



NEW ZEALAND
ARCHAEOLOGICAL
ASSOCIATION

ARCHAEOLOGY IN NEW ZEALAND



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/>.

NOTES AND NEWSAuckland Conference 1988

The extended biennial conference of the New Zealand Archaeological Association will be held in Auckland in the week of 9-14 May 1988. The main venue will be the University of Auckland, but the Auckland Institute and Museum will also be involved. The conference is being organised by Doug Sutton and Roger Green in conjunction with Brenda Sewell, Council's Conference Liaison Officer.

We hope to follow the usual format of registration, welcome and papers on the Monday, and papers again on Wednesday and Friday (and Saturday morning if needed) with full-day field trips on Tuesday and Thursday.

We are interested at this point in hearing from any who wish to present papers: basically about their proposed title and projected content.

A feature of this conference already well into the planning stages is a major symposium on the Origins of the First New Zealanders. This will be discussed over the course of several days by a variety of invited speakers dealing with the following questions:

1. When did the first people arrive in New Zealand?
2. Where did they come from?
3. What language did they speak and what culture did they possess?
4. Was there one or were there several voyages of colonisation?
5. Was there return voyaging from New Zealand to tropical Polynesia?

These will be covered under the following topical headings:

1. Maori views of their origins.
2. Evidence of voyaging.
3. Linguistic evidence for the origin of the New Zealand Maori language.
4. Biological evidence of Maori relationships with Polynesian populations.
5. Archaeological evidence for settlement from East Polynesia.
6. Date of first settlement in New Zealand: data from geomorphology, soil sequences, palaeobotany, and avifauna.
7. Archaeological evidence for early settlement in New Zealand.

Many potential speakers have already agreed to participate in what promises to be an exciting set of papers and debates.

Some funding for this symposium has already been obtained for an overseas participant, Dr Patrick Kirch, with more requests now in the pipeline.

At this point the organisers are keen to hear from those of you who have papers on other topics which you wish to present, or offers of papers relating to the main symposium.

Please write to: Roger Green
 Department of Anthropology
 University of Auckland
 Private Bag
 Auckland.

Accommodation with friends in Auckland, or in numerous motels in Parnell or Ponsonby is suggested, not to mention a range of hotels within walking distance whose prices range from the reasonable to the astronomical.

Further details will be forthcoming about these and other matters in the March Newsletter, however it would be well to begin making your plans to attend.

- - - - -

Editorial

There is no pleasure in being proved right when the outcome is to be regretted. In my September editorial on archaeology and Department of Conservation (DOC) I queried the future of the Trust's Archaeology Committee. This was with good reason as I must now report that the committee has been abolished. As the move is part of a more general trend towards dismantling the Historic Places Trust and concentrating historic resources conservation within a new bureaucratic structure I believe Association members should know what is going on.

Recently the government put out a paper entitled "Options for Conservation Quangos" in which future options for the Trust are given as (1) "status quo" and (2) an extension of Trust responsibilities to statutory responsibility for determining policies and approving management plans for historic sites within DOC land. These options, however, were overtaken by events before the paper came out. The status quo no longer exists. Trust power and resources have already been enormously reduced as DOC has been taking control. The offer of an 'extension of Trust responsibilities' in this situation is not to be taken seriously, the real power is with DOC whatever the Trust's policies or management plans.

Association members may be astonished to learn as I did recently that the Trust no longer has any staff. Former Trust staff are now DOC staff. The Trust consists only of its Board, its committees and its membership. As part of this change former Trust archaeologists now come under the new department's Science Directorate. Archaeologists in the regions are responsible to DOC Regional Managers and to the Science Directorate. The Trust has no say in what they do except on occasions, and then only indirectly.

Foremost among these occasions are when 'authorities' to destroy or modify sites are sought or when 'permits' to excavate are needed. These are statutory roles of the Trust and cannot be relinquished except by act of Parliament. Thus the Trust is left with those responsibilities which always were the most difficult parts of the formerly extensive Trust role in New Zealand archaeology. The wider and more exciting aspects of public archaeology in conservation planning, public education, resource inventory and research are now essentially the responsibility of DOC.

A considerable irony in all this is that when the shape and role of DOC were being planned in 1986 and early 1987 there was much talk from the Director-General and others of devolution and wide public involvement in the new department. What has happened is the reverse. Large areas of considerable public interest and concern are now disappearing into the bureaucracy. This does not just concern archaeology and the Trust but much of natural resources conservation as well, as any reading of the October 1987 "Options for Conservation Quangos" will soon show.

