Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Local Environment

The International Journal of Justice and Sustainability

ISSN: 1354-9839 (Print) 1469-6711 (Online) Journal homepage: www.tandfonline.com/journals/cloe20

Indigenous rights and managed public land: a critical treaty analysis of parks and reserves in New Zealand

Robin Quigg & Els Russell

To cite this article: Robin Quigg & Els Russell (25 Aug 2025): Indigenous rights and managed public land: a critical treaty analysis of parks and reserves in New Zealand, Local Environment, DOI: 10.1080/13549839.2025.2543308

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2025.2543308

LOCAL ENVIRONMENT
https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2025.2543308

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Indigenous rights and managed public land: a critical treaty analysis of parks and reserves in New Zealand

Robin Quigg and Els Russell

Te Tari Hauora Tūmatanui | Department of Preventive and Social Medicine, Otago Medical School, Dunedin, New Zealand

ABSTRACT

This research critically examines the extent to which the Reserves Act 1977, the primary legislative framework governing many parks and reserves, especially those associated with territorial local authorities, aligns with and upholds Indigenous Māori values and rights guaranteed under Te Tiriti o Waitangi, the Treaty of Waitangi. Using Critical Tiriti Analysis (CTA), a methodological approach developed by Indigenous Māori scholars, we assess the Act's responsiveness to Te Tiriti and explore opportunities to embed Māori perspectives in public land management. Our study highlights the colonial underpinnings of current governance and reveals how the implicit recognition of Te Tiriti in conservation law fails to honour Māori rights fully. We identify legislative gaps by analysing local government land management practices and national land database records and propose pathways for integrating Māori-led stewardship into parks and reserves governance. As Indigenous Māori researchers with lived experiences of land alienation, we position this work within broader conversations on decolonising and re-indigenising public land management. We argue that true partnership under Te Tiriti may require the uncoupling of Māori land from the Reserves Act 1977 to restore tino rangatiratanga (self-determination) of ancestral lands. Our research underscores the potential for parks and reserves to serve as sites of cultural and environmental restoration, enacting ahi kā and reinforcing the vital connection between Māori identity and whenua (land).

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 10 February 2025
Accepted 16 July 2025

KEYWORDS
Indigenous Māori; treaty of Waitangi; parks and reserves; decolonisation

Introduction

In 2024, the Honourable Hana-Rāwhiti Maipi-Clarke, the youngest Member of Parliament for New Zealand (NZ), staged a powerful protest opposing a proposed bill that challenged established interpretations of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, which is also known as the Treaty of Waitangi (TOW). By tearing up the draft legislation and performing a haka – traditional Māori actions with rhythmical words symbolising resistance and challenge, the enduring tensions between Māori sovereignty and Crown authority (e.g. see Harris 2004; Joseph et al. 2019) were underscored. This protest and a series of nationwide marches by both

CONTACT Robin Quigg robin.quigg@otago.ac.nz Te Tari Hauora Tūmatanui | Department of Preventive and Social Medicine, Otago Medical School, PO Box 56, Dunedin 9054, New Zealand

Māori and non-Māori in 2024, highlight the contemporary relevance and continuation of historical struggles over Māori land rights and sovereignty.

Te Tiriti o Waitangi is a key founding document. Signed in 1840, the Māori version of the text (Te Tiriti) embedded notions of partnership between Māori and arriving settlers (Orange 2020). Te Tiriti, the version of the Treaty that was most likely to be signed by Māori, granted Māori sovereignty over their people, lands and treasures while establishing Crown governance over newly arrived British populations. Despite these guarantees, Māori rights have continued to be eroded through justifications based on its mistranslation, the Treaty of Waitangi (TOW). There is a clear distinction between Te Tiriti and the TOW's guarantees. The TOW asserts that Māori ceded sovereignty to the British Crown to govern over all those living in NZ (Tunks 1999). Further, ignoring the international legal doctrine of contra proferentem (Came et al. 2023), the Crown also used this interpretation and a clause of pre-emption (sole rights given to the Crown to purchase land held under Māori customary title) to obtain vast swathes of Māori land and resources that today lie in Crown control beneath our cities and urban spaces (Thom 2022).

Land dispossession has shaped Māori society and influenced present-day social, health, education and economic outcomes, which fall behind those of non-Māori counterparts (Hall et al. 2021; McAllister et al. 2020; Michel et al. 2019; Reid, Taylor-Moore, and Varona 2014; Thom 2022; Walker et al. 2019). Te Tiriti is mainly absent from colonial policy development, but the Treaty of Waitangi is referenced in many legislative and policy arrangements, identifying a need to engage Māori in decision-making across the governance spectrum to ensure policy achieves equitable outcomes. While this could be regarded as progress towards recognising Māori rights, these references are often vague, refer to the Treaty of Waitangi or just its principles, failing to acknowledge unceded sovereignty and the rights granted by Te Tiriti for Māori.

Maintaining strong connections to land is central to Māori well-being and, as Whitinui (2011) emphasises, it is worth fighting for. For example, Taiapa, Barnes, and McCreanor (2021) have stated that reclaiming land through māra kai (food gardens) as expressions of ahi kā, could defy Western dominance, demonstrating resistance to land alienation. Similarly, Hond, Ratima, and Edwards (2019) also recommended urban māra kai as a vehicle to reclaim and reconnect with land and with food production, enabling the subversion of the colonial processes of urbanisation that estranged many iwi and hapū from their tūrangawaewae, their traditional lands. In New Zealand, the generational impacts of land alienation are stark, where even land that does not appear occupied holds colonial histories.

Parks and reserves were a key component of colonial land alienation. Even before the organised settlement of New Zealand, the New Zealand Company laid out public parks and green spaces in their proposed town plans in the 1830s as positive actions supporting settlement (Beattie 2008). Linda Tuhiwai Smith, however, was less optimistic about the colonial actions associated with defining public spaces, identifying that there was a "specific spatial vocabulary of colonialism which can be assembled around three concepts, lines, the centre and the outside" (Smith 2012, 55). This colonial ideology lives on today in current parks and reserves legislation and policy (Pihama et al. 2023), with TOW sporadically included in legislation focused on parks and reserves more generally, and meaningful engagement with Māori largely missing. This fails to represent the notions of a partnership between two parties, each maintaining distinct spheres

of control over their people. It also ignores how the TOW departs from Māori understandings of Te Tiriti. Our research focuses on these greenspaces as defined by Taylor and Hochuli (2017) as parks and reserves managed by local authorities and central government agencies. We are particularly interested in parks and reserves managed by local authorities, as the Crown and Māori relationship differs from that of the relationship Māori have with local authorities in New Zealand. The Crown agency, Department of Conservation (DOC), responsible overall for parks and reserves in NZ, has regional boards which must have Indigenous Māori representation (Taiepa et al. 1997). In contrast, local authorities have a much less clear, and perhaps more contested, involvement of Māori in their governance and operational matters (des Forges 2024; Raerino et al. 2021).

