceived aesthetic value of buildings is the main consideration when making conservation decisions, the historic context of the buildings conserved (or not conserved) may be overlooked. In contrast, a carefully designed historic framework can allow a variety of historic values to be taken into account when judgements are being made on how to manage historic sites (Barber & McLean 2000: 99).

The past activities of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT) and of public lobby groups have resulted in many significant sites being added to the Historic Places Trust Register. However, this register tends to be dominated by buildings and other structures representing the work of the wealthy, the powerful and the mainstream religions; it is not representative of the diversity of New Zealand's past. Buildings that represent the lives and work of the urban and rural working classes and women in domestic settings, and buildings that are associated with Maori, minority ethnic and religious groups, or political and social dissidents are not well represented. Archaeological sites are not as well represented as buildings, and tend to be listed by the NZHPT as category II sites. (In the Historic Places Trust Register, Category I status is given to places of 'special or outstanding historical or cultural heritage significance or value'; while Category II status is given to places of 'historical or cultural heritage significance or value'.) The inclusion of historic landscapes in the register is still being debated rather than acted on. A historic thematic framework could

be used to help redress this imbalance. Such a framework can serve as a tool to help heritage managers make decisions that take into account broader historic themes, consider larger concepts (such as protection for historic landscapes), and tackle the question of how to identify a representative sample of heritage that warrants protection.

2.2 REPRESENTATIVENESS

A primary objective of the current study is to investigate how useful thematic frameworks might be for selecting a representative range of historic sites for active management. The selection of a representative range of sites is an exercise that will always be surrounded by some degree of controversy. Indeed, the notion that effective conservation of historic sites can be carried out by selecting a representative range of sites to be conserved is a controversial idea in itself. McLean (1996: 11) pointed out that the protection of sites has often been the result of uncoordinated efforts by enthusiasts, generally driven by aesthetics or personal attachment, rather than being carried out in any systematic way. Any attempt to introduce a system that gives priority to certain heritage sites over others will inevitably create disagreement, as each interest group argues the merits of their own sites of interest. It is possible that the use of a thematic framework to aid the selection of a representative range of sites may lead to the identification and active management of sites that do not have immediate popular appeal. Ideally, a thematic framework should be a neutral tool for such an exercise; however, bias may enter the system through the way a thematic framework is originally constructed and the way it is applied. Combining a thematic framework with other tools, such as gazetteers of existing sites and records of local history, should help managers make more robust choices and reduce any inherent biases in the framework applied.

Before a 'representative' range of historic sites is selected for active management, the question of who decides what is representative must be addressed. Recent historical scholarship has emphasised the idea of 'multi-vocal' historic narratives, rather than one master narrative. This concept holds that many different groups have histories to tell and to be represented at sites, in contrast to the idea of there being one version of history sufficing to tell the story for everyone. This can be illustrated by the example of the siege of the Ruapekapeka pa, where not only do Pakeha and Maori have differing views on what happened, but each hapu involved in the battle also has its own distinct version of events. Similarly, the story of the Denniston coalmines from the point of view of the miners' families would be quite different from that of the mine owners.

Similar issues are raised when the stories of minority groups are recognised in historic interpretation, as illustrated by the controversy in Dunedin when the Dunedin Prostitutes Collective sought to have a display in one of the city's 1993 Suffrage Year exhibitions. There is also potential controversy when interest groups argue over which stories should be emphasised at particular sites. This was seen recently in Gisborne, where arguments arose over the relatively small coverage existing interpretive material gave to Maori history (in particular, the stories of Maori navigators) compared with the recognition given to James Cook (Radio New Zealand 2005: CD 3—Heritage and interpretation).

The controversy that arises over sites of conflict raises the question of whether to include in a representative range of sites those sites that are referred to by American public historians as ‘sites of shame’ or ‘sites of conscience’ (sites that memorialise inhumane or intolerant acts or events). Since 1987, a number of such sites have been added to the National Park Service (NPS) system in the USA. These include the Manzanar Historic Site, recognising the internment of Japanese Americans in relocation camps during World War II (WWII); and the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site and the Trail of Tears National Trail, acknowledging violence against and displacement of American Indians (Linenthal 2002; Cisneros 2005)². New Zealand has a number of sites of historic importance that would fit into this category, including sites of the massacre of Chatham Island Moriori by Taranaki Maori invaders, sites of musket war killings, sites connected with Crown repression of Maori resistance and sites of imprisonment of prisoners of conscience. Sites of major environmental destruction might also be considered for similar coverage, as might sites of failure or loss connected with events such as the 1930s depression and 1918 influenza epidemic. A more detailed list of potential New Zealand ‘sites of shame’ is presented in Appendix 1. If heritage managers wish to develop a truly representative sample of sites of New Zealand history, then sites representing the negative sides of our history should also be included, rather than simply presenting a sanitised or triumphalist version of our past.

Heritage managers will always have to deal with the fact that:

‘Cultural heritage management is, in essence, a facet of social engineering, whereby the physical remains of the past (and present) are selectively preserved pandering to values currently held by the community at large. Indeed, mid- and long-term protection of heritage places can occur only if such places are “embraced” or “owned” by the community.’ (Spennemann 2004: 1)

Spennemann (2004: 1) also pointed out that while it is necessary to get public buy-in for the long-term protection of heritage places, heritage experts may identify important heritage sites that deserve protection but do not fit within the current broader public values systems driving heritage protection. In such cases, a thematic framework may help to illustrate the place of such sites in wider historical stories. This, in turn, could help convince interest groups, heritage protection funding providers and the general public that these areas are worthy of protection and, in the process, perhaps increase the general understanding of the past. It is also important to make the strongest and clearest case possible for protecting and managing sites so that future generations can understand why particular sites have been selected. Our intention is to preserve historic sites not just for ourselves but for future generations. To do this we will have to leave a record that we hope will convince the people of the future, whose values and beliefs we can only guess at, to continue to recognise and manage these sites.

It must be recognised that both the discipline of history and the management of historic heritage are (and probably always will be) subject to contest. Heritage managers in organisations such as DOC and the NZHPT may see it as their roles to decide for the rest of the nation what constitutes a representative

² For more detail on the concept of ‘sites of shame’, see Burton et al. (2002).

range of historic sites, whose stories should be told at a site, and which sites to select or reject for management. Such decisions will always be open to dispute where community groups have strong and conflicting opinions about heritage management and interpretation. Sites of importance to tangata whenua will often be particularly controversial. In some cases, other groups will not share tangata whenua views of the value of particular sites and will therefore not support investing resources into site management. In other cases, non-tangata whenua groups will share the appreciation of a site's importance but will disagree with the way tangata whenua interpret the history of the site. As mentioned above, it is also not uncommon for different tangata whenua groups to value the same site but have very different views on the events that occurred there. As Egerton (2001: 100) pointed out, 'The reality is that the selection of heritage is inherently controversial, problematic, unscientific, political, and emotionally loaded, no matter what method is employed'. Thematic frameworks provide a tool to help make heritage management decisions, but do not remove the problems associated with that decision making.

2.3 INTERPRETATION

Interpretation can be defined as 'telling stories and creating understanding, as well as providing factual information about places and events' (DOC 2005: 48). A thematic framework can help uncover the variety of stories that have occurred over time at a particular site, giving a broader and deeper interpretation than is indicated by the most obvious historic fabric. For example, the lower Grey Valley in the Buller area has significant coal mining remains, illustrating the role of this region in the coal mining industry. However, a wider thematic approach to heritage interpretation could incorporate Maori working of the Mawhera pounamu; Maori hunting, gathering and domestic life in the area; Maori folklore of the area; gold prospecting, mining and the establishment of gold towns; coal mining disasters such as Brunner 1896; union struggles at sites such as Blackball and their wider political significance; the establishment of schools and other services in an isolated area; and the establishment of Pakeha domestic life in a harsh environment. Thus, a historic thematic framework provides a set of guidelines by which a variety of stories from a geographical area can be drawn out and connected to wider events, giving a richer picture of the local history. It also provides a tool to help judge which stories need to be told to illustrate the importance of a particular site within the wider contexts of local, national and international history, whilst being mindful of the limited resources for interpretation. Thematic frameworks are most successful when combined with local histories (written accounts of the history of the area in question), oral accounts from people with local historic knowledge, and lists of known historic sites.

2.4 CONNECTIVITY

A thematic framework can be used as a tool to show how the historic events at a local site fit into wider national and international stories. This, in turn, illustrates that history is not a series of isolated events but part of wider stories that connect people around the world. Through the theme of gold mining and gold rushes, sites on the West Coast of the South Island can be linked not just to sites in Otago, the northern South Island and Thames, but also to Victoria, Australia and California. In a similar way, New Zealand sites relating to the struggle for women's suffrage can be linked to related sites in Australia, the USA and Britain. Maori and Pakeha sites relating to the introduction of Christianity can be connected not only throughout New Zealand, but also to sites in Australia and throughout the Pacific.

2.5 INCLUSIVENESS

The application of a carefully designed thematic framework to a particular site can bring out the stories of groups that might not otherwise receive coverage. Thus, a framework that considers family life as well as agriculture could bring out the stories of women managing households and raising children in isolated farming areas, as well as looking at farming per se. A thematic framework might also examine the role of slaves at the time of the musket wars as well as the role of chiefs and pa builders. In all cases, this depends on how a thematic framework is designed and applied in conjunction with other sources of information.

3. Historic heritage thematic frameworks in an international context

This section describes the establishment of historic thematic frameworks in the USA, Canada and Australia, and discusses how useful they have been for heritage management. Although the USA, Canada and Australia each have a unique history, they all have historic heritage issues in common with New Zealand. In all of these countries:

- The indigenous people are now minorities, with the majority of the population being descended largely from 'settlers' or 'colonists'.
- A significant portion of the heritage fabric is associated with the indigenous people. Some of this fabric dates to before the arrival of settler populations, and some relates to the interactions between indigenous people and settlers.
- The political systems and systems of heritage management are largely built on political and economic structures introduced by the settlers, which were strongly influenced by British and other European traditions, rather than on indigenous systems of management.

In all four countries, the management and interpretation of sites now involves continual and increasing engagement between heritage managers and indigenous people. Interpretation is a particular issue for sites of conflict or coercion, where versions of history may vary sharply. Heritage managers have to address the questions of who has input into site interpretation, how much decision-making power different groups should have, and which versions of history should be told at the sites in question³. These countries also contain a range of sites that illustrate the establishment of the social and economic structures that transformed each country into its modern condition. In each country, the experiences of a wide range of immigrant groups have created stories to be interpreted through the surviving historic fabric. As McLean (1996: 9) described the four countries, 'All are predominantly English-speaking. "New World", post-colonial societies with a long tradition of shared values and history ... now struggling to come to terms with biculturalism and multi-culturalism'. The problems of historical management and interpretation in the USA, Canada and Australia bear enough similarity to New Zealand to make an examination of their use of historic thematic frameworks a worthwhile exercise.

3.1 USA — THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

The National Park Service (NPS) is a leading manager of American historic sites. In 2000, over 220 of the 377 National Park sites were cultural sites, based around history, anthropology and archaeology. Sites included historic landscapes, early Native American sites, gardens, historic buildings, battlegrounds and lighthouses.

The NPS adopted a thematic framework in 1936, which basically followed the broad theme of American history as a story of the 'march of progress'. This thematic framework had a variety of uses, of which the principal one appears to have been identifying the gaps in the historic stories represented in the National Park system. In 1960, congress established the National Historic Landmark Program (NHL), to enable the recognition and management of the many sites that were not included within National Parks. The thematic framework was used to assist the selection and interpretation of National Historic Landmarks (Feller & Miller 2000).

The NPS revised their old thematic framework in 1987, introducing a chronological and topical approach with a much expanded range of themes. This new framework had 34 themes with numerous subthemes and items. The 1987 framework still proved to be inadequate, as critics argued it pigeonholed historic events and sites too narrowly. This was highlighted when, in 1990, the NPS studied possibilities for the protection of sites associated with the Underground Railroad, the early 19th century escape network for runaway slaves. When they tried to use the 1987 framework to inform their study, it was found that the Underground Railroad fell rather inadequately across the subthemes of abolitionism (under the theme of humanitarian and social movements), and of slavery and plantation life (under the theme of American ways of life).

³ A good illustration of this process is the long series of developments of different memorials and interpretive material at the Little Bighorn Battlefield National Memorial (formerly the Custer Battlefield National Memorial) from 1876 to the present. Megan Reece (2005) gives a good outline and analysis of the often bitter debates surrounding memorials and interpretation of the site.

