



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 NEWS

NEW MEMBERS

The Association would like to welcome the following new members and wishes them many happy years of archaeological endeavours:

Simon Duff, Books Pasifika, Donald Prince, John Tollemache.

DONATIONS

Council would like to thank the following member for their donation to the Association:

I J Morrison.

1996 NZAA CONFERENCE - WHAKATANE

Date: 9-14 April 1996

Venue: Whakatane, actual venue still to be finalised

Organisers: Kim Tatton
Department of Conservation
PO Box 1146
ROTORUA

phone: (07) 3479179

Fax:(07) 3479115

Papers: Papers, 10-20 minutes in length, are invited on any subject relevant to New Zealand or Pacific archaeology. Following the success of the 'Work in Progress' session this year we intend to repeat it, so we invite short papers of 5-10 minutes for that session. Please get in early with your offers of papers so that you don't miss out. Please provide a brief description of your paper, including the length of delivery, as soon as possible so that topics can be organised into logical groupings.

Tentative Programme:

Tuesday, 9 April: Formal welcome at Wairaka Marae, Whakatane 3pm, followed by registration and happy hour(s).

Wednesday, 10 April: 9 am papers start, running all day.
Evening - drinks at the Whakatane Museum, followed by Public Lecture.

Thursday, 11 April: All day fieldtrip, departing Whakatane 9 am.

Friday, 12 April: Papers in the morning, afternoon session on archaeological site protection and the results/options arising from the Commissioner for the Environment's review of the HPT. AGM late afternoon. Evening - wine and cheese

cruise on the Ohiwa Harbour.

Saturday, 13 April: Papers in the morning, workshop style fieldtrips in the afternoon. Conference dinner - proposed hangi and fire-walking at the marae.

Sunday, 14 April: Papers all morning, Conference concludes 2pm.

Optional Fieldtrip: We will run an optional fieldtrip on Monday (15 April) to Moutohora (Whale Island). There will probably be limited places available for this trip and they will be on a 'first come' basis. More details will follow in January about this trip.

General Notes: Conference is timed to run after the Easter break so people will need to start thinking about accommodation relatively early. Offers of papers need to start coming in over summer so the programme can be planned. A further notice about the Conference will be sent out with the subscription notices in mid January which will have more concrete details. Members should start thinking about accommodation options over the summer as this area is very popular around Easter, and while most visitors will be leaving on the Easter Tuesday there is likely to be quite a number still around, i.e. accommodation might be short.

Note: A list of accommodation is included on the enclosed Conference flyer.

SAHANZ: AUCKLAND 96 INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

The 1996 Conference of SAHANZ (Society of Architectural Historians Australia and New Zealand) will take place at the University of Auckland, New Zealand, between Wednesday 2 - Sunday 6 October, 1996. The theme will be;

Loyalty and Disloyalty in the Architecture of the British Empire and Commonwealth

The Conference will address architecture, town planning, landscape, and interior design. A wide range of methodologies is encouraged as well as speakers from diverse backgrounds, historians and practitioners. Three broad areas will be acknowledged and/or questioned: the emphasis of British ties through architecture; the fragmentation of these ties through the adaptation of diverse models (such as the turning to US or Scandinavian prototypes in the 1950s); the present state of British architectural reference and the manner in which the increased awareness of indigenous architectural forms (Maori and Pacific Islands in New Zealand for example) now represents a new 'loyalty'.

A complementary open session will allow for papers on all aspects of Architectural History outside the Conference theme proper. This will allow those engaged in diverse research fields to present their material, or

research-in-progress reports, to an interested, and qualified, audience.

Paper titles with 200 word abstract to be submitted by 1 July 1996.

For further information contact:

Dr Hugh Maguire, Department of Art History, The University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland, New Zealand.

Tel:64-9-3737599(ext 7253); Fax 64-9-373 7014;

email:h.maguire@auckland.ac.nz

SITE RECORDING CO-ORDINATOR

The Association urges members to send copies of any site survey reports they produce to the Central File so that all relevant material is readily available to the archaeological community and associated public bodies.

The Association supports the principle of open access to archaeological information and this ethic has most recently been enshrined in the document governing the organisation and operation of the Site Recording Scheme (*Archaeology In New Zealand* 37 (4):282-299 (1994)). The Association has long urged that limited circulation site survey reports (the so-called 'grey literature') produced by its members should be made readily available through the Association's Site Recording Scheme and through public bodies such as the New Zealand Historic Places Trust.

Since the 1993 Historic Places Act came into force, the onus for survey and assessment has passed to applicants and their consultants. A new 'lighter-shade-of-grey' literature has developed which it is becoming increasingly difficult to keep track of. Some of this information is reaching the Site Recording Scheme and some the N.Z. Historic Places Trust but, if an archaeologist finds no sites or if the client develops so as to avoid damage, the reports may remain a matter between the client and their consultant. The Association believes that this information should be made available to the archaeological community and the public generally.

If the Association's Site Recording Scheme is to remain a key resource in the medium and long term, access to this rapidly developing grey literature is necessary. Even reports on areas where no sites were found are significant. Many judgements are based on ideas about the likely distribution of sites and this information can help test such models. **The Association requests members to provide copies of their reports for addition to the collection held with the Central File** (N.Z.A.A. Central File, C/- Conservation Sciences Centre, P.O. Box 10-420, Wellington.)

Chris Jacomb
Site Recording Co-ordinator

ALEXANDER S. ONASSIS PUBLIC BENEFIT FOUNDATION

Grants and scholarships for foreign scholars and students.