There has been comprehensive research that has addressed Māori land loss generally (Dew et al. 2016; Hogarth and Rapata-Hanning 2023; Kawharu 2013) and some consideration of the impacts of climate change on Māori in urban environments (Johnson, Parsons, and Fisher 2021), but a Māori exploration of parks and reserves is a less-understood research domain. A more common focus of research associated with greenspaces is demonstrated by Markevych et al. (2017). They describe how greenspaces that include parks, gardens and forests facilitate good health through three main functions: mitigating the effects of noise, air pollution and heat in urban environments; facilitating the psychological restoration of health as natural environments; and building human capacity through encouraging physical activity and social engagement. However, much of the greenspace literature, such as that by Taylor and Hochuli (2017), is silent about Indigenous involvement and association with these public lands. Thus, before undertaking research into the role of parks and reserves for Māori, our research group conducted a scoping review examining Indigenous engagement in parks and reserve management.

This scoping review defined greenspaces as parks and reserves, excluding national parks, across four settler-colonial nations: New Zealand, Australia, the United States, and Canada. (Russell, Quigg, and McDonald 2024). A paper detailing the scoping review is in the process of publication, but briefly, three themes emerged from the review (5,802 captured articles screened, 312 included for full-text review, resulting in analysis of 102 included articles). The first theme focused on the dualistic approach of parks and reserves, where humans and nature are separate binaries. This grounds Western understandings that parks and reserves must be managed for a particular conceptual purpose, such as tourism or recreation. These conceptualisations are focused on Western priorities and are often exclusionary for Indigenous communities, as their interest and values associated with parks and reserves do not often align with these definitions of purpose. Arnberger (2001) and Slaymaker, Catto, and Kovanen (2020) stated that framing nature as empty of humans marginalises Indigenous populations, preventing them from carrying out long-standing practices in parks and reserves and limiting their ability to interact and engage in these spaces. Historically, similar arguments were used in reference to the colonisation of whole nations, such as references to "terra nullius" in Australia, where Torres strait islanders and Aboriginals were largely removed from existence so as not to disrupt colonial objectives. While the sentiment of separating human activities from nature and protected areas builds on these colonial histories, it can also represent a more specific exclusion of Indigenous people and Indigenous activities. In a sense, recognising existence but not validity (Ngata 2019).

The second theme focused on the significant global variation in the extent of Indigenous engagement and participation in parks and reserves management. This focused on the role of parks and reserves as both tools for historic and continuing colonisation and, at times, as a vessel for decolonisation. Some authors proposed that the protection of natural values, as a reason for parks and reserves, provided the rationale for continued dispossession (Brown 1992; Colchester 2003; Coombes 2007; Finegan 2018). Two other authors, King et al. (2023) and Houde and Lemyre (2021) reported on the role of parks and reserves in supporting the protection of land and values associated with Indigenous communities. This notion of parks and reserves acting as decolonial tools to protect Indigenous land aspirations through conservation was a contested opinion, as other authors noted the inability to truly separate managed land from its colonial history or dispossession (McAvoy 2002; Simpson and Bagelman 2018).

The third theme of the scoping review showed that while there were legislative and policy frameworks at international, national, and local levels promoting, allowing, or facilitating Indigenous peoples' involvement in park and reserve management, there were varying degrees of engagement and success (Wilson and Pearce 2017). Literature suggests this is primarily due to the disconnect between international legislation and local contexts, whereby legislative requirements do not allow local practice (Hill 2006). This lack of applicability has led to many Indigenous communities opting to utilise informal agreements to co-manage protected land (Ayre and Verran 2010; Coombes 2007). While these agreements are favourable for allowing Indigenous people's influence in governance arrangements, they come without legal accountability. Bock et al. (2022) note that agreements can be left unfulfilled by partnering agencies, and their informal nature can limit the resources available for the protected area in question. Closing off this theme was the notion that Indigenous groups must adopt unfamiliar management frameworks and processes to work within these policy frameworks, which are dominated by Western ideals (King et al. 2023).

The scoping review concluded that Indigenous populations face many shared challenges when engaging with parks and reserves, whether through participation in traditional practices within reserves or the challenges associated with including or excluding Indigenous worldviews and representation at the governance level. The review also identified clear cultural, ecological, and social benefits when Indigenous peoples are reconnected with traditional lands through engagement with management frameworks.

With this understanding, this research seeks to analyse how the legislation governing protected areas and green spaces responds to Indigenous Māori values and rights. In New Zealand, the Reserves Act 1977 is the principal legislative framework for publicly owned green spaces in urban areas, where most of the population resides. Employing a critical Te Tiriti analysis methodology, we explore if and how the Reserves Act 1977 reflects Te Tiriti o Waitangi and propose commentary on how Indigenous values, protected through Te Tiriti, can be incorporated into this legislation and resulting policy. By understanding where governance supports or fails Māori, we aim to create a foundation for parks and reserves management that ensures Māori values and rights are respected in NZ. We, as two Indigenous Māori researchers, are each from Iwi and hapū (tribes and subtribes) who suffered loss and alienation through government policies associated with land, language and culture, which included our growing up and being educated away from

our traditional lands and people. This research supports our understanding of ancestral histories and contributes to the broader context of land and public land attitudes and management in contemporary NZ.

Method

This research uses Critical Tiriti analysis (CTA) as its methodological foundation. CTA is underpinned by the understanding that honouring Te Tiriti is foundational to achieving Māori wellbeing (Came, O'Sullivan, and McCreanor 2020). Developed by a group of Indigenous Māori researchers in 2020 as a tool for policy assessment, CTA provides a methodological framework for analysing how legislation aligns with the Te Tiriti (Came et al. 2020; Hamley et al. 2023). This research applies the principles of CTA to the Reserves Act 1977, which is the foundational legislation governing local parks and reserves in NZ. The Act is implemented by the Department of Conservation (DOC), which was set up in 1987 by the Conservation Act. While the Conservation Act 1987 requires that local governments recognise the Treaty of Waitangi when managing parks and reserves, it is a hidden requirement not explicitly stated in the Reserves Act 1977. The research also considers an extract of data from the National LINZ database as an output of the legislation mentioned above assess further how the Reserves Act 1977 responds to guarantees in Te Tiriti.

Table 1 illustrates the structure of the remaining sections of this paper, with the five stages of the CTA. This begins with a high-level analytical review where the Reserves Act 1977 is examined through language and the development processes used in its creation. Next, it is analysed against components of Te Tiriti, and a determination is made of how it responds to upholding the responsibilities inherent in Te Tiriti. Finally, suggestions are made for how policy can be strengthened to include Māori values and aspirations (see Table 1) (Came et al. 2023).