In 1990, both the Professional Division of the American Historical Association and the board of the Organization of American Historians (OAH) called on Congress to fund a further revision of the NPS's thematic framework (Feller & Miller 2000). It was agreed that a group of scholars, NPS officials and heritage experts would be brought together to discuss the problems with the 1987 framework and devise a new system. This group met in May 1993 and devised the framework that was adopted and has been used by the NPS since 1994. This framework was specifically designed to take into account the changes within the discipline of history that had occurred from the 1960s onwards. During this period, social and cultural histories emerged, challenging the idea that history was one narrative written by the powerful, which outlined the progressive achievements of founding fathers and military and political heroes. Instead, many scholars now saw history as consisting of a whole range of perspectives, including those of minorities, women, the defeated, workers and indigenous people. The new framework was designed as an attempt to allow this range of stories to be told, through a less compartmentalised and more interdisciplinary approach. Rather than being arranged chronologically, the new framework set out eight themes based around activities (see Appendix 2 for further details. The thematic framework can be accessed on:

http://www.nps.gov/history/history/hisnps/NPSThinking/themes_concepts.htm):

- Peopling places
- Creating social institutions and movements
- Expressing cultural values
- Shaping the political landscape
- Transforming the environment
- Developing the American economy
- Expanding science and technology
- Changing role of the US in the world

The themes were very broad and were considered to be overlapping, rather than mutually exclusive. The broad 'historical building blocks' of people, time and place were seen as cutting across and connecting all of these themes. There was to be no assumption of progress or inevitable improvement in this vision of historic processes. It was notable that the history of Native Americans would now be considered under all the framework's themes rather than in a separate section of their own (Feller & Miller 2000; Little 2000: 15; Nightingale 2004).

According to Little (2000: 15-17), the authors of this revised thematic framework envisaged that it would:

- Allow multilayered interpretation of historic sites, telling stories from the range of people and events connected with these places. Interpretations from a variety of disciplines could be applied.
- Be a tool for connecting the stories of particular sites into the broader narratives of American history. Discussion of the broader social and economic connections of a site would help to make sense of the surviving fabric; answering the 'so what?' question with regard to the importance of the site being considered.
- Be useful for making thematic connections between managed historic sites.
- Provide a tool for selecting sites whose historic stories were as yet unrepresented in the National Park and NHL systems.

As Barbara Little summed up:

‘This framework encourages the expanded representation within the National Park System of historical themes by including and expanding themes for which individual parks were not originally specifically designated. It therefore allows more connections to be made among significant places and invites the interpretation of a wider variety of themes to visitors.’ (Little 2000: 17)

This examination of the current NPS thematic framework and its predecessors has highlighted several key points:

- The changes in themes since the 1930s illustrate that the choice of themes can lead to particular histories being emphasised or ignored. Although a framework should ideally be neutral, in reality, the choice of themes can have a great influence on what aspects of heritage are managed or interpreted.
- Following on from this consideration, it is of the utmost importance that any given thematic framework is open to review and change, as any framework will unavoidably reflect the views on heritage that are current at the time it is established. Leaving systems open to review allows for constant input as views change. The various revisions of the NPS system reflect this process.
- Although the NPS thematic framework has been dramatically revised since the 1930s, no one appears to have suggested that it be ditched altogether, indicating that NPS heritage managers see some form of thematic framework as being of value in their work, even if such a system is constantly in need of revision.

3.2 CANADA — PARKS CANADA

Canada appears to have been the first country to use a thematic framework for historic heritage. The Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada (HSMBC) was founded in 1919 and soon after adopted an ‘informal organisational grid’, setting out a series of broad historic themes for identifying and commemorating historic sites. These themes were largely based around European settlement, wars and the activities of prominent men, and were in line with a progressive view of Canada’s history. The framework also gave some attention to First Nations’ sites. Through the 20th century, a variety of thematic frameworks for historic heritage were used at provincial and federal levels in Canada (Egerton 2001: 94).

In the mid-20th century, the focus of Canada’s thematic systems moved away from ‘great men and events’ toward political and economic history. In the mid-1980s, the Historic Resources Division of Alberta Culture set out a chronological system as a thematic framework for identifying prehistoric and historic heritage sites in Alberta. The system used the following ten broad themes:

1. The first people
2. Early prehistoric period
3. Middle prehistoric period
4. Late prehistoric period
5. The fur trade
6. Transition from a nomadic economy
7. Ranching

8. Settlement
9. Resource development
10. Politics

Each of these themes was broken into a number of subthemes. As McLean (1996) pointed out, such chronological systems have the advantages of comparative simplicity and a sense of familiarity, often making them easier to follow, especially for lay people. However, McLean (1996: 30) saw two principal disadvantages to chronological systems:

1. They can too easily be seen as reproducing the discredited ‘Whiggish’ view of history as a march of inevitable progress.
2. They do not easily accommodate the multi-vocal interpretations of history, where the stories of many different groups may connect to a particular historic site. McLean argued that a non-chronological thematic system, such as the most recent 1993 NPS system, could more easily incorporate the stories of indigenous people and other less-represented groups into the process of historical interpretation and management.

Egerton (2001: 102) pointed out that use of a chronological system ‘creates the danger ... of overlooking the more subtle aspects of change and continuity. It also obscures the layers of history that individual places may represent, or which cross over artificial boundaries’.

The present national thematic framework in Canada does not follow the chronological system. In 2000, the Minister of Canadian Heritage approved a new National Historic Sites of Canada Systems Plan to replace the national system that had been in use since 1981. A review of the 1981 Plan had identified that the histories of indigenous peoples, ethnocultural communities and women were all under-represented. Therefore, the focus of the new Plan had shifted once again, with a greater emphasis on social history and the strategic priority of redressing this balance. The histories of all the under-represented groups were seen as overlaying all the historic themes established for the 2000 System Plan (Parks Canada 2001: 52-54; HSMBC 2005).

The present thematic framework is similar to the 1994 NPS framework in that it sets out broad overlapping themes, based on activities, rather than being ordered chronologically. The five themes are as follows (see Appendix 3 for further details):

1. Peopling the land
2. Governing Canada
3. Expressing intellectual and cultural life
4. Building social and community life
5. Developing economies

The new framework has been built on the themes of the 1981 framework, but is designed to be simpler in approach, more responsive to evolving concerns and interests, and more reflective of recent scholarship on the evolution of Canadian historiography (Parks Canada 2000). The stated aim for adopting the new thematic framework was that it ‘assists in the identification of subject gaps and aids Parks Canada’s efforts to ensure diversity of representation in designations’ (Parks Canada 2001: 53).

3.3 AUSTRALIA — THE AUSTRALIAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

In 1993, the Australian Heritage Commission (AHC) initiated the Principal Australian Historic Themes Project, which aimed to develop 'a practical and comprehensive framework of Australian historic themes to assist in the identification, assessment, and management of heritage places in Australia' (AHC 2001: 2). It was intended that the framework would be applicable at local, state and territorial, and commonwealth levels. Historic themes and checklists had been used in Australia since 1976, but the AHC considered these systems to be too concerned with fabric, with insufficient consideration for historic meanings and connections. The project developed in three stages:

- Stage one: research and consultation by the Centre for Western Australian History
- Stage two: testing the applicability of the proposed historic themes to 20 registered sites and to historic places along a stretch of the Murray River system through three different state jurisdictions
- Stage three: testing the framework by territory, state and commonwealth government heritage agencies

The new framework was accepted by the Heritage Officials Committee in 1997. Minor revisions were made in 1998 and 1999, and the Australian Historic Themes Framework was finally released in 2001. The AHC saw the new framework as a tool that heritage professionals could use to link regional historic stories and the places that illustrate those histories. Such a national approach was seen as consistent with the commonwealth government heritage agencies' moves to develop common national standards for the identification and management of heritage places. The framework would provide a tool to detect historic themes that had been previously ignored. At the same time, the AHC acknowledged that state and local themes were already in use throughout Australia. The AHC's aim was for these thematic systems to continue to run in parallel with the national framework, but that the national framework could be used to link up the various regional systems (AHC 2001: 2-3).

The AHC thematic framework is similar in structure to both the NPS system in the USA and the Parks Canada system, but places a stronger emphasis on the impact of human beings on the natural environment. This may, in turn, lead to a greater consideration of how the environment has influenced historic processes. The AHC themes are:

- Tracing the evolution of the Australian environment
- Peopling Australia
- Developing local, regional and national economies
- Building settlements, towns and cities
- Working
- Educating
- Governing
- Developing Australia's cultural life
- Marking the phases of life

As with the American and Canadian frameworks, the themes were intended to be interlinked. The Australian framework mirrors the American and Canadian systems in incorporating the histories of indigenous people across all the themes, rather than creating separate categories for them. None of the literature examined for the current report indicated that there had been any debate over whether this was the best approach for dealing with themes connected with aboriginal history. The themes were also intended to be gender and age inclusive. The AHC (2001: 3, 6–8) stated that it saw themes as useful for:

- Emphasising the historic values of places rather than assessing them solely on fabric
- Aiding research into the part that places play in wider historic contexts
- Helping determine whether places should have heritage listing by enabling comparative assessment
- Identifying a range of storylines connected with a place
- Determining priorities in research, funding, conservation work, promotion and publicity
- Identifying aspects of heritage that may be under-represented among managed sites

3.3.1 The New South Wales Heritage Office state historic themes

In 1996, the New South Wales (NSW) Heritage Office developed its own list of 35 state historic themes to ‘provide a context within which the heritage significance of an item can be understood, assessed and compared’ (NSW Heritage Office 1996: 2). It was envisaged that the themes would be a useful checklist to help develop local histories and themes. The NSW Heritage Office believed that thematic systems would work best when local, state and national historic thematic frameworks were used in a complementary way (NSW Heritage Office 1996). In the course of the current study, no substantial analytical study on the effectiveness of either the NSW state historic themes or the AHC national historic themes was located. It was therefore considered that an examination of the uses of these two frameworks in New South Wales to date would give an idea of their practical value. To do this, only studies available online through the NSW Heritage Office website were used.

Since 2005, the NSW Heritage Office has commissioned a number of thematic histories. Two of these studies (Kass 2003, 2005) were part of the State Heritage Register Project, which aimed to provide knowledge about regions of NSW for the identification of fabric to be added to the State Heritage Register. Both these studies used an identical format, based around a combination of the AHC national themes and the NSW state historic themes. The reports use the concept of the State Heritage Register as a book divided into nine ‘volumes’, each of which is one of the AHC themes. Each volume has a varying number of ‘chapters’, each of which is one of the state historic themes. Kass (2003, 2005) considered that this arrangement would allow each heritage item identified to be located within the historic development of the region in question and within the wider historic development of both NSW and Australia. The two studies did not set out to provide comprehensive lists of sites to be added to the State Heritage Register of NSW; instead, they seemed to be designed to provide a context within which people in the regions could identify sites to be nominated for the Register. Kass

(2003, 2005) obviously considered the thematic frameworks to be valuable tools, but only when combining state and national frameworks, along with regional stories. Kass's work indicates that the AHC thematic framework on its own does not provide a sufficiently refined tool for the selection of fabric for the State Heritage Register. Egerton commented that this was unsurprising, as she considered the AHC thematic framework to be overly theoretical and vague (R. Egerton, DOC Southland, pers. comm. 18 August 2006).

The NSW Heritage Office has also commissioned a number of thematic histories of the settlement of NSW by various ethnic groups. To date, studies of the Greek, Italian, Chinese and Dutch ethnic communities have been completed. These studies have all employed aspects of the NSW state historic thematic framework but did not use the AHC thematic framework. In each study, the authors selected those themes from the state thematic framework that they considered to have relevance to the ethnic group being studied. As an example, in their thematic history of Greek settlement in NSW, Turnbull & Valiotis (2001) used the themes townships, convicts, pastoralism, migration, commerce, labour, religion, education, social institutions, welfare, leisure, sport communication and events. It is evident that the authors of the various ethnic theme studies did not consider it useful or necessary to use the AHC national thematic framework in addition to the NSW framework (Williams 1999; Kevin & Pesman 2001; Turnbull & Valiotis 2001; Velthuis 2005).

The NSW Heritage Office, in collaboration with Deakin University, Victoria, commissioned a thematic study on WWII aerodromes and associated structures in NSW. This was a strictly fabric-based study, with the theme being fabric associated with the role of the Royal Australian Air Force and the defence of Australia during WWII (Brew 2001). While this study revolved around a specific theme, no attempt was made to fit that theme into either state or national thematic frameworks, indicating that the author did not consider such frameworks particularly useful for this type of specific fabric-based project.

3.4 HOW EFFECTIVE ARE THE NORTH AMERICAN AND AUSTRALIAN THEMATIC FRAMEWORKS?

With the exception of the Alberta framework, all the thematic frameworks discussed above use a set of interlocking themes based around activities rather than chronology. All were designed to facilitate a more inclusive telling of history. The intention for each of these frameworks was that sites would be interpreted from a range of different historical perspectives, including those of indigenous people, minorities and women, rather than just from the perspective of 'great men and events'. Frameworks were designed to allow more groups to be represented in the story of a place, and to enable heritage planners to decide how representative the range of managed historic sites is. One of the aims of the frameworks was to connect historic sites to broader historic stories, so that managers could tell which stories were being told or neglected through the management and interpretation of historic sites (Little 2000: 15-17; Parks Canada 2000; AHC 2001: 3).

It is important that we ask how well these frameworks have succeeded in achieving these aims. No material was located during this study that specifically identified how well the Canadian thematic frameworks have carried out the purposes for which they were designed. The general problems with Alberta's chronological thematic systems, as outlined by McLean (1996: 30) and Egerton (2001: 102), can be summarised as follows:

- A chronological system can too easily be seen as reproducing the view of history as a march of inevitable progress
- A chronological system does not easily accommodate the multi-vocal interpretations of history, where the stories of many different groups may connect to a particular historic site
- The layers of history represented in a site, the more subtle changes and the things that continue through the history of a site may be obscured by a chronological approach

The Parks Canada and AHC thematic frameworks are both largely based on the US NPS framework. Unfortunately, at the time of writing there had been very little written analysis on the effectiveness of the NPS framework itself (J. Warren-Findley, Arizona State University, pers. comm. 2 May 2005; L. Feller, National Park Service, pers. comm. 17 May 2005.). The majority of articles about the NPS framework outline the perceived advantages of applying the framework, rather than providing information about how the framework operates on the ground. The following discussion must therefore be seen as speculative rather than conclusive.