The Department of Conservation shows every sign of becoming yet another administration-led bureaucracy. It was a great advantage of the Trust that the essential decisions of work priorities and programmes were in the hands of the professional people directly concerned. Rapid responses could be made to urgent situations. It will be most unfortunate if the common characteristics of large government departments, lengthy chains of command, comparative inflexibility of policy making and mountains of paper come to bedevil historic resources management in this country.

The Trust was not perfect. Trust policy in general like Topsy 'just grew'. Only the Archaeology Committee had a full written policy - for other committees and the Board this was not apparently considered necessary. The Trust suffered from the very beginning from a chronic lack of resources, and while one might have expected this to sharpen policy

choices, in fact it merely served to increase the hit-and-miss nature of project selection. The lack of resources also resulted in a marked timidity in any dealings which impinged on private property rights - not helped by the attitude of our political lords and masters on this point.

The Board as a whole was traditionally concerned with historic buildings. It never really came to grips with the particular problems of archaeological conservation which came late into its area of responsibility. It is no secret, however, that archaeologists have been an argumentative lot and have only slowly been making their own way to a workable consensus programme of public archaeology. The difference between those who gave every site equal value and those who insisted that we must make hard decisions for the sites we wish to save was only part of this. Nonetheless much has been learned in the past few years. It can only be hoped that the new department builds on this.

The division of the various aspects of historic resources management that were formerly under one roof in the Trust is, I believe, greatly to be regretted. There seems to me to be considerable value in having professionals concerned with buildings and standing structures, with archaeology in all its aspects and with traditional sites, etc., all under one clearly defined and independent body. Many of the problems faced by these different areas are similar in nature and require basically similar solutions. We learn from each other. Professionals concerned with old buildings should also be informed and concerned about archaeological matters, and vice versa. The historic landscape is a totality and while the various bits of it are important in themselves decisions regarding them should not be made in isolation.

One of the aspects of the Trust in which it differs most strongly from government departments is its large public membership. People join for different reasons, but among the members are many who want to be involved in the conservation of their local historic treasures, be they buildings, archaeological sites, industrial ruins or whatever. It is surely important that this level of volunteer activity and support is maintained. For this to happen people must be confident that they are needed on a decision-making level. The Trust has worked hard to build a membership which has in turn strongly identified with the Trust. This commitment and feeling of involvement must not be lost as DOC takes over much of the decision-making power and provides a paid work-force to carry out tasks that have for long absorbed the enthusiasm of unpaid Trust members.

I do not, however, want to sound all doom and gloom. The new Department of Conservation will, it is hoped, provide more resources in the historic area and it should also provide more clearly defined objectives than we have had in the past. Just as I believe all areas of historic conservation should work closely together, clearly too there are advantages in learning from problems and progress in natural resources conservation now allied in the same department.

In his address to the Trust's July 1987 Triennial Conference and given in the September Newsletter Murray Hosking of DOC had this to say.

"Perhaps the appropriate direction for development [of the Trust] is towards the model epitomised by the National Trust in Great Britain - a private citizen organised, resourced and operated body. Or, at the opposite extreme, perhaps the appropriate direction is for the work of the Trust to be completely integrated in the departmental structure."

These options are clearly being put to provoke discussion. Neither of them I believe is ideal. The Trust must of course build on its membership and its community support and involvement, but it should also play a part in historic resources management within the new department. The first demands a measure of independence, the second requires decision making power, access to resources and a strong commitment to the new department and the opportunities it represents.

Next year the Association will have a chance to make submissions to Government when the Historic Places Act is reviewed. This is an opportunity we must not let go. It will be a test of our capacity for constructive thinking, our commitment to the conservation of archaeological resources and, though it should not need to be said, of our independence.

- - - - -

Presenting conference papers

This is my last opportunity to re-run some notes published by Alastair Buist in Volume 7 Number 4 (1964), which have always impressed me with their good sense. They actually originate with the late lamented Glyn Daniel, long time editor of the British journal Antiquity. They concern the presentation of conference papers: the rules are brief.

1. Audibility: whilst it is not necessary to shout, all the audience should be able to hear you, and your audibility

should be checked by thinking about it after a third and two-thirds of the lecture.