Table 1. The Five Stages of Critical Tiriti Analysis.

Stage of analysis	Research action	Section of this paper
Orientation	A high-level analysis of where the legislation represents Te Tiriti through examining the language used.	Results
Close examination	An in-depth analysis that investigates how the legislation responds to the five components of Te Tiriti: The preamble (centrality of Te Tiriti) Kāwanatanga (governance) Tino Rangatiratanga (Māori self-determination) Ōritetanga (equitable citizenship) Wairuatanga (Spiritual freedom)	
Determination	An evaluation of how the legislation reflects the five elements of Te Tiriti against a five-point ranking scale (silent, poor, fair, good, excellent). The research team has made this determination collectively. Silent – no consideration Poor – insignificant consideration Fair – some consideration Good – significant consideration Excellent – Comprehensive consideration	
Strengthening of practice	A consideration of how the legislation could be strengthened to reflect commitments to Te Tiriti.	Discussion
Māori final word	A final reflection that presents an assessment of the conducted CTA through a critical Māori research lens.	Conclusion

To complete our analysis of the Reserves Act 1977, a dataset was developed from publicly accessible data from the government agency responsible for land records in NZ. This dataset represents an expression of the Act, and through critically assessing the responsiveness of this data, the research presents a better understanding of how the legislation in practice responds to the guarantees of Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Application of CTA to the name and section of legislation fields enables analysis of the policy implementation, which reflects the guarantees of Te Tiriti for Māori. It also presents an opportunity to understand where legislation departs from Te Tiriti and instead reflects colonial land management practice.

Results

Parks and reserves have historically been used as colonial tools in the formation of settler nations, disrupting Indigenous peoples' deep connections to their lands. This has been done through forced relocations, renaming of places, restricting access to traditional spaces, and causing environmental degradation to culturally significant landmarks and areas (Smith 2012). We examine the Reserves Act 1977 to document its place as a historical and contemporary tool.

Orientation

Word searches were undertaken to examine the reflection of Te Tiriti in Reserves Act 1977, one for Treaty given Te Tiriti is not widely used in a policy context and one for Maori as, again, using a macron, indicating a longer sound, for Māori is a relatively recent adaptation. We acknowledge the differences between Te Triti and the English translation of the Treaty of Waitangi (TOW). Given the period in which the Reserves Act 1977 was established, we reference both versions of the agreement, all while still acknowledging our understanding that as Māori signed Te Tiriti, they did not cede sovereignty to the British Crown.

The 2023 reprint of the Reserves Act 1977 does not mention the term "treaty" nor "tiriti". The word "Maori" appears 51 times, though only 36 instances are within the main body of the Act. The remaining 15 mentions are in the contents and amendments sections, with some relevance in the definitions section. The Reserves Act 1977 references another statute, the Te Ture Whenua Maori Act 1993, the core statute for Māori land governance, for its definitions of "Maori", "Maori land", and "Maori reservation". The Reserves Act 1977 broadly defines "reserve" or "public reserve" as land purchased, acquired, or set aside for reserve purposes but explicitly excludes Māori reservations. Overall, the Reserves Act 1977 shows no evidence of including or considering Te Tiriti or the Treaty. The Minister of Conservation plays a significant role in implementing the Act, particularly in managing the vesting of land and permitting activities.

Close reading

This examination of the Reserves Act 1977 looks for evidence of Te Tiriti and is presented in the following five sections: (1) Preamble, (2) Kāwanatanga, (3) Tino Rangatiratanga, (4) Ōritetanga and (5) Wairuatanga.

Preamble

We first examined the preamble of the Reserves Act 1977, looking for the centrality of Te Tiriti. We concluded there is no consideration of Te Tiriti in the preamble. The preamble focuses on public reserves, highlighting concepts such as land acquisition, control, development and use, and references public access to the coastline and countryside. Māori values, both traditional and contemporary, align with collectivism, multi-generational wisdom, ancestral connections, relationships, and kinship, all aspects missing in this section of the Reserves Act 1977 (Mika et al. 2022; Phillips, Woods, and Lythberg 2016; Spiller et al. 2020).

Kāwanatanga

This section examines governance in the Reserves Act 1977. Part 2 of the Act identifies land acquisition. The language of this section is government and sovereign-focused, giving power to the Minister of Conservation, the Governor-General, and territorial local authorities, with allowance for the involvement of other organisations, including voluntary groups, boards, and trusts. Some consideration of Māori values is included in section 12(1)(b), stating that while the Public Works Act 1981 can be used to acquire land, taking of Māori land requires additional processes involving the consent of the Minister of Māori Affairs, and the Māori Land Court and its registrar, and yet does not include consent of Māori communities, nor landowners and shareholders.

The management and control of reserves are dealt with in a section of Part 3. Still, the key point is that no matter what delegation is awarded to a local authority, board, or voluntary organisation, absolute control remains with the Minister of Conservation. Section 25(3)(a) effectively illustrates this. The focus of this section is revocation of reserve status or change of its classification, and this section enables land to be offered back to its former owners, reflected in the following quote, which reads:

> in the case of land that immediately before its transfer to the Crown was Maori land, the Minister, unless he or she considers it would not be in the public interest, shall offer the land, on such terms and conditions as he or she thinks fit, to the former owner or, if he or she is deceased, to his or her descendants, those descendants being as determined by order of the Maori Land Court.

Thus, even with some acknowledgement of how the land might be acquired or what encumbrances might still be embedded on the land, for example, roads or power lines, there seem to be veiled threats about what might be in "the public interest". The public interest is not defined in the Act.

A key part of the Act, and crucial in governance, is the classification and defining the purposes of reserve land. Sections 17–23 focus on this, and according to these prescribed sections, this categorisation process dictates subsequent land management in perpetuity. Table 2 below presents the specific details for each of the classifications.

While each classification has significantly more detail about each type of provision, two key commonalities exist in each section. Firstly, each type of reserve includes directions concerning public access. For recreation reserves, "freedom of entry" and "access" are important, whereas for historic and scenic reserves, there is freedom of entry and access, but there may be restrictions for the protection and well-being of the reserve and control of the public. The other key common section for each classification is the

Table 2. Reserves Act 1977 Classification of reserves.