The 1994 NPS thematic framework was designed to:

‘... guide the NPS, working independently and with its partners in the public and private sectors, in:

- ‘evaluating the significance of resources for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, for designation as National Historic Landmarks, or for potential addition to the National Park System;
- ‘assessing how well the themes are currently represented in the existing units of the National Park System and in other recognized areas; and,
- ‘expanding and enhancing the interpretive programs at existing units of the National Park System to provide a fuller understanding of our nation’s past.’ (NPS 2000: 3)

The framework was used by the NPS and the Society of American Archaeology's National Historic Landmarks Archaeology Committee as one of the tools for assessing areas for National Historic Landmark (NHL) nominations in their ‘Earliest Americans Theme Study’ programme. This project aimed to identify and protect archaeological sites associated with the earliest human settlements in America. The framework was also used as a basis on which to construct questions to apply to the archaeological record. In the ‘Lower Mississippi Delta Study’, a 1996 symposium of experts used the framework as a basis for their discussion on how to assess sites. Part of the framework (the ‘peopling places’ theme) was used as the organising point for a series of chronological categories for assessing the significance of sites. In each of these cases, it was stated that experts were involved in drawing up the programmes, but there was no clear

evidence that Native Americans or other community groups had active roles in project development (NPS 2000: 22–25).

Dunkerly (2003) maintained that a number of recent initiatives by the NPS were, at least in part, products of the new thematic framework. He cited the recent focus on ethnic and indigenous sites (such as those of Creole and Alaskan peoples). He also mentioned the inclusion of new park areas, such as the Manzanar National Historic Site (site of a WWII internment camp for Japanese Americans), the Minute Man Missile National Historical Site (a Cold War missile site), and the Tuskagee Airmen National Historic Site (commemorating the role of African-American airmen in WWII) (Dunkerly 2003: 19–20).

According to Janelle Warren-Findley, the NPS has on occasion used the thematic framework to try to exclude a site from being added to a list (J. Warren-Findley, Arizona State University, pers. comm. 16 May 2005). When a congressman or local group proposed a site that the NPS did not want to add to its listed sites, the NPS would sometimes argue that the site did not fit the themes. Warren-Findley cited the example of Val-Kill, Eleanor Roosevelt's house, which the NPS tried to remove from listing on the grounds that it did not fit the thematic framework. A feminist heritage activist was able to show Congress how the site did in fact fit into the thematic framework and the house retained its listing. Warren-Findley made the additional point that the revised framework is flexible enough that it can be used to fit most arguments. This indicates the importance of using additional tools, such as area histories and studies of the social significance of sites, in combination with a thematic framework, in order to make robust decisions that hold up to scrutiny.

There is also only limited information on the use of the revised framework to assess the representation of themes in current sites, and to broaden the range of interpretation currently being carried out. An example of a site where this has been successful is the Lowell National Historical Park in Massachusetts, which was originally listed as an NHL due to its architectural and industrial significance. The focus of interpretation has now been expanded to include the social history of the young, unmarried, rural women who made up a large proportion of the Lowell workforce. The interpretation at the Kings Mountain National Military Park in South Carolina has also been expanded, to focus not only on the area as the site of a battle in the American Revolution, but also on how the process of commemoration has been carried out at the site over the years (Dunkerly 2003: 19).

Warren-Findley found that the revised framework was not necessarily easy to use when applied to writing an interpretive history of a particular area (J. Warren-Findley, Arizona State University, pers. comm. 3 March 2005). The use of themes made it difficult to present a clear chronology, as the themes themselves cut across chronologies. The readers from the NPS reacted badly to a non-chronological theme-based arrangement of her draft, seeing it as confusing. Warren-Findley therefore rewrote her draft, continuing to use the thematic framework as a tool to identify issues, but arranging the material chronologically and not specifically identifying the themes in the text. Thus, she found that while the thematic framework was not necessarily a good way to arrange material, it was a good way to find issues and information that might not have come to light in a standard research exercise.

Only one serious study that examined the application of the NPS thematic framework was located during the research for the current report. This was a paper by Greg Shine on historical interpretation at the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's (GGNRA) Nike Missile Site SF-88 (Shine 1999). Shine examined the relationship between public memory and historical interpretation. The site was a Cold War missile defence site that had been deactivated in 1974 and transferred to the NPS in 1976. In 1999, the site was largely managed and interpreted by volunteers, who were mostly veterans of Nike missile bases. The management and interpretation programme was carried out in cooperation with NPS staff. Shine (1999) noted that since those giving the interpretation were largely Cold War veterans, they were, in fact, primary sources of information. He also noted that the interpretation was largely confined to technical information, personal reminiscences and a 'heroic version' of the Cold War. There was little analysis of the reasons for the Cold War or perspectives other than those of servicemen. Shine (1999) also noted that the personal reminiscences part of the interpretation was very popular with the public. He found that, at the time of his research, the volunteers at the GGNA Nike Missile Site had not in any way incorporated the NPS thematic framework into their interpretive programme, and that the interpretation on site did not place the missile base into any wider historic perspective. Controversial topics, such as the reasons for the site's closure, the site's role in the arms race and the costs of the Cold War, were not examined. Bud Halsey, the volunteer Site Manager, stated that he had no interest in academic perceptions of the Cold War, but saw the project more as one of restoration first, with interpretation as a secondary goal. The NPS thematic framework was supposed to have been distributed to all NPS employees shortly after its publication, with the idea that it was to be the basis for historic interpretation. On enquiry, Shine found that neither Halsey nor Park Ranger Cathy Petrick, the NPS volunteer program coordinator, had read the NPS's thematic framework (Shine 1999).

3.4.1 The NPS's revised thematic framework

There seems to be a general consensus among people that having a thematic framework is better than not having one at all, especially when viewing historic sites as part of broader historic stories. However, there has been insufficient analysis to date to conclude whether the NPS's revised thematic framework is working effectively to achieve the stated goals for which it was designed. From the limited information currently available, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- There is some indication that the framework provides a useful tool for evaluating sites for inclusion in management and interpretation regimes, but it appears that the NPS framework is so broad in its applicability that it can be used to argue for or against the inclusion of the same site, as shown in the case of Val-Kill, Eleanor Roosevelt's House. A thematic framework does not, in itself, solve the problem of defining what is 'representative'. However, a more tangible definition of what it is that sites are meant to represent could make the framework a more useful tool in helping determine which sites are representative. It is also clear that application of the framework on its own was not enough to make a decision about Val-Kill; other types of historical analysis were also required. The incident also shows that frameworks have the potential to be misused. A thematic framework only shows what

is representative within the context of the framework itself; how well the framework identifies a representative range of sites is dependent on how well the framework itself is designed.

- While the revised framework appears to provide a starting point for the evaluation and interpretation of sites, it appears to be most useful when tailored for the task in hand by those using it, rather than when applied as a fixed system. For example, the framework may be more effective when combined with studies of local areas (i.e. histories of places) and the themes that may arise from such studies. The thematic framework may also have to be adapted to a chronological telling of history, to give greater clarity to the stories being told.
- Shine's (1999) study of the GGNRA Nike Missile Site indicates that for thematic frameworks to work as an aid to interpretation, heritage managers need to make a concerted effort to identify the people on the ground who actually interpret heritage fabric to the public. These 'interpreters' must then be made familiar with the framework and managers must seek their active 'buy-in' to the use of thematic frameworks. Those carrying out the interpretation need to see a framework as something that enhances and assists what they are doing, rather than viewing it as a bureaucratic imposition. This process will be made much easier if a framework is flexible enough to be adapted to local situations.
- The NPS framework does allow a somewhat more inclusive approach for both evaluation and interpretation of sites. The stories of indigenous people, minorities, women or other groups who might previously have been ignored have more chance of being considered under the NPS framework. There is, however, no evidence that the framework allows more input from such groups in the selection and management of sites. The framework itself seems to have been devised largely by academic experts, with little evidence of input from groups such as Native American tribes or local heritage specialists, who have a strong interest in certain aspects of heritage. There is space for Native American commentary, but no evidence of any Native American involvement in the setting up of programmes such as the Earliest Americans Theme Study (NPS Archaeology Program 2005). A thematic framework is clearly not an alternative to proper consultation with interest groups or to thorough evaluation of the social significance of sites.

3.4.2 Australian thematic frameworks

There have been a limited number of studies investigating how thematic frameworks operate in Australia. The 'Australian Historic Themes' document contains a section that refers to a study carried out in Albury, New South Wales, by Jaqueline Durrant and Bruce Pennay of Charles Sturt University in 1996, in which they applied the Australian historic themes framework to the Albury local government area (AHC 2001).

Durrant and Pennay concluded that the framework was useful for identifying:

- Under-representation of sites associated with indigenous heritage
- Under-representation of sites associated with multi-cultural heritage
- Under-representation of sites associated with women's heritage and with children, young people, families and older people

- Under-representation of sites associated with conflict and failure
- Over-representation of sites associated with wealth, power, privilege and social elitism

For identifying sites, Durrant and Pennay concluded that a combination of the thematic framework and previously identified local themes worked better than trying to use either system on its own (AHC 2001). They considered that the national framework helped raise issues that were not obvious in the local thematic scheme, while the local themes were important for identifying sites connected with local historic issues.

For recording and assessing sites, Durrant and Pennay claimed that the thematic framework enabled a more thorough recording of site histories, as well as allowing for a comparative assessment of groups of similar sites (AHC 2001).

For site interpretation, Durrant and Pennay concluded that the framework:

- Allowed for multi-layered interpretation of sites, telling a variety of stories, particularly for those sites that had been used for a number of purposes through the years
- Enabled local history to be connected to wider historic themes
- Helped indicate the interconnections between local sites
- Allowed for the discussion of contested versions of the history of sites

There is no information provided about the extent to which Durrant and Pennay consulted local community groups, Aboriginal groups and other interested parties during their study, nor whether the framework was any help in such consultation. There is also no information on whether Albury's heritage managers and other interested parties were aware or supportive of the AHC's historic themes framework. The overall conclusion of the case study appears to be that the historic framework is useful, but mainly when it is tailored to the local situation by combining it with local thematic systems (AHC 2001: 3).

The usefulness of the results of the Durrant and Pennay study is questionable, however, at least in the form in which they are presented in 'Australian Historic Themes' (AHC 2001), where the coverage is very brief and the methodology is not outlined. The reader cannot judge what comparative work Durrant and Pennay carried out or what background material they looked at, and no comparisons are made with other systems. Until a full research report can be obtained for this study, their findings on the application of the AHC's thematic framework cannot be seen as conclusive.

In a brief analysis of the general use of thematic frameworks in Australia, Pearson & Sullivan (1999) pointed out that thematic frameworks can be useful in assessing the historic values of sites, particularly the values that are not obvious from the historic fabric. This can allow more layers of history to be interpreted, e.g. the Aboriginal stories connected with the sites of 'European' homesteads in the Outback. Pearson & Sullivan (1999) pointed out that thematic lists do not guard against misinterpretation of the past. Indeed, thematic frameworks are themselves the product of particular interpretations of history, and so are subject to the historical 'fashions' of the age in which they are devised and to the conscious

or unconscious prejudices of those who devise them. Pearson & Sullivan (1999) illustrated the danger of the uncritical use of themes without accurate historic information, using the cases of Hill End and Kiandra in New South Wales. In the 1960s, the NSW National Parks Service decided to acquire the town of Hill End, designate it as a historic site and establish it as the Service's example of a goldmining town. It was therefore considered unnecessary to also maintain the goldmining town of Kiandra in Kosciusko National Park, as one goldmining town should be representative of the whole theme. In reality, both towns represented completely different types of goldmining and had very different and distinctive histories. An opportunity to maintain a site that represented an entirely different aspect of goldmining history was lost through an over-simplistic approach to the goldmining theme (Pearson & Sullivan 1999: 139-144). Pearson & Sullivan (1999: 144) concluded that 'Thematic approaches in most cases do not help in making decisions about how to manage a place, but such surveys can mean that decisions are made in the light of known heritage resources rather than in blinkered ignorance'.

Heritage workers in NSW have found thematic frameworks to be useful in at least two different situations: the AHC national thematic framework has been combined with the NSW state thematic framework to help identify heritage sites in regional studies; and the state thematic framework has been used in studies of ethnic immigrant groups. In both cases, the thematic frameworks were used in conjunction with local studies to make them more useful in local settings. The fact that the authors of the various ethnic studies did not use the AHC framework indicates that they considered the NSW state framework to be perfectly adequate for the task in hand (or possibly that they did not consider the AHC framework to be adequate). This illustrates the fact that even when it is thought that a thematic framework would be a valuable tool for a particular project, the decision must still be made as to which thematic framework to use. However, the NSW Heritage Office has found that the AHC thematic framework is a useful system by which to categorise the thematic histories and heritage studies held in the Heritage Office library, indicating that the framework is a practical way to organise a large body of knowledge (NSW Heritage Office 2004). Such use of a framework may, however, be very little different from organising a library under pre-existing systems such as Dewey or Bliss.