2. Brevity: if you have been asked to speak for an hour, prepare a script for fifty minutes; if you have been allotted a half an hour, prepare a paper of twenty minutes. This, in terms of pages, means 4-5 single spaced typed quarto pages for a half hour lecture. It is not only a courtesy to your audience but also essential to the exposition of your theme to prepare your paper in the manner to be presented - and not as a series of notes with slides to follow. Those giving an illustrated talk should realise that 10 slides will fill ten minutes no matter how interesting those other 30 slides may be. It is an embarrassment to both chairman and audience to steal time from the succeeding speakers for the day.

3. Economy: start your lecture with what you want to say, say it and then stop. There is not time for preludes and postludes. Cut, and cut again.

4. Control: never apologise to your audience. The lecturers who say 'I am sorry I did not have time to get a slide made of this' or 'I'm afraid the drawing of this is very bad', should be shot, and probably will be one day. The same may be said for those who apologise for over-running their allotted time.

5. Modesty: you are not being honoured by performing, you are lucky to be asked to give a talk, and if you don't feel this way and observe the rules you won't be asked again.

- - - - -

Skinner Fund

Roger Green writes,

"Every year the Royal Society of New Zealand advertises its Skinner Fund Grants with a closing date of 15 March. There is no form on which to apply. Basically what is required is a letter setting out the main points of any grant proposal: title of project, location of work, what kind of research and analysis is planned, its aim and scope, any special permits or approvals necessary, methods and procedures to be applied, significance of project, relation to existing research (and relevant publications), and plans for publication of results. This should be followed by a short summary budget, and what part you wish a grant for from the Skinner Fund. In addition a brief curriculum vitae is useful to identify yourself. These should be addressed at the Executive Officer, Royal Society of New Zealand, Private Bag, Wellington.

The purpose of the Fund is for the promotion of the study of the history, art, culture, physical and social anthropology of the Maori and other Polynesian peoples, particularly through the recording, survey, excavation, and scientific study of prehistoric and historic sites in New Zealand and the islands of the south-west Pacific, and the detailed analysis of all cultural, artistic, or physical remains which have been recovered as the result of such investigations. To this end both research projects having survey, recording and excavation as their goal, and those which propose to treat analytically and comparatively materials already so recovered shall be deemed to have equal weight.

The Skinner Fund Grants Committee consists of the President of the Royal Society, the Presidents of the Polynesian Society and the New Zealand Archaeological Association (or their deputies) and two other persons nominated by the Royal Society.

Because of recent donations, including one from the Association, the Fund now has a capital sum for investment of over \$11,000, and thus a yield of \$1200 or so, from which four to six grants in the range of \$200 to \$400 can be made each year. Grants are generally not made to any single large project in one year, but used to support several small projects in whole or in part. They may be made to assist in preparing materials for publication, but not to cover costs of actual publication and/or offprints. Grants are not designed to fully support basic research for thesis projects, but they can be used to support smaller, discrete projects which themselves might be included within thesis work, provided the research done under support from the Skinner Fund was reported or published separately from the thesis itself. Awards are not restricted to university students or staff or to people working in recognised institutions or public service organisations.

Brief reports of the results of work done under a grant are required and these are published in the following year in the Proceedings of the Royal Society of New Zealand. Arrangements have now been made for these reports to also appear in the Association Newsletter.

As the medical profession has shown, the only way in New Zealand that we archaeologists can hope to generate sufficient money for basic research among our members is to set up and strenuously support a fund for the purposes in which we are interested. The Skinner Fund is such an entity. Donations, bequests, and contributions by those with an interest

in furthering such research should be actively promoted. Continual fund raising for the Skinner Fund should be among our regular activities."

- - - - -

Coromandel filekeeper

Council has appointed Louise Furey filekeeper for the Coromandel region. This is a new file district, split off the very large Auckland file. Louise's address is:

3 Burnley Terrace
Mt Eden
Auckland.

- - - - -

Publications

James Beever, A Dictionary of Maori Plant Names. Auckland Botanical Society, 1987. 74 pp.

James Beever has produced a valuable resource book giving Maori names for our native flora and some introduced plants. Two alphabetical lists are presented: scientific names and their Maori equivalents. The information has come from a wide range of manuscript and published sources.

A Dictionary of Maori Place Names is available for \$3.00 if you call at the Botany Department, Auckland Institute and Museum, or for \$3.80 (includes postage) from:

The Secretary
Auckland Botanical Society
14 Park Road
Titirangi
Auckland.