Section	Classification	Act specifics – for the purpose of:
17	Recreation reserves	" … providing areas for the recreation and sporting activities and the physical welfare and enjoyment of the public, and for the protection of the natural environment and beauty of the countryside, with emphasis on the retention of open spaces and on outdoor recreational activities, including recreational tracks in the countryside."
18	Historic reserves	" … protecting and preserving in perpetuity such places, objects, and natural features, and such things thereon or therein contained as are of historic, archaeological, cultural, educational, and other special interest."
19	Scenic reserves	(a) " … protecting and preserving in perpetuity for their intrinsic worth and for the benefit, enjoyment, and use of the public, suitable areas possessing such qualities of scenic interest, beauty, or natural features or landscape that their protection and preservation are desirable in the public interest:" (b) " … providing, in appropriate circumstances, suitable areas which by development and the introduction of flora, whether indigenous or exotic, will become of such scenic interest or beauty that their development, protection, and preservation are desirable in the public interest."
20	Nature reserves	" … protecting and preserving in perpetuity indigenous flora or fauna or natural features that are of such rarity, scientific interest or importance, or so unique that their protection and preservation are in the public interest."
21	Scientific reserves	" … protecting and preserving in perpetuity for scientific study, research, education, and the benefit of the country, ecological associations, plant or animal communities, types of soil, geomorphological phenomena, and like matters of special interest."
22	Government purpose reserves	" … providing and retaining areas for such government purpose or purposes as are specified in any classification of the reserve."
23	Local purpose reserves	" … providing and retaining areas for such local purpose or purposes as are specified in any classification of the reserve."

consideration of the multi-purpose nature of reserves. Thus, the Act requires a primary classification and purpose to be determined, but different subsections for each allow for other values, such as scenic, archaeological, geological, indigenous fauna or flora, to be managed and protected. These notions of defined prescriptive control do not include remit for Māori governance or kāwanatanga.

Tino Rangatiratanga

There is imperceptible consideration of Tino Rangatiratanga (Māori self-determination) in the Reserves Act 1977. The Act is dominated by the requirements associated with classification and the purposes listed above in reserve creation and management, and then sections focused on management planning. The reserves management planning sections, with section 41 guiding non-DOC management planning, are silent on the role of Māori values, and iwi and hapū. Within these classifications, the lack of inclusion of Māori values suggests that iwi and hapū would not easily use the Reserves Act 1977 to support historical and future aspirations for reserved lands. The direct reference of the Reserves Act (1977) to Te Ture Whenua Maori Act (1993) for Māori land would perhaps suggest that the Reserves Act was also not proposed to support Māori aspirations and values.

Ōritetanga

Ōritetanga, defined as equitable citizenship, is explored in the Reserves Act 1977. While the overriding tenet of the Act is that it is entirely silent on Te Tiriti, some checks and balances within the Act are relevant for Te Ao Māori.

For instance, Section 40(2), within the directions for administering bodies, requires "every administering body of a reserve that includes any part of the Wanganui River shall, in carrying out its functions, have regard to the spiritual, historical, and cultural significance of the river to the Whanganui iwi". This quote is directly from the Reserves Act, which interestingly spells the river name omitting the "h" of Whanganui, the spelling of choice of the iwi, although the requirement for this inclusion is set out in Te Awa Tupua (Whanganui River Claims Settlement) Act 2017, which consistently names it as Whanganui River. Other than an error, our assumption of ongoing colonialism associated with the drafting of the amendment to the Reserves Act 1977, we cannot find a reason for the different spellings. Section 46 includes consideration of Māori customary practices in some reserves. The Minister may grant rights for taking or killing birds from a scenic reserve that was immediately prior, Māori land, or to continue to inter tūpāpaku (deceased person) in "ancient burial grounds' in scenic or historic reserves. While these rights are considered, the minister retains the power for approval, and these rights are also tied to birds not protected by the Wildlife Act 1953. Section 46(3) also indicates the vulnerability of these rights to the favourability or change in government attitude, stating, "Any rights so granted may at any time in like manner be withdrawn or varied by the Minister".

One section of the Reserves Act 1977, section 77A Ngā Whenua Rahui kawenata, indicates that broader values of and for Māori could be associated with reserves. This section falls within the part of the Act focused on protecting conservation values on private land. The Act does not define Ngā Whenua Rahui kawenata other than being an agreement, but the text indicates that it is an agreement for Māori land, or Crown land leased to Māori, to ensure that the land is managed for preservation and protection of either natural or historical environmental values, or "the spiritual and cultural values which Maori associate with the land". There are parts of section 77A that indicate the financial aspects of these agreements, in that there may be a reduction in rent, if the land is leased by Māori from the Crown, or that grants, from the Crown, may be paid to support the reserved land.

Wairuatanga

This part of the CTA process considers the spiritual freedom of the Reserves Act 1977. Our reading is that two specific sections of the Act could be regarded as considering of wairua. These are the sections relating to the Whanganui River and iwi, and the Nga Whenua Rahui kawenata section that specifies an agreement could be made so that reserve land could be managed to preserve and protect Māori cultural and spiritual values associated with the land.

Most of the Reserves Act 1977 does not enhance nor acknowledge the wairua, or value and the deep connection of land held as reserves for Māori. To further explore the Act and how it has been implemented, we also analysed the data captured from the Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) database of Reserves Act 1977 land to see if, despite the specific text, reserves were reflections of Te Tiriti. We considered the size, type of organisation, and classifications of all the Reserves Act 1977 reserves and undertook a reserve name audit of a subset of the reserves managed by one Territorial Local Authority located in the South Island.

Data was obtained from the Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) Protected Areas (PA) dataset and downloaded as a comma-separated-value file on 20 November 2024 (https://data.linz.govt.nz/layer/53564-protected-areas/). There were 17,624 records in the PA dataset. Each record was a row, representing a named individual block of land. The fields of the data set were a unique identifying number, a start date, its area, a type categorisation, its relevant statute and section, and the agency or organisation associated with its control, management, or vesting. Using StataNow 18.5 for Windows (StataCorp LLC 2024), the dataset was refined to focus specifically on the greenspaces/parks and reserves governed only by the Reserves Act 1977. Table 3 below shows the changes from the original downloaded data to the cleaned dataset, which is the focus of this paper.

The size of these parks and reserves governed by the Reserves Act 1977 varies greatly, with the largest being over 180,000 hectares (Molesworth Recreation Reserve) and another that is nearly 30,000 hectares (Lewis Pass Scenic Reserve). However, most reserves are much smaller, and almost half of all the reserves are under two hectares in area (n = 5284), although as Table 3 shows, there is still over one million hectares of land governed by the Reserves Act 1977 alone.

Territorial Local Authorities (councils, TLAs) look after the majority of the parks and reserves (n = 6,604 60%), although the Department of Conservation (DOC) is responsible for nearly 35% (n = 3,769). Almost 5% of NZ's Reserves Act 1977 parks and reserves are in some form of co-management agreement, with quasi – and other government agencies such as the Fish and Game Council, Ministry of Education, and Heritage New Zealand responsible for a further 114 reserves. There are 495 parks and reserves (5%) governed by community organisations such as scout and kindergarten associations and hall societies. Finally, there are 29 reserves in Māori organisation management, such as marae trusts or committees.