Neither the AHC national nor the NSW state thematic frameworks show any clear evidence of Aboriginal input into their structures. The author of the two regional studies does not appear to have consulted local Aboriginal groups regarding the areas studied (Kass 2003, 2005). Even the NSW Heritage Office's document

'Aboriginal history and heritage: a guide' appears to have been drawn up by non-Aboriginal heritage experts, with little evidence of significant Aboriginal input (NSW Heritage Office 1998).

4. The New Zealand situation

At the time of writing, neither the New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT) nor DOC have adopted thematic frameworks at a national level. However, the NZHPT has considered a number of thematic framework models and has trialled one of these at a regional level. Some DOC conservancies and area offices have adopted local thematic frameworks, and DOC Head Office has also carried out a number of fabric-based studies that have used thematic frameworks as one of their tools of analysis. As Egerton (2001) suggested, it appears that the continual debate over the use of thematic frameworks in New Zealand has, in fact, been one of the major factors in preventing their implementation: 'It seems more time has been spent arguing about and consulting over the methodology than just trying it out' (Egerton 2001: 95).

The best general background to the use of thematic frameworks in New Zealand and the debates around such use is Gavin McLean's draft report 'Meanings to an end', which covers the situation up until 1995 (McLean 1996). As the current report will only briefly cover the background to the New Zealand situation, those seeking more detail are advised to read McLean's draft. The following account will examine the problems identified with the current situation in New Zealand, with particular attention to the question of representativeness. This will lead in to a discussion on problems that may arise when applying thematic frameworks to the New Zealand situation.

4.1 THE NEW ZEALAND HISTORIC PLACES TRUST EXPERIENCE

In 1985, the New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT) Board commissioned the preparation of a thematic framework for the NZHPT, which aimed to identify gaps or under-represented areas in the Trust's system of historic places at that time. Over 2 years, NZHPT research officer Patricia Adams, with the assistance of Jo Breese and, later, Paul Mahoney, worked on a thematic framework. This was presented in 1987 in a draft paper entitled 'Themes in New Zealand history' (Adams 1987). The devised framework was not based on a chronological or 'horizontal' view of history, but was, instead, based on 21 themes of human activities (see Appendix 1 for further details). Adams described this as a 'vertical division of history into human activities that had been pursued throughout the continuum of human occupation of New Zealand, or at least through long sections of it' (McLean 1996: 25). The scheme was presented to the Board in a report, which was then shelved with the 1987 restructuring that led to the NZHPT's

archaeological section being transferred into the newly created Department of Conservation (McLean 1996: 25–27).

The next step in the NZHPT's efforts to develop a thematic framework appears to have been Gavin McLean's (1996) comprehensive study 'Meanings to an end'. McLean (1996: 4) wrote, 'This paper has its genesis in the separate, but converging, requirements of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust and the Department of Conservation to reassess their heritage assets and responsibilities'. McLean mentioned that DOC's publication 'Atawhai ruamano conservation 2000' (DOC 1995) had expressed the aim of developing a national system of themes for both NZHPT and DOC, and stated that his own paper was a contribution towards such a process. The paper was presented at a joint DOC/NZHPT workshop in February 1996 and then used as a basis for further comment and analysis. In addition to providing a comparative analysis of the New Zealand situation and of recent developments in the USA, Canada and Australia, McLean set out a proposal for a draft New Zealand thematic framework. The proposed framework was largely based on the NPS thematic framework discussed above. McLean's (1996: 33–65) framework is set out in Appendix 4.

McLean's comprehensive system was not adopted, however, as the NZHPT considered it too complex to operate without some form of amendment. In 2001–2002, Elizabeth Cox and Peter Richardson set up a workshop process to review McLean's draft framework, with the aim of shortening and simplifying it. As a result of this process, a revised framework was redrafted in April 2002, with six themes and 35 subthemes (as opposed to the eight themes and 40 subthemes in McLean's original). However, the revised framework was not adopted either, and a further review was carried out by NZHPT Senior Policy Adviser Aidan Challis in June 2003. Challis (2003) examined and assessed the previously existing frameworks, and came to the following conclusions:

McLean's 1996 'Meanings to an End' framework was seen as well designed but too long and complicated to be easily applied. (It had not been routinely used by NZHPT up to the time of Challis' review.)

The 2002 redrafted framework was also seen as too long, involving too much repetition and overlap between themes and, while allowing more consideration of Maori heritage than its predecessors, remained overly Eurocentric.

The USA National Park System's revised thematic framework was considered to be impractical for the needs of the NZHPT.

The Australian Heritage Commission's Historic Themes Framework was not considered to apply readily to the New Zealand situation; in particular, the need to give fair coverage to Maori heritage.

Challis (2003: 2) considered that any framework used by the NZHPT Register of Historic Places must achieve the following goals:

1. Relate clearly and easily to the four parts of the Register: historic places, historic areas, wahi tapu, and wahi tapu areas
2. Function as an organising structure and/or search classification for the Register

3. Encourage comprehensive regional or local heritage inventory and assessment for the purposes of registration

Challis thus decided that a new thematic framework was needed. The framework he developed was based on the paper 'Themes in New Zealand history' (Adams 1987), the NZHPT Forms and Current Uses categories, and lists of wahi tapu and historic places of interest to Maori as set out on registration proposal forms (Challis 2003: 3).

The framework set out the following non-exclusive categories for:

A. Historic places and areas:

1. Discovery, migration, exploration and survey
2. Settlement, accommodation and residence
3. Fishing, hunting and gathering
4. Farming, timber and forestry
5. Mining and minerals
6. Processing, manufacturing and construction
7. Trade, finance and retailing
8. Central and local government
9. Law and justice
10. Dispute, war and defence
11. Transport by sea, land and air
12. Utilities, postage and communications
13. Education, science and technology
14. Health and welfare
15. Sport, outdoor recreation and conservation
16. Arts, culture, heritage and indoor recreation
17. Events, persons, ideas and movements
18. Religion and burial
19. Disasters, memorials and monuments

B. Historic places and historic areas of Maori interest:

1. Taunga waka (ancestral canoe landings)
2. Pa and kainga (occupied in former times)
3. Marae buildings and whareniui
4. Mahinga kai
5. Taonga ika (fishing grounds and associated features)
6. Mineral and stone resource sites
7. Wahi taonga mahi a ringa (resource sites for art materials)
8. Places associated with kingitanga, governance and leadership
9. Landscape features that determined the boundaries of iwi or hapu
10. Ahi karoa (sites associated with claiming land or ownership)
11. Battle sites and defence sites where the tapu has been removed
12. Ara (pathways connecting tribal areas or resources)
13. Wananga and kura kaupapa
14. Wahi taonga mahi (art sites)
15. Sites associated with mythological events
16. Wahi whakamahara (memorial sites)

C. Wahi tapu and wahi tapu areas:

1. Urupa

2. Rua koiwi (storage areas for skeletal remains)
3. Former sites of skeletal storage, still subject to tapu
4. Caverns and underwater burial places
5. Baptismal rites sites
6. Wahi whenua (repository places for placenta)
7. Whare karakia
8. Tuahu (enclosures for divination and similar rites)
9. Battlegrounds and sites of bloodshed still subject to tapu
10. Waiora springs (healing sites)
11. Sources of water for death rites
12. Ara purahourua (sacred pathways for messengers)
13. Places imbued the mana of tupuna
14. Landforms embodying creation stories and whakapapa

Challis (2003: 4–5) also considered that, when applying a thematic approach to heritage identification and assessment, the variables of time, geographical space and cultural variation needed to be taken into account.

On the surface, Challis' draft framework seems to apply to 'general' historic sites a set of themes that involve historic activities such as trade, mining, transport, and education. In contrast, Maori sites are ordered according to very specific site types, rather than historic themes. On examination it can be seen that the site types in the Maori section reflect activities that match the themes presented in the 'general' historic sites. Thus, while the 'general' system includes themes such as discovery, farming, mining and religion, the Maori system includes taonga waka (canoe landing sites), mahinga kai (food gathering and planting sites), mineral and stone resource sites and wahi tapu (sites of spiritual significance). The question does arise as to how the system should be applied when sites are considered significant to both Maori and Pakeha, particularly sites of cultural interaction. Both Challis' and McLean's schemes also beg the question of how much Maori input was actually sought or made into the drafting of the specific frameworks. It should also be acknowledged that both authors were trying to devise systems that could operate within criteria set down in the register of Historic Places and within the Historic Places Act.

4.1.1 The Ruapehu-Rangitikei Pilot Project 2003–2005

This section is based on an interview with Rebecca O'Brien, project manager of the NZHPT's Ruapehu-Rangitikei Pilot Project. The interview was carried out in February 2005 and discussed the first year of the pilot project from July 2003 to July 2004. Over this period, the Central Region Team of the NZHPT carried out a registration pilot project in the area administered by the Ruapehu District Council and the Rangitikei District Council. The overall aim of the project was to find a method that could be used to create a comprehensive and representative register of historic sites in the region to which it was applied. The specific aim of the project in the district concerned was to fill gaps that existed in the types of sites that were on the HPT Register. Aidan Challis' (2003) thematic framework was initially applied to identify gaps in the type of sites registered. Thus, the registration pilot project also became a test of the use of a thematic scheme.

In the first year of the pilot project, the HPT researchers looked at what was recorded on the HPT Register for the Ruapehu-Rangitikei districts. This led to

consultation with the Ruapehu-Rangitikei communities to establish a selection process for heritage sites. The history of the districts was then examined to establish appropriate themes for the selection of heritage sites. As more background information was collected and more effort was made to select appropriate sites, it became clear that the original generic historic themes did not work for selecting sites and that the set of physical types for Maori sites were inappropriate for site selection. O'Brien noted that during the pilot project the team did not look for wahi tapu sites, as this was being covered by the Maori Heritage Team. She mentioned that sites tend to be identified as either 'wahi tapu' or 'Pakeha', which does not recognise the subtleties and cultural cross-overs that occur in New Zealand history.

O'Brien emphasised the importance of distinguishing between research themes and interpretive themes. She saw a broad interpretive thematic approach as being useful when searching an area for sites, as it helps the researcher to 'think outside the square' and thus identify sites that may not otherwise be recognised as significant. An interpretive thematic scheme provides a context in which to place sites that have been identified, illustrating their importance to wider historic events and processes.

O'Brien stated that while the thematic scheme was a good tool for recognising gaps in the record of sites, it was not a robust enough framework for identifying new sites, with many of the 'gaps' it identified being irrelevant to the area in question. For example, although 'mining' was a 'gap' in the sites identified for the Ruapehu-Rangitikei area, this was irrelevant as mining was never a significant industry in the area. O'Brien felt that a better approach would be to make a specific historic study of the area in question to determine the themes of relevance to that area. For example, transport, and more specifically railways, emerged as a major historic theme for the Ruapehu-Rangitikei area. O'Brien considered that if a national thematic framework was being used, a specific regional study was still needed to determine which themes from the national framework applied to the area in question. A thematic scheme should be seen strictly as a tool for interpreting sites in a place, rather than as something that existing sites must be made to fit in to.

O'Brien believed that, to be useful, a thematic system needs a series of layers. Thus, while the thematic scheme may have a series of broad themes, each of these themes should be able to be broken down into more specific subthemes, which should, in turn, be able to be broken down into specific examples. For example, the broader theme of migration might have navigation as a subtheme and lighthouses as an example of a site.

In O'Brien's opinion, two possible approaches might work when looking for sites for the Register:

- A regional approach, where researchers look at the history of a region and devise appropriate broad themes from such a study. Researchers would have to take care not to simply be 'enclosed by district boundaries', but to be aware of how things cross over into other geographical areas. In any regional study, researchers would still have to be aware of broader national themes.
- The use of national themes to look at particular types of sites, as was the case in the recent study of New Zealand coastal defences. Other possible uses are when sites associated with particular national organisations are examined

(Freemason's lodges, for example). In the process, researchers would still have to be aware of broader historic themes, but would essentially be looking at a fairly narrowly defined set of sites.

In the Ruapehu-Rangitikei pilot project, the thematic guidelines were, at first, followed to the letter. O'Brien stated that the guidelines appeared logical for analysing the existing record and showing the gaps that existed in the Register, but broke down once they were used to select sites to be added to the register. A further problem was that there appeared to have been no tangata whenua input into the thematic scheme as it existed. This was further exacerbated by the fact that 'Maori' sites were ordered by type of physical site, whereas 'general' sites were ordered by historic theme.

In a final comment on the proposal for a national thematic scheme, O'Brien thought that we should establish what the problems really are with the current ad hoc ordering of historic sites in New Zealand, by addressing the following questions: is there a real problem that needs fixing or has the system worked adequately up until now, and is there a real need or desire for a new thematic system? Only when these questions have been answered can we make a fully informed decision about what sort of thematic system should be adopted in New Zealand⁴.

