



NEW ZEALAND
ARCHAEOLOGICAL
ASSOCIATION

NEW ZEALAND ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION NEWSLETTER



This document is made available by The New Zealand Archaeological Association under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

To view a copy of this license, visit
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>.

If there is one major criticism of this volume then it must be the price. It is unfortunate that the work had to be published overseas as this undoubtedly added to the cost, but unless the archaeological community at large is prepared to financially support publications of this kind then we must accept the consequences. Price apart, this monograph is a credit to those who organised its publication, and contributed to it. It deserves to be widely read.

Phil Moore

- - - - -

LETTER

The Editor,
New Zealand Archaeological Association
Newsletter.

10 June 1980

Dear Sir,

My first reaction on reading the review of Niue Island Archaeological Survey in your March issue was to do nothing more about it. After all, readers of the report can make up their own minds about it. But when the publication has already been very well received in erudite circles in New Zealand, Australia and the Pacific, I think that some comment is not only justified, but necessary in sheer self defence.

I must first say that Hunt's criticism of the presentation of the introductory section may have some validity; shortcomings in the arrangement of information were touched upon by referees. But his comments on the lack of "organised research objectives", "overall research design", "problem-oriented design and survey sampling strategy" and "tenable analytical results" are just so much jargonistic nonsense. As is made clear in the preface, the Niue survey was carried out for, and financed by, the Government of Niue for specific reasons; this was not some dilettante student research project that had to be undertaken in a manner calculated to impress a supervisor, but a field survey carried out in strictly limited time. The Government had defined its requirements precisely and to the best of my knowledge these were adequately met. There was no obligation to publish this report, but it was my belief that the information should be made available to others.

Yours faithfully

Michael M. Trotter