Of more than 10,000 reserves governed by territorial local authorities and non-government organisations, nearly half classified as local purpose reserves (s.23, n = 5,149), a further 3,142 are for recreation (s.17), and 1,677 are scenic reserves deemed already worthy of protection for perpetuity (s.19(1)(a)), while 130 are scenic reserves which have the purpose of providing suitable areas which will become reserves worthy of protection (s.19(1)(b)).

The final stage of this reserve portfolio analysis involves examining the names of parks and reserves. McGill et al. (2022) conducted a study of more than 2,200 US national park

Table 3. Comparison of all LINZ Protected Area reserve and RA77 reserve lists.

	Original downloaded list – all protected area legislation	RA77 only reserves list
Number of records	n = 17,624	n = 10,848
Start date range (year)	1839–2021 Records were missing for 917 reserves	1839–2021 Records were missing for 775 reserves
Area (Hectares) range	0–1,260,711 Records were missing for 63 reserves	0–180,660 Records were missing for 42 reserves
Total Area (Hectares) reserved	12,414,068	1,004,417

*

place names, finding that many were perpetuating mythologies of colonial settlers and white supremacy, as they serve as windows "into the layered histories and meanings of places" (p.684). Our portfolio includes over 10,000 reserves, so we focused our analysis on one TLA, the 260 Dunedin City Council (DCC) reserves. Dunedin was the city of residence of the principal researcher.

Following the process outlined by McGill et al. (2022), we identified six emergent categories, assigning each reserve name to one of them: Tangata Tiriti Remembrance, Erasure, Tangata Whenua (local Indigenous Māori), Misspelt, Descriptive, and Dual. Table 4 details these categories. Tangata Whenua and Tangata Tiriti are used as descriptors of names that represent Māori places and people and settler colonial memories and geographies, descriptors both appropriate for the NZ context (Gilbert, Quigg, and Morgaine 2021) and well-suited to this analysis. The Ngāi Tahu atlas, https://kahurumanu.co.nz/atlas, was useful for the name analysis undertaken, but does not have many entries directly useful for the DCC-level of reserves.

As Table 5 illustrates, most reserves (n = 195/260, 75%) have names that reflect the settler geographies and histories of settlement generally in Dunedin after the signing of Te Tiriti in 1840. The remembrance association of some names, such as Queens Gardens, is apparent. In contrast, others are reminders of more recent settlements, such as Peter Johnstone Park, or reminders of tangible things, such as planes, Friendship Drive Recreation Reserve, or locations in other countries, such as Portobello Recreation Reserve. There is a set of descriptive names (n = 13, 5%) where reserves have taken on functional names, such as the Southern Cemetery. Some reserve names reflect the local Indigenous Māori people, albeit just 18 reserves (7%). One such reserve, Te Rauone Local Purpose Reserve (Coastal Protection), has a name that both acknowledges and specifies its role. There are a further group of reserves (n = 11, 4%), however, where their names could have been intended to reflect the local Māori histories and geographies, but misspellings have intervened (Ōtakou Runaka No date). Kaikorai Scenic Reserve is one such example, where Kaikorai is near the right name but not quite, with Kaikārae the correct version (Moorfield 2023). Just two reserves have dual names, with the most recent reserve, created in 2005, carrying the non-Māori name first: Mt Watkins/Hikaroa Scenic Reserve. The final category that emerged from the audit is Erasure, which is mainly associated with prominent geographical locations around

Table 4. Dunedin City Council reserve name categories.

Reserve name categorisation	Description of categorisation
Tangata Whenua component	Parks and reserves where the name component fairly represent mana whenua (local Indigenous Māori) naming, such as Waikouaiti Recreation Reserve.
Misspelt Tangata Whenua component	Names that represent historical mana whenua names but have been misspelled. Taieri, instead of the correct Taiairi, is an example.
Dual	Dual names, such as Titeremoana (Pudding Island) Scenic Reserve.
Historic or Contemporary Descriptive	Descriptive names associated with current use or locationally specific – Museum Reserve or Gasworks Reserve.
Erasure	Names that have overtaken a mana whenua name. This includes using an incorrect Māori name, such as Taiaroa Heads Reserve (Ngāi Tahu name is Pukekura).
Tangata Tiriti Remembrance	This category also includes parks and reserves with non-Māori names where the origin cannot be confirmed but appears to commemorate local a person, activity or event. Anzac Park or Bishopscourt, are names that indicate past events or settler geographies. Arthur Street and Cargill's Monument are names that tell Pākehā histories.

Table 5. Frequencies of Dunedin City Council name categories.

Reserve name categorisation	Number (n = 260) (% of total DCC reserves)
Tangata Whenua	18 (7%)
Misspelt Tangata Whenua	11 (4%)
Dual	2 (1%)
Descriptive	13 (5%)
Erasure	21 (8%)
Tangata Tiriti Remembrance	195 (75%)

Dunedin, such as the hills or waterways. These locations always had local Indigenous names, such as Flagstaff Scenic Reserve, but when the reserves were created and named, the Māori name, which for Flagstaff is Whānau-paki, was not used (Ngāi Tahu 2021).

Determination

The third stage of the results section in this CTA of the Reserves Act 1977 brings the five elements of Te Tiriti (Preamble, Kāwanatanga, Tino Rangatiratanga, Ōritetanga, Wairuatanga) against a five-point ranking scale presented by Came et al. (2023). This determination is presented in Table 6 below.

The 2023 reprint of the Reserves Act 1977 used for this paper does not have any specific reference to Te Tiriti o Waitangi, nor its English version, the Treaty. Table 6 shows the Poor box is marked for the first criterion, the preservation of Māori interests. The authors considered that while there was no evidence that the Reserves Act 1977 preserved Māori interests, it has largely contributed to protecting land from development in NZ. The Reserves Act 1977 governs about 12th (one billion hectares) of all protected land (Table 3). The preservation of land in Crown and quasi-governmental agencies, including TLAs, rather than in entirely private ownership, means it could be uncoupled from its agency and returned to iwi and hapū, such as how Urewera National Park was returned to Tūhoe in 2014, and it ceased to be a National Park (Coombes 2020). For the second criterion, focusing on Māori leadership, the Act is silent on Māori leadership for the implementation of the Act. There is no specific part of the Act that prioritises the leadership of Māori people or organisations. The third criterion seeks evidence of Māori authority, worldviews and values. Poor, rather than Silent, was selected, as there are occasional references to Māori values in the "killing of birds" or processes associated with acquiring Māori land, which have additional steps that involve other Ministers, albeit still within the machinery of the presiding government. Poor was also selected for the criterion associated with evidence of equitable citizenship and rights; this selection acknowledges some references to Māori values, even if non-Māori considerations and

Table 6. Critical Treaty Analysis Determination of the Reserves Act 1977.