4.2 THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION

The Department of Conservation administers around 30% of New Zealand's land area. Less than 8% of this land is classified under the Reserves Act 1977, which includes reserves for recreation, scenic, natural, scientific and historic purposes. Most of the remaining 92% of public conservation land is classified under the Conservation Act 1987 or the National Parks Act 1980. Although most land administered by DOC was not inherited or acquired primarily to protect or manage its historic values (Auditor-General 2006: 17), the Conservation Act 1987 (section 6a) states that DOC must manage all historic resources on public conservation land for conservation purposes. The Department's Statement of Intent for 2006 to 2009 identifies as one of its intermediate outcomes that 'A representative range of historic heritage is protected restored and interpreted' (DOC 2006b: 50). Interpretation can be defined as 'telling stories and creating understanding, as well as providing factual information about places and events' (DOC 2005: 48). There is a lack of interpretation on many DOC historic sites, and it has been noted that where there is interpretation, it is often narrowly focused and based solely on the surviving fabric at the site (Warren-Findley 2001; McLean 2002; Nightingale 2004). A better stocktake of DOC historic sites around the country would confirm whether or not the problems with interpretation are at a national scale or simply apply to particular regions.

⁴ For additional information on the Ruapehu-Rangitikei Pilot Project, see www.historic.org.nz/Register/register_pilot_project.html

4.2.1 Representativeness of historic sites on public conservation land

There are many sites of historic importance on public conservation land. Certain types of industrial or working sites (e.g. gold and coal mining, timber working, shore whaling, navigation, and rural animal control) are better represented on public conservation land than on the NZHPT register. In cases where there are many examples of certain types of historic fabric, e.g. Wild Animal Control (WAC) huts and baches on conservation land, heritage managers have to decide which examples to manage and interpret. Such decisions must allow for the limited budgets available, while taking into account DOC systems such as the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS), the Visitor Asset Management System (VAMS) and input from engineers. A thematic framework is one of the tools that can be used to help decide which examples of fabric should be actively managed or protected, e.g. which historic stories are connected with WAC huts and baches and which best represent particular themes.

While DOC faces the same intellectual problems as any other heritage manager in deciding how to define a 'representative' sample of historic sites, DOC is also constrained by the fact that its historic sites were not originally acquired with the aim of being representative of the broad sweep of New Zealand history. Therefore, it would make sense for DOC to concentrate on securing protection for a range of sites within public conservation lands that reflect the events and heritage represented by fabric and landscape, rather than the history of the country as a whole. It has been identified that DOC needs to develop a prioritising process for management and interpretation of historic heritage (DOC 2006a: 7-8). The problem for DOC has not been choosing which sites to acquire for protection and conservation, but how to manage the sites already on public conservation land given the limited resources made available for historic conservation purposes. This means a more narrow focus of representation; as Egerton (2001: 95) pointed out: 'The limited budgets within which DOC has to work mean that not all historic resources can be managed with facilities or access provided, so a few have to be chosen to represent the rest'. To assist DOC in making such decisions, any thematic framework adopted must not only take into account the broader themes of New Zealand history, but also be able to be adapted to the specific historic themes relevant to conservancies in different parts of New Zealand.

When identifying representative heritage sites, DOC staff need to bear in mind that there may be a difference between the most important sites and the sites that are most in need of funding. Some sites may be of great historic importance but need only a small amount of resourcing. The purpose of site selection must be made clear from the beginning of the project. In other words, is a thematic framework being applied to help identify all the most significant sites in an area, or is it being applied to help identify which sites are most in need of funding and attention? A thematic framework is not an alternative to proper funding of historic heritage conservation and should not be used as some sort of tool to justify underfunding. It should also be noted that historic sites that are not actively managed are still legally protected on DOC-managed conservation land.

In discussing the question of representativeness, Tony Walton raised a number of important questions that must be considered when selecting 'representative' samples of sites (T. Walton, DOC, pers. comm. 8 November 2005). Walton pointed out that while the concept of 'representativeness' may be usefully employed for specific purposes in conservation management, there is no one approach that

fits all circumstances. Problems can easily arise ‘due to conceptual muddles, inadequate methodologies, and lack of good information’ (T. Walton, DOC, pers. comm. 8 November 2005). Walton sees it as vital to:

‘be explicit about

‘What we are doing and why

‘What the values are that are being brought to the analysis

‘What the methodology being employed is’

Walton also sees it as essential that DOC does not overstate the quality of the data or data analysis used in the process of selecting ‘representative’ heritage sites. He understands representativeness to mean the identification of a group of sites that represent the diversity of the larger class of site from which they are drawn. To do this, it is important to decide on the appropriate size of the sample of representative sites. However, no matter what the size of the sample, its adequacy in representing other sites will always depend on the questions being asked. Walton makes the important points that:

‘The choice of what attributes to consider as relevant is a choice about values. Representativeness doesn’t avoid the need to handle values because it is as dependent on them as any other approach. It is not a neutral or objective construct based only on solid scientific principles, and this is as true of natural heritage as it is of historic heritage. In practice, representativeness is often used to pick winners and losers, e.g. for identifying sites to add to a register or for identifying places that can be “discarded”. The argument is that if a representative sample is protected then the others are redundant. But there are good grounds for thinking that this is never so.’ (T. Walton, DOC, pers. comm. 8 November 2005)

A number of different thematic systems have been applied within DOC. Therefore, before adopting any new thematic framework, DOC first needs to consider whether there are already systems in place that can carry out the selection, management and interpretation tasks that a thematic framework is expected to fulfil.

If it is decided that DOC should adopt a new thematic framework, a number of points need to be considered before selecting the framework:

- How does DOC intend to use the thematic framework(s)?
- What will be considered a ‘representative range’ of historic heritage sites and who will make these decisions?
- Should DOC adopt a modified version of frameworks used in other countries or devise a new system specific to New Zealand?
- Should DOC devise a framework in conjunction with other heritage agencies or develop its own system?

In the remainder of this section, these questions are addressed through an analysis of the effectiveness of the current systems being used in DOC and consideration of DOC’s requirements both nationally and at the conservancy level.

4.2.2 Historic Asset Management System

Actively managed historic sites were previously recorded under the Historic Asset Management System (HAMS), which categorised sites according to fabric types. While the categories appeared to be somewhat ad hoc, a number of factors

went into the development of these (Paul Mahoney, DOC, pers. comm. 24 August 2005). They were based not only on the way sites were recorded in the New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) Site Recording Scheme, but also on the frequency of occurrence of site types on DOC-managed conservation land. Although DOC has deliberately acquired some sites, others (e.g. historic animal control huts) have been acquired 'accidentally' through the acquisition of the land they are sited on (Paul Mahoney, DOC, pers. comm. 24 August 2005). In September 2002, actively managed historic sites were moved into the Visitor Assets Management System (VAMS).

4.2.3 Visitor Assets Management System

The national Visitor Assets Management System (VAMS) is based on site types and was devised to assist in the management and administration of visitor assets. Since 2004, DOC has maintained a list of Visitor Asset Management System (VAMS) 'site types'. Although it incorporates some broader historic themes, VAMS is essentially a fabric-based system, and its development was influenced to some extent by other fabric-based systems, such as the NZAA site register, but was also based around the frequency with which certain sites occurred among the historic heritage managed by DOC (P. Mahoney, DOC, pers. comm. 24 August 2005). It must also be noted that the VAMS typology was drawn up to apply to sites already being managed, not to categorise all historic sites on DOC-managed conservation land.

As outlined by Mahoney (2004), the VAMS site types as of March 2004 were:

- Coal mining
- Defence of New Zealand
- European discovery
- Failed settlement
- General farming
- General mining
- Gold mining
- Government service
- High country farming
- Land transport
- Maori
- Maritime
- Moriori
- New Zealand wars
- Other
- Power generation
- Sealing and whaling
- Timber industry
- Tourism and recreation

Tony Nightingale (2004: 16) commented that VAMS focuses on the physical aspects of historic sites, but omits costs such as historic research and community consultation, and consideration of the social significance of historic sites. This would appear to reinforce concerns that DOC may be underestimating the costs of maintaining historic heritage. Nightingale also noted that the VAMS categories

are neither consistent nor comprehensive. As an example, he cited the lumping of all sites of early Maori conflict in with a wide variety of other sites under the category 'Maori', while sites of Pakeha-Maori conflict have their own category under 'New Zealand wars' (Nightingale 2004: 16).

In considering whether to adopt a new thematic framework, DOC must first determine whether the VAMS site type is adequate for making decisions on conservation priorities, representativeness and interpretation. A number of DOC reports on the interpretation and management of historic sites, including a study of Wild Animal Control (WAC) huts (Kelly 2007: 55), the section of the DOC interpretation handbook covering the Ruapekapeka pa (Colquhoun 2005: 92), and a study of gold rush sites (Nightingale 2006: 12), have used the Australian Heritage Commission (AHC) thematic framework, showing that while it was considered necessary to use a thematic framework, VAMS was not considered up to the task.

In October 2005, Historic Heritage Technical Support Officers (TSOs) and staff from the Heritage Appreciation Unit (HAU), DOC, discussed issues surrounding the uses of thematic frameworks (Clayworth 2005). A number of TSOs argued that the current VAMS system was not appropriate for interpretation purposes in areas such as Northland, which have a large proportion of Maori sites, as all Maori sites are lumped together. Several attendees noted that a framework needed to have a more refined approach to Maori sites to be of any use for their management or interpretation.

TSOs pointed out that several conservancies had already devised their own thematic schemes for dealing with local historic sites. It was noted that when looking at local areas, thematic frameworks had to be used with other tools. In particular, heritage managers needed to know what sites existed in their areas, what values (including social and cultural significance) different people ascribed to these sites and which values should be taken into consideration. Rachael Egerton (TSO, Southland Conservancy) made the point that themes should not be regarded as a shortcut for understanding history.

In a discussion of the idea of representativeness, TSOs raised the question of how unique sites should be dealt with. It was suggested that a methodology needed to be devised to deal with questions regarding what constitutes a representative range of sites. Tony Walton (HAU Archaeologist) believed that thematic frameworks only worked well for interpretation and did not work for protection, management or representation. There appeared to be some support for the adoption of a thematic framework or frameworks in DOC, especially given the shortcomings identified with the VAMS system. However, Paul Mahoney (Senior TSO, HAU) maintained that the current VAMS scheme had been successful in getting projects funded, and that a great deal of resources and effort might have to go into devising a new scheme (Clayworth 2005).

It is evident that the list of VAMS site types cannot be regarded as a balanced thematic framework. This is clearly a result of the fact that VAMS was not devised to be a thematic framework. Rather, it was developed as a typology for the management of fabric by DOC and should not be regarded as an effective mechanism for selecting representative sites for active management, or as a strong interpretive tool.

4.2.4 The use of thematic frameworks by Southland Conservancy

Rachael Egerton (2001) has documented Southland Conservancy's development and use of a thematic framework. The framework was established in 1992, with the aim of selecting 73 sites for priority management out of an inventory of over 600 recorded sites. The initial inventory was built up from the NZAA Site Recording Scheme, with additional material from DOC records and staff knowledge, maps, local iwi, oral sources and secondary works of history. In addition to providing a list of historic sites, the inventory served as a basis for identifying the sites that most adequately represented the range of remaining historic resources in Southland. The management priorities for historic sites in Southland Conservancy were set out in the 'Southland Conservancy Historic Resources Management Plan' (1993), which aimed to prioritise active management for 73 sites that represented the historical diversity of their region, in recognition of the fact that the conservancy had a limited budget for historic site management. Egerton (2001: 95-96) noted that from 1995, Southland Conservancy adopted the definition of representativeness as set out in DOC's Historic Heritage Strategy:

'The extent to which a historic place or group of historic places represents, symbolically or typically, defined themes, aspects or periods of New Zealand history or the history of an area or region.' (DOC 1995: 9)

To select a representative range of historic places, a thematic framework was used in conjunction with area histories and significance criteria. As Egerton (2001: 96) described it: 'Themes were used to enable the context of history to be taken beyond the boundaries of management units selected for area histories. The area histories were designed to connect various thematic strands within landscape units'. The area histories were written first, and then the thematic framework was drawn up. The themes were devised using the information from the area histories, from primary and secondary historic material, and by comparison with the register of recorded sites.

The Southland themes were as follows:

- Maori—covering all activities prior to the arrival of other ethnic groups
- European discovery and exploration
- Sealing and whaling—including both Maori and Pakeha
- Early European settlements—in the case of all the areas administered by DOC, these are 'failed' settlements
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental protection
- Natural resource use—all non-mineral resource industries and activities, including saw milling, farming and hydro-electric development
- Mineral resource use
- Disasters—includes disasters and efforts to minimise them (shipwrecks, lighthouses, shipwreck depots, provision for war)
- Tourism

The inventory was used both to confirm the themes to be adopted and to exclude themes that were not represented on conservation land. For example, sites representing themes such as successful urban development do not tend to be on land that has been acquired by DOC. The thematic framework devised

was confined solely to historic activities relating to heritage sites currently represented on DOC land. The themes chosen all 'represent human activities that lead directly to the creation of historic resources that remain, rather than abstract ideas or written history' (Egerton 2001: 97). Such human activities were taken as the basis of the thematic framework, as the main objective was to select sites and fabric for management and preservation. Although the framework was not designed to set out themes in chronological order, many of the activities represented did occur in sequence.