Jeffrey Sissons, Wiremu Wi Hongi and Pat Hohepa, The Puriri Trees are Laughing: a political history of Nga Puhī in the inland Bay of Islands. Polynesian Society Memoir 46, Auckland, 1987. 165 pp. \$24.95.

This fascinating account of Nga Puhī history is a spin-off of Doug Sutton's Pouerua archaeological project. Much of it is presented in Maori and English. Numerous genealogies help make sense of the labyrinthine politics of the period up to the early years of last century. Never before have the critical relationships of various well known historical characters of the Bay of Islands district been made so clear.

- - - - -

Erratum

In the September issue (p.167) a mistake was made regarding the title of Rick McGovern-Wilson's M.A. thesis. It should read: "Small-Bird Exploitation. An Archaeozoological Approach to the Study of Fowling in Southern New Zealand."

- - - - -

File search fees

Neville Ritchie has sent me a note regarding expenses claims and commercial activities of filekeepers. At the 31 October meeting council adopted or confirmed a variety of commercial charges. Filekeepers have been notified of the details of these.

Briefly charges are made to commercial users (such as mining companies) for the searches and field inspections. General expenses can be claimed from the Historic Places Trust. Income generated from file search fees and inspection fees will be used for reimbursing filekeepers and for supporting the Skinner Fund and radiocarbon fund.

- - - - -

Farewell

This is the last newsletter I shall produce. I have been editor for nine years (36 issues) and feel that is quite enough. Also with the name change beginning next year it seems to be a good opportunity to let someone else start afresh with new energy and ideas.

I have enormously enjoyed being editor. It has been time-consuming but great fun. Through it I have kept up with what has been going on in New Zealand archaeology and I have enjoyed the contacts with contributors and others in Newsletter matters. To those that have felt unduly harassed for articles, I'm sorry! To those who have contributed, thanks; to those who have not, get to work and support your new editor!

There are some special people I would like to acknowledge. First of all, Mary Best of the Auckland Museum, who has typed up more than thirty issues over the years. Mary has come under a lot of pressure at times trying to fit the Newsletter into a busy programme but has coped admirably. She has also been an excellent back-up editor, spotting errors and clarifying obscurities that I have missed.

I must also thank Sue Stenner formerly of the Auckland University Department of Anthropology and Dot McVicar of

Auckland Museum who typed some of the early issues.

My thanks go to successive directors of the Auckland Institute and Museum who have made resources available for the production of the Association's Newsletter. These have included not just typing but also back issue storage, an addressograph machine and space for mailouts, in addition to an immense amount of xeroxing, stationery and postage.

Many people have been roped in to help with mailouts over the years but I would like especially to thank Anne Leahy who, as Association Treasurer did a lot of work in those bad old days before addresses were computerised and come ready-made on sticky labels. Louise Furey has helped by organising the troops in recent years.

Finally, some of my pet likes and dislikes. I don't like articles that are too long for their subject matter, and nor do I enjoy reading lengthy and self-conscious arguments for doing a piece of work. I have always disliked great numbers of references, especially the American habit of following mentions of 'settlement pattern', 'flaking technology' and such with great lists of everyone who has been there before. Where possible I have tried to take out all references to unpublished material, especially authors' own manuscripts.

My likes have included articles that report fieldwork, well-prepared illustrations, brevity - and especially brief introductions, book reviews that come in before the book is actually out of print, anything unexpected that I knew nothing about before the manuscript lands on my desk, and feedback (rare exceptions to the 'black hole syndrome' that operates in New Zealand archaeology). Most of all I like all those contributors who have kept up the flow of articles: the Newsletter, under whatever name, is what you have made it.

From Volume 31 Number 1 your editor will be Tony Walton of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust, Wellington. I'm sure Tony will do a great job and I look forward to the different approach that a new editor will bring. But Tony needs your support as I have - so ... get writing!

- - - - -

Ritual site on the Coromandel Peninsula

Some time ago I was given the marvellous photo reproduced over the page which was taken by Janet Romanes at Paparoa, Coromandel Peninsula. Was there once a motorway here, suddenly overwhelmed by a landslide or by paper from a govern-

ment department? Or has this been the scene of strange, even unspeakable, rituals? Whatever the cause I think this sort of thing needs encouraging.