Tiriti Components	Silent	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
Evidence that the policy preserves Māori interests and contributes to peace and good order		X			
Evidence of Māori leadership in policy development and execution	X				
Evidence of Māori authority, worldviews and values		X			
Evidence of Māori equitable citizenship and rights being exercised		X			
Evidence of the recognition of wairuatanga and tikanga		X			

values entirely bound them. The final criterion seeks a response to evidence of the recognition of wairuatanga and tikanga. Again, Poor was selected, as while the values and customs of iwi and hapū of Whanganui and Tuhoe were identified as significant and special, the Act has not been amended for other regions.

Discussion

Strengthening practice

This fourth key phase of a CTA requires considering how the policy could be strengthened, requiring suggestions of successful practice rather than just critique. We present opportunities for strengthening practice as two concepts, Ahi kā and Whenua tāpui, as they are concepts that have emerged through our examination of the Act, through a Māori worldview lens and reflecting on the relevant international literature.

Conceptualising Ahi kā on parks and reserves, especially in urban environments, would support the reclamation of parks and reserve lands. Conceiving it in a contemporary context would encourage parks and reserves to be available for customary and modern practices, such as harvest of materials for raranga (weaving) and rongoā (healing and medicines), hunting, gathering and cultivating for kai (food). A modern Ahi kā practice would progress past the embedded assumption that Māori just want land for customary practices, such as bird killing, and that the wildlife must also be protected from Māori.

Pīngao is an Indigenous plant central to traditional weaving practices by Māori. For the tribal group, Kāi Tahu, of Dunedin, it is a taonga (treasure). Pīngao grows only on coastal sand dunes and supports dune stabilisation. Traditional practice was that the head of the plant was harvested, but its sustainability was secured by cutting an offshoot from the harvested head and transplanting it next to its parent plant. This practice ensured an ongoing source of a brilliant, golden yellow weaving material. Pīngao is one of only four native species used for weaving, and the only one not requiring further colour augmentation (Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu 2013). There are only a few locations in Otago where pīngao is found, with a significant Dunedin reserve, Ocean Beach Domain, being one of those sites (Johnson 1993). Enacting Ahi kā would facilitate planting but also encourage harvest. Harvest is not currently permitted otherwise in this nearly 100-hectare reserve (Dunedin City Council 2012), although for other reserves generally in Dunedin, the Council has a policy framework that allows for the harvest of materials for cultural purposes. However, despite this apparent enlightenment, this policy still enacts the Reserves Act 1977, as a written application must be made, and the Council demonstrates its Western approach to individual property rights, claiming landowner status should there be any concern or dispute.

Our second concept, Whenua tāpui, is a term for reserves (Moorfield 2023), and provides a practical, strength-based conceptualisation of reserves as tāpui means "to be set aside", bookmarked. This re-imagines the reserved land of NZ as being held but available for Iwi and hapū for reclamation. The LINZ records illustrate that creating the one million-hectare reserves portfolio has taken more than 180 years of systematic government processes. As Whenua tāpui, we can consider that these are lands held for us, Māori, to regain. The Reserves Act 1977 alludes to the government acquisition process

in that it permitted customary bird hunting practices on land immediately before reservation, Māori land.

In their book on 40 years of Māori protest action and events, Harris (2004) stated that significant occupations of public land in NZ in the 1970s contributed "cogent movements of Māori activism" (p.58). The first of these occupations was in 1972, in a small North Island coastal town. In Raglan, the government acquired more than 30 hectares, now called Whaingaroa ki te Whenua, from the local Tainui Awhiro people for defence during World War Two. Tainui Awhiro expected that it would eventually return to them. However, it was given to the TLA, who then leased it to a golf club. After following the submission and claim processes through the more formal channels, occupation was the action Iwi took, the first being in 1972. Ultimately, it was successful, albeit with significant hurt and trauma for Iwi, as well as taking a long time. It was not until 1983 that the land was returned to the Iwi.

In contemporary Dunedin, occupation has not yet been the mechanism for redress chosen by the people of Kāi Tahu. The significant maunga (mountain), Hikaroroa, part of the pepehā, a traditional recitation of markers of the landscape associated with identity, of the nearby hapū, has a chequered history regarding its status as public land. In 1895, it was land endowed to the then TLA for purposes of recreation, but in 1970, it was leased to a farming operation, with perpetual, essentially endless, right of renewal (Dunedin City Council 2011). The inappropriateness of that perpetual farming lease was realised in the 1990s. However, it was the ecological and biodiversity values that were stated to be significant, rather than its place as wāhi tapu (sacred land), and it was formally vested as a 650-hectare Scenic Reserve (section 19(1)(b)) in 2005. Further demonstrating the invisibility of Indigenous values is that its non-Māori name, Mount Watkin, comes first in its formal record.

There is little in the Reserves Act 1977 that gives confidence that while the nation's parks and reserves can be considered whenua tāpui, the attitude of both the Crown and TLAs would support the return of public land to Iwi and hapū.

Conclusion

Māori final word

This study focused on local government land management practices, analysing the data available for parks and reserves and its governing legislation, the Reserves Act 1977. Using a CTA framework, we demonstrated that current practices enforce coloniality while identifying opportunities to recognise and embed Te Tiriti o Waitangi principles. Parks and reserves have untapped potential to reflect a Te Tiriti partnership, aligning with the needs of predominantly urban Māori communities and fostering culturally and environmentally sustainable land management practices. For whānau, hapū and iwi, it may be that their parks and reserve lands should be uncoupled from the Reserves Act 1977. Future research could gather the historical narratives of reserves creation processes, explore the contemporary consequences of their alienation, and reimaging their reclamation. This would enact all parts of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, as it was signed and is meaningful now. We conclude this paper with a whakataukī, a Māori saying that signifies the centrality of land to us as Māori: Te toto o te tangata he kai, te oranga o te tangata

whenua. Literally, this means that a person's blood is nourished by food, and our well-being is drawn from the land and soils, so the land that sustains us must be protected as it nurtures our mind, body, and spirits.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding

This work was supported by Ngā Pae o te Maramatanga.

ORCID

Robin Quigg http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8214-5876
Els Russell http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7749-4027

References

Arnberger, R. L. 2001, November 2–8. "Science and Stewardship to Protect and Sustain Wilderness Values." Seventh World Wilderness Congress symposium: 2001, Port Elizabeth, South Africa.

Ayre, M., and H. Verran. 2010. "Managing Ontological Tensions in Learning to be an Aboriginal Ranger: Inductions into a Strategic Cross-Cultural Knowledge Community." *International Journal of Learning in Social Contexts* 1: 2–18.

Beattie, James. 2008. "Colonial Geographies of Settlement: Vegetation, Towns, Disease and Well-Being in Aotearoa/New Zealand, 1830s–1930s." *Environment and History* 14 (4): 583–610.