Egerton (2001) pointed out some of the problems with the Southland Conservancy list of themes. In particular, she noted that the concentration of the thematic framework around 'paid work' and 'industry' tended to mean that the central roles played by women throughout the history of Southland were ignored. Egerton (2001) also saw the lumping of all early Maori history under one theme heading as a problem, as it obscures the Maori role in a wide variety of activities, including many of the themes identified as representative of events after European contact, which serves to marginalise the Maori role in Southland history. She noted that a separate theme was designated for Maori following consultation with representative Southland Maori groups. Egerton (2001: 98-99) suggested two possible improvements that could be adopted following appropriate consultation with representative tangata whenua groups:

1. Remove the separate Maori theme and revise the general themes to be more inclusive of Maori activities throughout Southland's history.
2. Keep a separate Maori section, but divide it into a variety of themes to better illustrate the diverse and changing nature of Maori history, e.g. places of mythical and legendary importance, settlements, resource sites, pathways and wahi tapu.

Egerton's concern over how Maori history should be represented in a New Zealand thematic framework highlights a very important issue that has not been adequately dealt with in the thematic framework models in other countries. As Egerton (2001) pointed out, DOC is at an advantage when adopting any framework in that it already administers or manages the land on which the sites in question are located. The system used in Southland was designed to concentrate on the management and conservation of heritage fabric rather than intangible heritage values, and it should be remembered that the framework was a tool that could only be useful as part of a toolkit that included an already established inventory of heritage fabric and a set of area histories (Egerton 2001: 99-100).

Egerton (2001: 100-104) considered the following to be important for the effective use of thematic frameworks:

- **Any thematic framework must be subject to regular review** As ideas about history change, so do the meanings societies give to historic artefacts. Regular and continual reviews of the thematic frameworks in use will accommodate changing views of the past and allow the systems in place to be improved in the light of new research.
- **Thematic frameworks should be based on an inventory of the resource as well as on written history** The best starting point for selecting representative heritage is to compile as comprehensive an inventory as

possible of the heritage that survives. Listing the available resources will help formulate an appropriate thematic framework. The framework should cover all aspects of the surviving material heritage and help in prioritising the heritage items to be conserved. Aspects of written history that are not represented in the surviving heritage fabric should not be included in such thematic frameworks. 'The aim is not to find landmarks that represent written history, but to select some representative heritage from the broad spectrum of all heritage' (Egerton 2001: 101).

- **Thematic frameworks should be combined with other selection criteria** A thematic framework should not be an exclusive tool but should be used in conjunction with evaluation of factors such as the aspects of history represented by a site; the physical integrity of the fabric in question; and the contemporary cultural value placed on the site by members of communities. Sites that are grouped together under particular thematic headings can be evaluated within such a grouping for their historical, physical and cultural values. Thematic frameworks being used for the interpretation of sites need to be more flexible, dynamic and interactive than frameworks being used for the selection of representative sites. Once a site has been chosen for management and conservation, a comprehensive study of that place should be carried out using the thematic framework in combination with other tools, such as local histories and fabric inventories.

Egerton (2001: 105) concluded that thematic frameworks can help organise heritage knowledge which, in turn, can help when making decisions about prioritisation of representative heritage to be managed and conserved. However, such results can only be achieved if thematic frameworks are used with a range of other research tools, including the study of local history and, above all, a comprehensive knowledge of the surviving heritage fabric.

For a variation on proposals from within DOC for a historic thematic framework, see Appendix 4, which outlines a proposal by Kevin Jones (Heritage Appreciation Unit, DOC) for a thematic framework for World Heritage in the Pacific.

4.2.5 National Heritage Identification Studies

Since DOC has only limited resources for the management of the many heritage sites on conservation land, it is necessary to decide which sites to actively manage. This is especially the case where DOC manages a considerable number of a particular type of historic fabric, such as Wild Animal Control (WAC) huts, lighthouses or historic bridges. The idea of representativeness can facilitate the prioritisation of selected heritage sites for management with a minimum of historic loss. To aid this decision-making process, a number of National Heritage Identification Studies (also referred to as National Context Studies) have been made (Paul Mahoney, DOC, pers. comm. 18 Nov 2006). These studies are comparable to the recent study that aided English Heritage in listing 40 classic cinemas around Britain as heritage buildings (Neil Cossons, speech to NZHPT conference, Napier, 4 October 2005; also see English Heritage 1999).

Although National Heritage Identification Studies do not provide a thematic framework, they use a thematic framework as part of their analytical toolkit. Since DOC does not have its own national historic thematic framework, the AHC

national framework has been adopted for use with National Heritage Identification Studies, to allow the fabric to be examined in the light of its role in historic contexts, which in turn will help inform decisions about which examples of fabric are representative of particular themes. As an example, Paul Mahoney has described how this would work in the case of a study of lighthouses: lighthouses and their associated buildings can be linked to the AHC theme of 'developing an economy linked to the world', through their role in maritime safety, and secondary links can also be made to other AHC themes, such as 'peopling the country' (again the link through the role of shipping in immigration); 'working' (in looking at the role of men and women living and working in isolation at lighthouse complexes); and 'education' (looking at both the training of lighthouse keepers and the problems of educating children in the isolation of lighthouse life) (Paul Mahoney, DOC, pers. comm. 18 November 2006).

Michael Kelly's (2007) report on WAC huts illustrates how the National Heritage Identification Studies use the AHC thematic framework (Kelly 2007: v-vi). The study used a 'research and analysis framework' that was based on the AHC framework, and was linked to the theme of 'evolution of the environment'. This theme was grouped together with the other eight themes from the AHC framework under an overall grouping of 'holistic New Zealand', and was broken into subthemes. The WAC huts were linked to the 'natural environment' subtheme, which was, in turn, broken into a number of categories. The WAC hut study was linked to the 'introduced pests' category. At each level of this system, allowance was made for 'boundary effects' (the cross-links between categories). The report itself largely consists of an account of the historic development of the Wild Animal Control programme and the associated hut-building activities, along with sections on the heritage value of huts and designs and building processes (Kelly 2007: 25-33).

Kelly (2007) also examined literature from the deer-culling experience in a section on 'the mythology of the deer culler'. This is clearly a cross-link with the theme of 'cultural life'. The section on the role of huts in recreation might also be seen as crossing over into the cultural life theme. The author could also perhaps have examined whether the themes of 'developing the economy' (protection of forest resource), 'working' (conditions of work and life for deer cullers), and 'educating' (in this case, training of deer cullers) would give any extra insights into the role of WAC huts. It is not clear from the text whether any such attempt was made. Overall, the report appears to have used a narrow range of themes with only a limited attempt to use the AHC thematic framework to link WAC huts into wider New Zealand historic stories. The report was sent out to DOC's Historic Heritage Technical Support Officers with a template for the nomination of huts for inclusion in a pool of nationally significant huts. This means that while the AHC thematic framework informed the writing of the original report, it may not have had much direct application to the final selection of WAC huts. Rachael Egerton argued that the AHC framework would not have been a particularly useful tool for the WAC hut report regardless of how it was applied as it has too many subthemes (making it ineffective, in her opinion) She suggested that a framework designed specifically for the New Zealand context may have been more useful (Rachael Egerton, DOC, pers. comm. 18 August 2006).

While a thematic framework is not essential for carrying out this type of study, it can help identify how the fabric in question fits into wider historic stories

and suggest extra layers of stories that might be told in the interpretation of the heritage fabric. This can give an extra dimension to the decision-making process involved in selecting a representative sample of historic fabric. However, the usefulness of a thematic framework will be largely dependent on how well the framework is designed for the task in hand.

5. Discussion

Thematic frameworks for historic heritage have two major uses:

- As tools to assist in the selection of sites for management, particularly when the aim is to select a representative sample of sites
- As tools for the interpretation of sites, especially where the aim is to connect such sites to wider historic stories and tell the stories of the sites from a variety of points of view

These two roles are not mutually exclusive; the ideal would be to devise a thematic framework that can be used for both roles.

Thematic frameworks have been adopted in the USA, Canada and Australia. All these countries have sufficiently similar histories to New Zealand to make them worthwhile as comparisons in the field of heritage management. It is not clear from the literature how effective the frameworks adopted in each of these countries have been in achieving the goals expected of them. There is some evidence from the USA that both professionals and volunteers managing heritage on the ground were initially unaware of the NPS thematic framework or, if they were aware of it, saw it as simply another 'box to tick' in the process of project planning. This does not mean that thematic frameworks are ineffective, but it does illustrate the necessity for them to be accepted by the people who work with historic heritage 'on the ground'. Thematic frameworks do appear to have helped in the process of connecting the stories of local sites to broader regional, national and international historic events. In NSW, thematic frameworks have proven useful for regional studies, and for studies of ethnic groups and the sites connected with them. In the regional studies, a combination of both the AHC and NSW thematic frameworks was used; in the ethnic studies, however, only the NSW framework was used. The use of the different frameworks for different studies indicates that one size does not fit all, and that thematic frameworks need to be selected or tailored for the particular task in hand. In both examples, thematic frameworks were always combined with local historic studies. In NSW, the AHC framework has also proven to be a valuable organising tool for the large body of reports on a variety of themes produced by the NSW Heritage Office.

While it is not clear to what degree the American, Canadian and Australian frameworks aided the selection of representative samples of heritage, they do seem to have encouraged a wider range of interpretation of sites. Thematic frameworks, when designed appropriately, help to reveal the stories of groups that otherwise might not have a voice in the interpretation of sites. This concept is given much attention in the material describing the frameworks, particularly with respect to indigenous peoples. However, it appears that this idea has not

been carried out in practice, as there is very little evidence that there was any consultation with indigenous people during the process of establishing thematic frameworks in the USA, Canada or Australia, with all the frameworks devised by teams of academics or 'experts'. All three countries have a large number of heritage sites associated with indigenous peoples, both pre- and post-European contact, including many sites that are significant for the interactions between first nations and colonising peoples. It would therefore seem that getting serious input and agreement from indigenous people on the structure and function of historic thematic frameworks should have been a priority. It could also be argued that getting input and support from the many community groups involved in heritage management, interpretation and use would lead to the development of thematic frameworks that can be used more effectively in the long term.

The adoption of some form of historic thematic framework beyond the systems already in use could assist the management of historic heritage in New Zealand. The system that is currently operating in DOC—VAMS—is not suitable for selecting a fully representative range of historic sites on conservation land. The list of categories currently used in VAMS was not designed to act as a set of all encompassing historic themes, but is a categorisation system applied to a group that has already been selected. A major shortcoming of VAMS is the fact that it lumps most Maori sites together under the category 'Maori', which is of little use for the management or interpretation of such sites. Also, the system has not been designed to interpret sites in such a way as to connect their stories into broader historic themes and allow the variety of historic voices in New Zealand to be heard. The inadequacy of VAMS for such roles is made clear by the fact that, on a number of occasions, DOC has used the AHC framework on an ad hoc basis (Kelly 2007: 55; Colquhoun 2005: 92; Nightingale 2006: 12); clearly indicating that, while it was seen as necessary to use a framework, DOC did not already have a national system suitable for these tasks.

Southland Conservancy devised an effective local thematic framework for selecting a representative sample of historic sites, demonstrating that frameworks can be used effectively. However, they must be tailored to the local situation and used in combination with local historic studies. The fact that Southland Conservancy had to devise its own framework illustrates the lack of an existing usable national framework for DOC in 1992. This situation still exists in 2008. The NZHPT has also been attempting to develop and use thematic frameworks, as seen in the Ruapehu/Rangitikei region.

Rebecca O'Brien and Paul Mahoney (DOC) have both argued that thematic frameworks are a good tool for selecting examples of specific types of fabric on a national level, e.g. coastal defence installations, lighthouses, WAC huts and baches. Again, they would be used in conjunction with other tools, such as resource inventories, local histories, national histories of fabric sites being investigated, and the input of experts and interest groups. The use of a thematic framework would help link the fabric in question to wider historic stories and help reveal the layers of historic stories connected with the sites. This would assist in the selection of sites for active management or registration under the Historic Places Act, and would also assist with the interpretation of the sites selected. The findings from this report indicate that a national thematic framework designed to assist with the management and interpretation of historic heritage would probably be a more effective tool for these purposes than the current

VAMS system. The experiences of the New South Wales Heritage Office, DOC's Southland Conservancy and the NZHPT in Ruapehu/Rangitikei all indicate that to work effectively a framework must be adaptable to local circumstances. It may, therefore, be sensible to adopt a national framework that acts as a model on which to base local frameworks, rather than a rigid template to be applied regardless of the area to which it is applied.

'Atawhai Ruamano Conservation 2000' put forward the aim of developing a combined national thematic system for DOC and the NZHPT. In the current situation, the ideal solution would appear to be for DOC, the NZHPT and the Ministry for Culture and Heritage (MCH) to devise a thematic framework following consultation with experts such as historians, architects and archaeologists, along with tangata whenua and other interest groups. Such a process could perhaps be led by MCH. However, any such process is likely to take a considerable period of time to complete. In the meantime, DOC should consider adopting its own thematic framework. This could be based on the Southland Conservancy's example, but informed by the examples of the Australian and North American systems (and by the Southland Conservancy's critique of their own framework). The framework should be adapted to allow for effective consultation with tangata whenua and have the flexibility to be adjusted to local situations. This would not prevent DOC from continuing to work with the NZHPT and MCH on the adoption of a nationwide framework.