Bock, E., L. Hudson, J. Isaac, T. Vernes, B. Muir, T. Whap, M. Dulfer-Hyams, M. McLean, and D. Fell. 2022. "Safeguarding Our Sacred Islands: Traditional Owner-Led Spa Country Governance, Planning and Management in Australia." *Pacific Conservation Biology* 28 (4): 315–329.

Brown, A. J. 1992. *Keeping the Land Alive: Aboriginal People and Wilderness Protection in Australia*. Sydney: Wilderness Society & Environmental Defender's Office.

Came, Heather, Dominic O'Sullivan, Jacquie Kidd, and Timothy McCreanor. 2020. "The Waitangi Tribunal's WAI 2575 Report: Implications for Decolonizing Health Systems." *Health and Human Rights* 22 (1): 209.

Came, Heather, Dominic O'Sullivan, Jacquie Kidd, and Tim McCreanor. 2023. "Critical Tiriti Analysis: A Prospective Policy Making Tool from Aotearoa New Zealand." *Ethnicities* 24 (6): 985–1004.

Came, Heather, D. O'Sullivan, and T. McCreanor. 2020. "Introducing Critical Tiriti Policy Analysis through a Retrospective Review of the New Zealand Primary Health Care Strategy." *Ethnicities* 20 (3): 434–456. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796819896466.

Colchester, Marcus. 2003. "Indigenous Peoples and Protected Areas: Rights, Principles and Practice." *Nomadic Peoples* 7 (1): 33–51. https://doi.org/10.3167/082279403782088840

Conservation Act 1987 31 March.

Coombes, Brad. 2007. "Postcolonial Conservation and Kiekie Harvests at Morere New Zealand – Abstracting Indigenous Knowledge from Indigenous Polities." *Geographical Research* 45 (2): 186–193. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-5871.2007.00450.x

Coombes, B. 2020. "Nature's Rights as Indigenous Rights? Mis/Recognition Through Personhood for Te Urewera." *Espace-Populations-Societes* 2020 (1–2). https://doi.org/10.4000/EPS.9857.

Council, Dunedin City. 2012. "Ocean Beach Domain Local Purpose (Coastal Protection)." *Reserve Management Plan. edited by Recreation Planning Department*.

des Forges, Sandra. 2024. "Māori Wards and Local Government Democracy: Contested Spaces of Representation." *New Zealand Geographer*: 80 (3): 171–183. https://doi.org/10.1111/nzg.12403

Dew, Kevin, Anne Scott, Allison Kirkman, Kevin Dew, Anne Scott, and Allison Kirkman. 2016. "The Health of Indigenous Communities." *Social, Political and Cultural Dimensions of Health* 49–64. Cham: Springer.

Dunedin City Council. 2011. Mt Watkin/Hikaroroa Reserve Management Plan.

Finegan, C. 2018. "Reflection, Acknowledgement, and Justice: A Framework for Indigenous-Protected Area Reconciliation." *International Indigenous Policy Journal* 9 (3): 25–48. https://doi.org/10.18584/iipj.2018.9.3.3.

Gilbert, Hazel K., Robin Quigg, and Kate C. Morgaine. 2021. "The Last Straw! Race Parameter: A NZ Conundrum." *The Clinical Teacher* 18 (5): 513–514. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111tct.13405.

Hall, Monique Mae, Priscilla M. Wehi, Hēmi Whaanga, Erana T. Walker, Jonni Hazeline Koia, and Kiri Joy Wallace. 2021. "Promoting Social and Environmental Justice to Support Indigenous Partnerships in Urban Ecosystem Restoration." *Restoration Ecology* 29 (1): e13305. https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.13305.

Hamley, Logan, Kyle Tan, Waikaremoana Waitoki, and Sarah-Jane Tiakiwai. 2023. "A Critical Tiriti Analysis of the Treaty Statement from a University in Aotearoa New Zealand." *Journal of Global Indigeneity* 7 (1): 1–28. https://doi.org/10.54760/001c.92446.

Harris, Aroha. 2004. *Hīkoi: Forty Years of Māori Protest*. Wellington: Huia Publishers.

Hill, R. 2006. "The Effectiveness of Agreements and Protocols to Bridge between Indigenous and non-indigenous Toolboxes for Protected Area Management: A Case Study from the wet Tropics of Queensland." *Society and Natural Resources* 19 (7): 577–590. https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920600742310.

Hogarth, Karole, and Mereana Rapata-Hanning. 2023. "Māori Health in Aotearoa New Zealand." In *Understanding Pathophysiology*, edited by Judy Craft, Christopher Gordon, Sue E. Huether, Kathryn L. McCance, and Valentina L. Brashers, 1179–1197. Chatswood NSW: Elsevier.

Hond, Ruakere, Mihi Ratima, and Will Edwards. 2019. "The Role of Māori Community Gardens in Health Promotion: A Land-Based Community Development Response by Tangata Whenua, People of Their Land." *Global Health Promotion* 26 (3_suppl): 44–53. https://doi.org/10.1177/1757975919831603

Houde, N., and L. C. Lemyre. 2021. "Revitalization of Indigenous Political Cultures Through Locally-Governed Protected Areas: The Case of Masko Cimakanic Aski." 117–148.

Johnson, Peter. 1993. "Pīngao on Otago Peninsula".

Johnson, Danielle, Meg Parsons, and Karen Fisher. 2021. "Engaging Indigenous Perspectives on Health, Wellbeing and Climate Change. A New Research Agenda for Holistic Climate Action in Aotearoa and Beyond." *Local Environment* 26 (4): 477–503. https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2021.1901266.

Joseph, Robert, Mylene Rakena, Mary Te Kuini Jones, Rogena Sterling, and Celeste Rakena. 2019. "The Treaty,Ttikanga Māori, Ecosystem-Based Management, Mainstream Law and Power Sharing for Environmental Integrity in Aotearoa New Zealand – Possible Ways Forward.".

Kawharu, Hugh. 2013. "Common Property, Maori Identity and the Treaty of Waitangi." In *The Governance of Common Property in the Pacific Region: 1089*, edited by Peter Larmour, 89–102. Canberra: ANU Press.

King, L. J., K. E. Fortin, B. Belanger, B. S. R. Grimwood, and Ł. K'é Dene First Nation. 2023. "Land-based Methodologies and Disrupting Settler Colonial Legacies in Parks and Protected Areas: Lessons from *Tracking Change*." *Leisure/Loisir* 47 (1): 121–144. https://doi.org/10.1080/14927713.2022.2141831.

Markevych, Iana, Julia Schoierer, Terry Hartig, Alexandra Chudnovsky, Perry Hystad, Angel M. Dzhambov, Sjerp De Vries, Margarita Triguero-Mas, Michael Brauer, and Mark J. Nieuwenhuijsen. 2017. "Exploring Pathways Linking Greenspace to Health: Theoretical and Methodological Guidance." *Environmental Research* 158: 301–317. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2017.06.028

McAllister, Tara G., Jacqueline R. Beggs, Shaun Ogilvie, Rauru Kirikiri, Amanda Black, and Priscilla M. Wehi. 2020. "Kua takoto te mānuka: Mātauranga māori in New Zealand Ecology." *New Zealand Journal of Ecology* 43 (3): 1–7. https://doi.org/10.20417/nzjecol.43.41.

McAvoy, L. 2002. "American Indians, Place Meanings and the Old/New West." *Journal of Leisure Research* 34 (4): 383–396. https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.2002.11949978.

McGill, Bonnie M., Stephanie B. Borrelle, Grace C. Wu, Kurt E. Ingeman, Jonathan Berenguer Uhuad Koch, and Natchee B. Barnd. 2022. "Words Are Monuments: Patterns in US National Park Place Names Perpetuate Settler Colonial Mythologies including White Supremacy." *People and Nature* 4 (3): 683–700. https://doi.org/10.1002/pan3.10302.

Michel, Pascale, Aaria Dobson-Waitere, Holden Hohaia, Amber McEwan, and Danielle F. Shanahan. 2019. "The Reconnection between Mana Whenua and Urban Freshwaters to Restore the Mouri/Life Force of the Kaiwharawhara." *New Zealand Journal of Ecology* 43 (3): 1–10. https://doi.org/10.20417/nzjecol.43.33.

Mika, Jason Paul, Kiri Dell, Jamie Newth, and Carla Houkamau. 2022. "Manahau: Toward an Indigenous Māori Theory of Value." *Philosophy of Management* 21 (4): 441–463. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40926-022-00195-3

Moorfield, John C. 2023. "Te Aka Māori Dictionary." *In Te Whanake*.

Ngata, Tina. 2019. "Toppling Cook: On Remembering vs Misremembering." *Overland* 236: 44–48.

Ngāi Tahu. 2021. "The Ngāi Tahu Atlas." Cultural Mapping Story. Kā Huru Manu Ngāi Tahu. Accessed October 15. https://www.kahurumanu.co.nz/atlas.

Orange, Claudia. 2020. *The Treaty of Waitangi=Te Tiriti o Waitangi: An Illustrated History*. ed. Tiriti o Waitangi. 3rd ed. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.

Phillips, Tom, Christine Woods, and Billie Lythberg. 2016. "An Investigation into the Aspirations, Governance and Management Challenges of Māori Farming Trusts." *Outlook on Agriculture* 45 (4): 246–253. https://doi.org/10.1177/0030727016676713

Pihama, Leonie, Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Shirley Simmonds, N. Raumati, Cherryl Waerea-i-te-Rangi Smith, B. Cassidy, R. Te Nana, and B. Sio. 2023. *He Waka Eke Noa: Māori Cultural Frameworks for Violence Prevention and Intervention*. Taranaki: Tū Tama Wahine o Taranaki (Taranaki). https://www.tutamawahine.org.nz/he_waka_eke_noa.

Raerino, Kimiora, Alex Macmillan, Adrian Field, and Rau Hoskins. 2021. "Local-Indigenous Autonomy and Community Streetscape Enhancement: Learnings from Māori and Te Ara Mua – Future Streets Project." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 18 (3): 865. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18030865

Reid, John, Karyn Taylor-Moore, and Golda Varona. 2014. "Towards a Social-Structural Model for Understanding Current Disparities in Maori Health and Well-Being." *Journal of Loss and Trauma* 19 (6): 514–536. https://doi.org/10.1080/15325024.2013.809295

Reserves Act 1977. 23 December.

Russell, Els, Robin Quigg, and Heather McDonald. 2024. "Parks and Reserves: A Scoping Review of Indigenous People'; Relationships with Management and use." In Poster presented at the International Indigenous Research Conference, 12–15 November, Auckland, New Zealand.

Simpson, M., and J. Bagelman. 2018. "Decolonizing Urban Political Ecologies: The Production of Nature in Settler Colonial Cities." *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 108 (2): 558–568. https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2017.1392285.

Slaymaker, O., N. Catto, and D. J. Kovanen. 2020. "Protecting Geodiversity in Eastern Canada." 557–582.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books Ltd.

Spiller, Chellie, Rachel Maunganui Wolfgramm, Ella Henry, and Robert Pouwhare. 2020. "Paradigm Warriors: Advancing a Radical Ecosystems View of Collective Leadership from an Indigenous Māori Perspective." *Human Relations* 73 (4): 516–543. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726719893753

StataCorp LLC. 2024. StataNow/SE 18.5 for Windows. In *Revision 16 Oct* 2024.

Taiapa, Ken, Helen Moewaka Barnes, and Tim McCreanor. 2021. "Mārakai as Sites of ahi kaa and Resistance."

Taiepa, Todd, Philip Lyver, Peter Horsley, Jane Davis, Margaret Brag, and Henrik Moller. 1997. "Co-management of New Zealand's Conservation Estate by Maori and Pakeha: A Review." *Environmental Conservation* 24 (3): 236–250. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0376892997000325

Ōtakou Runaka. No date. "Language History." Te Rūnaka o Ōtākou. https://www.otakourunaka.co.nz/language-history.

Taylor, Lucy, and Dieter F. Hochuli. 2017. "Defining Greenspace: Multiple Uses across Multiple Disciplines." *Landscape and Urban Planning* 158: 25–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2016.09.024

Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu. 2013. "Pīngao." Last Modified 5 August 2013. Accessed January 26, 2025. https://ngaitahu.iwi.nz/connect-2/connect/news-and-stories/pingao-bush-and-beyond/.

Te Ture Whenua Maori Act 1993 21 March.

Thom, Rowan Ropata Macgregor. 2022. "Land Loss, Confiscation, Arability and Colonisation: The Experience of iwi in Aotearoa New Zealand." *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples* 18 (4): 556–565. https://doi.org/10.1177/11771801221122810

Tunks, Andrea. 1999. "Pushing the Sovereign Boundaries in Aotearoa." *Indigenous Law Bulletin* 4 (23): 15.

Walker, Erana T., Priscilla M. Wehi, Nicola J. Nelson, Jacqueline R. Beggs, and Hēmi Whaanga. 2019. "Kaitiakitanga, Place and the Urban Restoration Agenda." *New Zealand Journal of Ecology* 43 (3): 1–8.

Whitinui, Paul. 2011. "The Treaty and "Treating" Māori Health: Politics, Policy and Partnership." *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples* 7 (2): 138–151. https://doi.org/10.1177/117718011100700206

Wilson, R., and T. Pearce. 2017. "Management Challenges for Aboriginal Cultural Heritage in Peri-Urban Queensland." *Australian Geographer* 48 (2): 203–217. https://doi.org/10.1080/00049182.2016.1254006.