Before adopting or devising any framework, DOC must be clear what the framework is to be used for. A thematic framework could be for the selection of representative sites for management; for the interpretation of sites; or for both of these tasks. It must be remembered that the main issue for DOC is not how to acquire and protect sites currently outside its jurisdiction, but how best to protect, manage and interpret sites already on public conservation land.

Regardless of the framework adopted, it is of the utmost importance to realise that thematic frameworks will not achieve results on their own. Instead, they need to be applied as one of a range of tools, especially when being used to select representative samples of sites for management. For example, in the NZHPT's Rangitikei/Ruapehu study, the thematic framework only worked well when used in combination with a specific historic study of the area in question, and was more successful when the broad themes of the framework were broken down into more specific subthemes relevant to the history of the region being studied (Rebecca O'Brien, pers. comm. 8 February 2005). The experience with Southland Conservancy has shown that when a thematic framework is used to select a representative range of sites for active management, it is most effective when used together with an inventory of local sites and a set of regional histories. Other factors, such as the physical condition of fabric, the aspects of history represented by the site and the cultural value placed on the site by the contemporary community, should also be taken into account. To determine whether a framework is doing the job for which it has been designed, it must also be re-evaluated on a regular basis.

The experiences of Southland Conservancy and of the NZHPT in Ruapehu/Rangitikei provide the best models of how to go about setting up thematic frameworks in the New Zealand situation. However, we can also apply the lessons learnt from the application of the Australian and North American systems. In

both the Southland and Ruapehu/Rangitikei cases, part of the aim of the project was to select a representative range of historic sites to reflect the heritage of a specific region. These two examples reflect practical efforts to apply and adapt thematic frameworks to local settings, with illustrations of problems and attempts to overcome these. In contrast, the literature on the use of thematic frameworks in other countries tends to be more focused on the theory of how thematic frameworks operate than on ways to overcome problems arising during such operations. Both of the New Zealand experiences suggest that the most sensible approach would be to use a national thematic framework as a model rather than as a prescription. Following the example of Southland Conservancy and the lessons learned from its experience, DOC conservancies could devise their own thematic frameworks, based on the model of the national system, but informed by their own heritage inventories and regional histories, and by consultation with tangata whenua and other interest groups. The national model would provide a benchmark against which local frameworks could be judged.

If one of the roles of an adopted thematic framework is as a tool to help in the selection of a representative range of sites on conservation land, then DOC must make some clear decisions at the beginning of the process. The Department needs to be clear as to whether it is identifying sites to be protected or identifying already protected sites to be actively managed. The 2005–2008 Statement of Intent stated that '*Representative Range* is about securing protection for examples of different types of historic and cultural places to adequately reflect the history and cultural character of our country and tell the story of important events that shaped its development' (DOC 2005). As Walton (DOC, pers. comm. 8 November 2005) pointed out, if DOC is attempting to select a representative range of sites it is important to:

- Spell out clearly what we are trying to achieve and why
- Make explicit the values being used in the selection process
- Be clear about the methodology being employed

The Southland Conservancy experience shows us that, rather than trying to secure protection for sites reflecting the historic and cultural character of New Zealand as a whole, the sensible approach is for DOC to work out which features of New Zealand's history and culture are featured in the historic sites on conservation land in each conservancy. The aim should then be to select sites that are representative of historic fabric and stories of each conservancy, while also considering the national and international significance of the sites. This would probably best be carried out on a conservancy by conservancy basis, using the combination of a thematic framework, an inventory of the heritage fabric in each conservancy, regional histories, and consultation with tangata whenua and other interest groups.

DOC must also decide whose stories will be told when sites are selected and interpreted. If DOC is serious about selecting a range of sites that are truly representative of the history connected with conservation land, there must be a real consideration of using a framework that tells the stories of those who often do not get a voice; for example, religious and ethnic minorities, women, workers (including working women), children and the economically powerless. While the positive elements of New Zealand's stories should be told, any range of sites selected should also include sites of conflict, and even sites of shame, which

tell less-pleasant stories of our history. Anything else runs the risk of being an exercise in sanitising our history. The thematic frameworks devised in the USA, Canada and Australia allow a range of stories to be told about the same sites, so that many voices are represented in the historic narrative. While this allows for indigenous voices to be heard, the fact remains that the framework within which these stories are told is one devised by experts from the colonising cultures, rather than a framework devised in partnership with the indigenous people.

As a tool for both management and interpretation of Maori-related sites, a thematic framework is only useful if it does not lump all such sites together under the general category of 'Maori'. A large proportion of the heritage sites on conservation land are areas of great significance to Maori. DOC is obliged, through the Conservation Act 1987, to 'give effect to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi'. DOC should therefore work through our Pou Kura Taiao to consider what role tangata whenua will have in devising thematic frameworks in particular conservancies (advisory or a full partnership in the decision-making process). Such a process should also consider whether tangata whenua consider there is value in adopting thematic frameworks. DOC should take into account the opinions of tangata whenua when selecting sites for active management. DOC should also decide to what extent the stories of sites such as Otatarā and Ruapekapeka will be told by technical experts, who are generally Pakeha, and by tangata whenua. As the good will of tangata whenua will be essential in the future management of Maori sites, these questions need to be given serious consideration.

6. Conclusions and recommendations

The current study revealed that there is limited literature on how effective historic thematic frameworks have been in achieving their stated goals. However, there is some evidence that thematic frameworks can be useful tools for selecting sites for management and the interpretation of the sites selected. They have been used extensively in the USA, Canada and Australia, but it is not yet clear how effective they have been in carrying out the tasks for which they were designed. They do appear to have allowed for a greater linking of local sites into larger historic stories and for the telling of a wider range of stories in the interpretation of historic sites. It is clear from all three of these countries and New Zealand that thematic frameworks work best when tailored to local situations and when used as one of a variety of tools in the management and interpretation processes. Thematic frameworks also appear to have a definite value as one of the tools to be used in nationwide management studies of specific types of fabric, such as WAC huts or lighthouses.

The current report identifies that DOC may well benefit from adopting a thematic framework, as the current VAMS system is not designed for the selection of sites for active management or for interpretation of sites. It is recommended that any national framework adopted should be seen largely as a model for devising frameworks at the conservancy level, which should be developed in the

context of local resource inventories, regional histories, and consultation with tangata whenua and other local interest groups. The lack of consultation with indigenous groups in the devising of thematic frameworks in other countries is a good reason to avoid adopting an exact copy of any of these models. It would be more appropriate for DOC to use the systems trialled in New Zealand (such as those in Southland Conservancy and NZHPT in Ruapehu/Rangitikei, which were devised to suit local conditions) as models. We should, however, try to learn from the application of frameworks in Australia and North America. Any nationwide thematic framework would provide both a model and a benchmark against which local frameworks could be compared to ensure consistency and rigour.

As a next step forward, DOC needs to:

- Develop an appropriate framework to be used on public conservation land, bearing in mind that this may have to be adapted if a nationwide system is adopted in conjunction with MCH and the NZHPT
- Reopen negotiations with MCH and the NZHPT over establishing a nationwide thematic framework

If DOC, the NZHPT and MCH can agree to go ahead with a national thematic framework, the ideal situation would be to engage with leaders in New Zealand historic research and heritage management, including tangata whenua representatives. These experts should be asked to collaborate in developing guidelines for the design of a thematic framework.

If DOC is to select a representative range of sites for management, there must be clear exposition of the goals of this exercise, the values employed in the selection process and the methodology employed to make this selection. If DOC chooses to use thematic frameworks as a tool in the interpretation of sites, choices must be made as to whose stories will be told and whether the more controversial or unpleasant stories associated with sites should be included.

Any national thematic framework that is adopted should be:

- Open to review
- A guide to conservancies to enable them to devise frameworks that are adjusted to their local situations rather than being prescriptive
- Used in conjunction with an inventory of heritage sites and with existing or specifically commissioned local histories, when used in a local context
- Used with evaluation criteria that includes the historical, physical and cultural significance of sites
- Used in conjunction with criteria devised in consultation with tangata whenua and other local interest groups and stakeholders

7. Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Bronek Kazmierow (DOC) for his input in developing several of the ideas in this report. I wish to thank Rachael Egerton, Paul Mahoney and Rebecca O'Brien for their advice on this project. This research was funded by DOC (Science Investigation No. 3760).

8. References

- Adams, P. 1987: Themes in New Zealand History. New Zealand Historic Places Trust internal paper (unpublished).
- AHC (Australian Heritage Commission) 2001: Australian historic themes: a framework for use in heritage assessment and management. Australian Heritage Commission, Canberra.
- Auditor-General 2006: Department of Conservation: planning for and managing publicly owned land. Performance Audit Report, Office of the Auditor-General, Wellington. <http://www.oag.govt.nz/2006/doc-landholdings/> (viewed 12 November 2006).
- Barber, I.; McLean, G. 2000: Heritage and the big picture: reading a cultural landscape. Pp. 91–105 in Trapeznik, A. (Ed.): *Common ground? Heritage and public places in New Zealand*. University of Otago Press, Dunedin.
- Brew, A. 2001: World War II aerodromes and associated structures in NSW. NSW Heritage Office & Deakin University, Sydney. www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/docs/aerodromes_intro.pdf and www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/docs/aerodromes_study.pdf (viewed 12 February 2006).
- Burton, J.; Farrell, M.; Lord, F.; Lord, R. 2002: *Confinement and ethnicity: an overview of World War II Japanese American relocation sites*. University of Washington Press, Seattle.
- Challis, A. 2003: New preliminary draft thematic framework for the Register. New Zealand Historic Places Trust internal paper (unpublished).
- Cisneros, J. 2005: Memorializing shame. *The Albuquerque Tribune*, 7 June 2005.
- Clayworth, P. 2005: Notes from TSO/HAU meeting, Department of Conservation, Napier, 6 October 2005 (unpublished).
- Colquhoun, F. (Ed.) 2005: *Interpretation handbook and standard: distilling the essence*. Department of Conservation, Wellington.
- DOC (Department of Conservation) 1995: *Atawhai Ruamano Conservation 2000: Historic Heritage Strategy*. Department of Conservation, Wellington.
- DOC (Department of Conservation) 2005: *Statement of Intent 2005–2008*. Department of Conservation, Government Printer, Wellington.
- DOC (Department of Conservation) 2006a: *Historical and Cultural Heritage Framework*. Department of Conservation, Wellington.
- DOC (Department of Conservation) 2006b: *Statement of Intent 2006–2009*. Department of Conservation, Government Printer, Wellington.
- Dunkerly, R.M. 2003: Our history's history. *The George Wright Forum* 20(1): 18–24.
- Egerton, R. 2001: Themes as a tool in heritage management. Pp. 92–106 in: *Historic Heritage Workshop Proceedings: Turnbull House, Bowen Street, Wellington*. Department of Conservation, Wellington.
- English Heritage 1999: *Picture palaces: new life for old cinemas*. English Heritage, London.

- Feller, L.; Miller, P.P. 2000: Public history in the parks: history and the National Park Service. *American Historical Association: Perspectives*, January 2000. www.historians.org/perspectives/issues/2000/0001/0001pub1.cfm (viewed 3 October 2005).
- HSMBC (Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada) 2005: About the HSMBC. www.pc.gc.ca/clmhc-hsmbc/clmhc-hsmbc/index_E.asp (viewed 31 August 2005).
- Kass, T. 2003: Central west thematic history. NSW State Heritage Office, Sydney. www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/docs/thematchistory_centralwest.pdf (viewed 12 February 2006).
- Kass, T. 2005: Western Sydney thematic history. NSW State Heritage Office, Sydney. www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/docs/ThematicHistory_WesternSydney.pdf (viewed 12 February 2006).
- Kelly, M. 2007: Wild Animal Control Huts: National Heritage Identification Study. Department of Conservation. 75 p. <http://www.doc.govt.nz/template/MultiPageDocumentTOC.aspx?id=44580>
- Kevin, C.; Pesman, R. 2001: A history of Italian settlement in NSW. NSW Heritage Office, Sydney. www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/docs/italianhistory.pdf (viewed 12 February 2006).
- Linenthal, E.T. 2002: Violence and the American landscape: the challenge of public history. *OAH Magazine of History* 16, Winter 2002. www.oah.org/pubs/magazine/publichistory/linenthal.html (viewed 9 October 2005).
- Little, B. 2000: Using the revised thematic framework. Pp. 15–25 in: History in the National Park Service: themes and concepts. National Park Service, Washington, DC.
- Mahoney, P. 2004: Heritage inventory guideline. DOC internal memo. Department of Conservation, Wellington (unpublished).
- McLean, G. 1996: Meanings to an end: a draft national thematic framework for historic places in New Zealand. New Zealand Historic Places Trust (unpublished).
- McLean, G. 2002: 100 historic places in New Zealand. Hodder Moa Beckett, Auckland.
- Nightingale, T. 2004: Improving historic interpretation standards. Department of Conservation (unpublished).
- Nightingale, T. 2006: A national interpretation scheme for conservation management of historic goldrush sites. *Science for Conservation* 262. Department of Conservation, Wellington. 64 p.
- NPS (National Park Service) 2000: History in the National Park Service: themes and concepts. National Park Service, Washington, DC.
- NPS (National Park Service) Archaeology program 2005: The Earliest Americans Theme Study. www.cr.nps.gov/archeology/PUBS/NHLEAM/H.htm (viewed 9 October 2005).
- NSW (New South Wales) Heritage Office 1996: History and heritage: the use of historical context and themes in heritage assessment. NSW Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning, Sydney. www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/docs/hm_history&heritage.pdf (viewed 9 October 2005).
- NSW (New South Wales) Heritage Office 1998: Heritage Information Series: Aboriginal history and heritage: a guide. NSW Heritage Office, Sydney. www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/docs/info_aboriginal.pdf (viewed 12 February 2006).
- NSW (New South Wales) Heritage Office 2004 Thematic histories and heritage studies held in the NSW Heritage Office Library as at 22/12/04. NSW Heritage Office, Sydney. www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/docs/thematchistories.pdf (viewed 12 February 2006).
- Parks Canada 2000: National Historic Sites of Canada System Plan—Thematic Framework. www.pc.gc.ca/docs/r/system-reseau/sec2/sites-lieux16_e.asp (viewed December 2005).
- Parks Canada 2001: The state of protected heritage areas 2001. Parks Canada, Ottawa.
- Pearson, M.; Sullivan, S. 1999: Looking after heritage places: the basics of heritage planning for managers, landowners and administrators. Melbourne University Press, Melbourne.
- Radio New Zealand 2005: A nation's heritage. 5 CD set, NRP0628. Radio New Zealand, Wellington.
- Reece, M. 2005: 'The Little Bighorn Battlefield National Memorial and an Indian memorial after 1988.' <http://www.friendslittlebighorn.com/Reecethesis.pdf> (viewed 3 May 2006).

- Shine, G. 1999: An exploration and critical analysis of the role of memory in Cold War historical interpretation at the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's Nike Missile Site SF-88'. <http://userwww.sfsu.edu/~epf/1999/shine.html> (viewed 2 December 2005).
- Spennemann, D.H.R. 2004: Your solution, their problem. Their solution, your problem: the Gordian knot of cultural heritage planning and management at the local government level. Paper presented at the Planning Institute of Australia Conference 2004: Planning on the Edge, Hobart, 22-26 February 2004.
- Turnbull, C.; Valiotis, C. 2001: Beyond the rolling wave: a thematic history of Greek settlement in NSW. NSW State Heritage Office, Sydney. www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/docs/greekhistory.pdf (viewed 12 February 2006).
- Velthuis, K. 2005: The Dutch in NSW: a thematic history. NSW Heritage Office and Charles Sturt University. www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/docs/thematichistory_dutch.pdf (viewed 12 February 2006).
- Warren-Findley, J. 2001: Human heritage management in New Zealand in the year 2000 and beyond. Ian Axford New Zealand Fellowship in Public Policy, Wellington.
- Williams, M. 1999: Chinese settlement in NSW: a thematic history. NSW State Heritage Office, Sydney. www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/docs/chinesehistory.pdf (viewed 12 February 2006).

Appendix 1

POTENTIAL 'SITES OF SHAME' OR 'SITES OF CONSCIENCE' IN NEW ZEALAND

Sites that memorialise inhumane or intolerant acts or events within New Zealand could include the following:

- The sites of Taranaki Maori massacres of Moriori on the Chatham Islands/ Rekohu/Wharekauri.
- Sites of musket war killings and depopulation, such as Papaitonga, where Ngati Toa killed hundreds of Mua Upoko tribespeople.
- Sites of violence from the New Zealand Wars, such as Ngatapa where Ngati Porou allies of the Crown killed 120 followers of Te Kooti after their surrender in 1869.
- Sites connected with the confiscation of land during the New Zealand Wars and resulting displacement of tangata whenua.
- Sites associated with the destruction of wahi tapu, such as the site of the tapu rock Te Toka a Taiau in Gisborne Harbour, which the Marine Department dynamited in 1877 on the grounds it was a navigation hazard.
- Sites of imprisonment of prisoners from the New Zealand Wars, of Parihaka prisoners and of conscientious objectors from the two World Wars.
- Sites associated with industrial violence, such as the mine remains at Waihi, the town where striker Frederick George Evans was killed by strike breakers in 1912.
- Sites of incidents of ethnic, religious or other civil conflict, such as the Hokitika 'Fenian riots' of 1868, the Timaru 'Orange riots' of 1879, and sites of rioting between New Zealand and American servicemen from 1943 to 1945.
- The site of the Featherston prison camp, where 48 Japanese POWs were shot dead during a riot in 1943.

While contemplating the negative aspects of New Zealand history, it might also be appropriate to include narratives of environmental destruction, e.g. moa butchering sites, sealing and whaling sites, sites of erosion from farming and mining activities, and sites such as Stephens Island (Takapourewa), where the lighthouse keeper's cat reputedly killed off the last surviving Stephens Island wrens. Many, but not all, of these sites will be on conservation land.

In a similar vein, sites connected with disasters or economic failure could also be included, e.g. sites connected with the 1930s Depression such as the 'bridge to nowhere' at Mangaparua, the Charming Creek coal mine site and access way, and Cecil King's hut in Kahurangi.

Appendix 2

TOPICS THAT HELP DEFINE THE NPS REVISED THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Peopling places:

- Family and the life cycle
- Health, nutrition and disease
- Migration from outside and within
- Community and neighbourhood
- Ethnic homelands
- Encounters, conflicts and colonisation

Creating social institutions and movements:

- Clubs and organisations
- Reform movements
- Religious institutions
- Recreational activities

Expressing cultural values:

- Educational and intellectual currents
- Visual and performing arts
- Literature
- Mass media
- Architecture, landscape architecture and urban design
- Popular and traditional culture

Shaping the political landscape:

- Parties, protests and movements
- Governmental institutions
- Military institutions and activities
- Political ideas, cultures and theories

Developing the American economy:

- Extraction and production
- Distribution and consumption
- Transportation and communication
- Workers and work culture
- Labour organisations and protests
- Exchange and trade
- Governmental policies and practices
- Economic theory

Expanding science and technology:

- Experimentation and invention
- Technological applications
- Scientific thought and theory
- Effects on lifestyle and health

Transforming the environment:

- Manipulating the environment and its resources
- Adverse consequences and stresses on the environment
- Protecting and preserving the environment

The changing role of the USA in the world community:

- International relations
- Commerce
- Expansionism and imperialism
- Immigration and emigration policies

Appendix 3

THE CANADIAN NATIONAL THEMATIC FRAMEWORK 2000: THEMES AND SUBTHEMES

1. Peopling the Land:

- Canada's earliest inhabitants
- Migration and immigration
- Settlement
- People and the environment

2. Governing Canada:

- Politics and political processes
- Government institutions
- Security and law
- Military and defence
- Canada and the world

3. Expressing intellectual and cultural life:

- Learning and the arts
- Architecture and design
- Science
- Sports and leisure
- Philosophy and spirituality

4. Building social and community life:

- Community organisations
- Religious institutions
- Education and social well-being
- Social movements

5. Developing economies:

- Hunting and gathering
- Extraction and producing
- Trade and commerce
- Technology and engineering
- Labour
- Communications and transportation

Appendix 4

HISTORIC THEMATIC FRAMEWORK PROPOSED BY GAVIN MCLEAN

The following Historic Thematic Framework was proposed by Gavin McLean in *Meanings to an End: A Draft Thematic Framework for Historic Places in New Zealand* (1996):

1. Peopling the land:

- Migrating to and from New Zealand
- Migrating within New Zealand
- Special settlements
- Disputing settlement

2. Providing and consuming health and social services and marking phases in the life cycle:

- Providing and consuming health services
- Providing and consuming social services and welfare
- Marking phases in the private life cycle

3. Building New Zealand settlements and communities:

- Planning settlements
- Building and developing villages, towns and cities
- Governing at the local level

4. Transforming the environment:

- Responding to natural events
- Manipulating the environment
- Protecting and preserving the environment

5. Developing the New Zealand economy:

- Surveying resources
- Developing extractive industries
- Developing other primary industries
- Producing, distributing and selling foodstuffs for New Zealand and the international market
- Developing manufacturing and other secondary industries
- Developing tertiary industries and services
- Developing transport, communications and marketing industries
- Financing New Zealand
- Struggling with remoteness, hardship and failure
- Undertaking scientific advance and innovation
- Creating and propounding economic theory
- Developing the 'black' economy

Continued on next page

6. Working in New Zealand:

- Recruiting and shedding labour
- Formulating responses to harsh conditions
- Working in the paid economy
- Working in the unpaid economy
- Creating, propounding and enforcing industrial relations theory, policies and practices

7. Governing New Zealand:

- Governing
- Providing for the common defence
- Administering and dispensing justice
- Administering race relations

8. Developing New Zealand cultural institutions and ways of life:

- Educational and intellectual trends
- Creating visual and performing arts, literature and crafts
- Forming and maintaining social, spiritual and cultural associations
- Paying public tribute
- Creating New Zealand folklore
- Pursuing leisure activities

Appendix 5

PROPOSAL FOR A THEMATIC FRAMEWORK FOR WORLD HERITAGE IDENTIFICATION IN THE PACIFIC

Kevin Jones is a DOC archaeologist who has been involved for many years with the UNESCO World Heritage convention and the selection of World Heritage sites in the Pacific. The ‘World Heritage—Pacific 2009’ meeting, held at Tongariro in 2004, recognised the value of developing a thematic framework to assist in identifying potential World Heritage cultural sites in the Pacific and to evaluate those sites nominated. Jones and Ali Tabbasum Salamat (UNESCO), developed the brief for a paper on this subject. Jones’ proposals for a Pacific thematic framework, as outlined below, were set out in a paper prepared for the World Heritage Centre, Paris, and presented to a World Heritage meeting at Port Vila, Vanuatu, 5-8 September 2005 (Jones 2005: 2-3, 33).

Jones (2005: 5) defined themes as ‘story elements that can be used to establish or to demonstrate the significance of a place’. He developed a set of potential themes and subthemes directly for the Pacific, loosely based on the NPS’s thematic framework. These were:

Peopling places

- Migration from outside and within
- Encounters, conflict and colonisation

Creating social institutions and movements

- Religious institutions

Expressing cultural values

- Visual and performing arts
- Architecture, landscape architecture and urban design
- Popular and traditional culture

Shaping the political landscape

- Political ideas, cultures and theories

Developing the Pacific economy

- Extraction and production
- Exchange and trade

Expanding science and technology

- Scientific thought and theory

Transforming the environment

- Manipulating the environment and its resources
- Adverse consequences and stresses on the environment

Changing role of the Pacific in the world

- Expansion and imperialism

Jones (2005) then compared these themes with those set out in the 1994 guidance from the World Heritage Centre and argued that, with the exception of issues of imperialism and adverse effects on the environment, which were better

covered by the NPS-based framework, there was a reasonable fit between the two frameworks. The framework set out by the World Heritage Centre is:

Human coexistence with the land:

- Movement of peoples
- Settlement
- Modes of subsistence
- Technological evolution

Human beings in society:

- Human interaction
- Cultural coexistence
- Spirituality and creative expression

Jones (2005) proposed that the Pacific be divided into six sub-regions for realistic application of a thematic framework. He also put forward more specific themes derived from his proposed framework, as a basis for nominating World Heritage sites:

1. The Pasifika-Europe 'encounter'
2. Discovery in tradition and the first settlement story established by archaeology and other scientific disciplines
3. Ceremonial centres, which can also represent the intangible values of the Pacific, such as Polynesian traditions of the founding of the earth, sea and sky
4. Horticulture and horticultural landscapes
5. The societal competition and island environmental degradation that has arguably shaped many small islands

Jones' ideas on a thematic framework for the nomination and selection of Pacific World Heritage sites remain at the proposal level. He acknowledged that any framework would have to be adaptable to local situations. Jones recommended that an improved format of his proposed framework be adopted by the World Heritage Committee as a basis for encouraging further work, preparation and analysis of tentative site lists, and for the evaluation of the final World Heritage proposals (Jones 2005: 31-32). As Jones' thematic framework is still at the proposal level, it is not possible as yet to judge its effectiveness, but a clear early question is whether a framework based on the American NPS system will be readily adopted by the indigenous peoples of the Pacific.

The conclusions from Jones' work, after consideration at the Vanuatu meeting of September 2005, were later published as Thematic Framework for World Heritage in the Pacific 5-8 September 2005, Port Vila, Vanuatu- Report.

References

- Jones, K.L. 2005: World heritage in the Pacific: a provisional thematic framework for trans-boundary and serial cultural site nominations. Paper prepared for the World Heritage Centre, Paris, for a meeting at Port Vila, Vanuatu, 5-8 September 2005. Prepared on behalf of ICOMOS (unpublished).

Do thematic frameworks assist in managing and interpreting historic heritage?

In this report, the use of thematic frameworks in the management of historic heritage is discussed and the question of whether frameworks allow a more representative sample of historic sites to be managed is considered. A comparison of how thematic frameworks have been applied in the USA, Canada and Australia, and a summary of their effectiveness is included. The previous and current use of thematic frameworks in New Zealand is then summarised and the question of whether any framework adopted in New Zealand in the future should be a general copy of the systems used in other countries or a unique system is considered.

Clayworth, P. 2008: Historic heritage thematic frameworks: their use as tools for management and interpretation. *Science for Conservation* 285. 56 p.