Applications for research grants and postgraduate research scholarships close 28th February 1996.

These grants, which cover airfares, hotel accommodation and a monthly allowance, are addressed to foreign scholars working in a university or research institution and are allotted as follows:

A1: Up to 5 grants for a one month stay in Greece will be offered to academicians and university professors whose scientific work has been widely acclaimed and who wish to visit Greece in order to conduct research or to collaborate with scientific institutions.

A2: Up to 5 grants for a duration of 6 months will be offered to university researchers (max. age 50yrs) who wish to do research in Greece in cooperation with a Greek university.

B: Postgraduate scholarships of Greek language teachers.

C: Postgraduate research scholarships for a period of 12 months are addressed to foreign postgraduate and PhD. students who pursue theoretical or artistic studies in universities, scientific centres or Fine Art schools.

Please contact the editor if you are interested and I will send you the detailed information on eligibility and how to apply.

The following letter was sent to the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment by the Institute of New Zealand Archaeologists (Inc.) on 16 February 1995.

Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment
P.O. Box 10-241
WELLINGTON
FAX: 04 471 0331

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES OF LOCAL COUNCILS

The Institute represents a small group of archaeologists engaged in private sector consulting or in the public service.

Our submission concerns the statutory functions of the Historic Places Trust and their relationship with district plan and local council consents under the Resource Management Act. The Historic Places Act 1993 was written following the Resource Management Act 1991 and, as a matter of Parliamentary policy, attempts to integrate cultural or heritage protection with the natural or physical protection offered under the Resource Management Act.

We believe the implementation of these Acts is not achieving the protection sought.

The Trust's primary statutory functions are to administer a system of authorities (consents) for archaeological sites (HP Act ss 9-20), and to register all classes of historic places (including archaeological sites and wahi tapu)(HP Act ss 22-37).

Local councils have not dissimilar statutory functions under the RM Act. Although charged primarily with the sustainable use of natural and physical resources, they have powers to enter historic places in district plans and to issue consents which protect historic places (RM Act, ss 7(e), 75; schedule 2 Part 1 4(c)), Part 2 2(c).

An historic place registered under the HP Act must be notified to the local council, and the council in turn must refer any consent relating to the place to the Historic Places Trust (HP Act, ss 34 35). This is the essential integrative mechanism between the consenting operations of the Trust and local councils. Clearly it depends on an adequate body of, and continuing programme to notify, registered sites. There are many examples where national executive programmes have been required to give proper effect to the principal Act. The obvious example is national coastal policy and the designation of ASCVs (areas of significant coastal conservation value).

Where adequate enforcement or compliance of the statute depends on some preliminary executive action, this action should be given the highest priority, as has been the case with coastal policy.

We believe that the Trust is not placing priority on national programmes for registration of archaeological sites, and appears generally under-resourced (from the Appropriation Act) to deliver such a programme.

Such a lack places great weight on the adequacy of the district plan provisions of local councils which vary greatly in the quality of attention paid to these issues. In addition, any protection depends on the activity concerned being controlled in some way under the district plan. However, some district councils take the view that they have no mandate to initiate such provisions and controls. In any case, such control is not available where there is an existing use or no consent is required for a new use. Existing farming uses (cultivation, fencing, farm forestry) are prime examples. It appears therefore that Parliamentary intention established in the Historic Places Act 1993 is being widely frustrated in practice.

Waipa District Council

You seek examples of local council activities or programmes for review. Our notes cover the Waipa District only. For some years, the district council has

had recorded archaeological sites listed in its district plan. This data was supplied through the Department of Conservation as a computer file and plotted on to maps as part of the district plan. The data is from the files of the New Zealand Archaeological Association (Inc.), and the sites are not the subject of statutory registration.

The types of site include many fortifications representative of pre-European, early 19th century and New Zealand Wars period. Such sites are found in this district in great numbers and include such nationally renowned places as Matakaitaki, Paterangi and Orakau.

This was an excellent initiative on the part of the council, Department of Conservation and the New Zealand Archaeological Association as the owner of the file data. It has materially aided protection of historic places in the district, except as we note for existing uses. We understand that the district also refers its applications for consents covering these places to the Historic Places Trust.

However, the Historic Places Trust has made no effort to register sites in this priority area. It is also an area in which there are several existing lists of priority sites. The result is that landowners are not directly notified of the existence of sites.

In addition, any scheme for archaeological site protection has to allow for the discovery and protection or investigation of sites that may not have been known before a development was to take place. The Historic Places Act 1993 has a form of words in s. 13 that allows for investigation to determine whether a site exists. No such provision is made in the Waipa District plan. We believe that the plan should allow for any development to be subject to scrutiny for unknown archaeological sites to be searched for.

National scene

The consequence of the Historic Places Trust's failure to carry out registration means:

- (a) existing uses escape the net of Historic Places Act protection;
- (b) where councils have not taken up their discretionary planning powers (and only a few have) there is a very limited protection, or onus on landowner and district council alike to protect archaeological sites;
- (c) even where known sites are afforded a degree of protection under district plans, there is still no provision to check for effects on unknown archaeological sites.

At present, buildings are reasonably widely and representatively registered. Archaeological sites and wahi tapu, by contrast, are poorly registered. Of approximately 50,000 sites known and recorded by the Archaeological Association only 1,000 are registered and therefore notified to local councils.

Almost all of these sites are in five council jurisdictions only (Otago, Tasman, Gisborne, Whakatane and Western Bay of Plenty). Other council areas urgently need this degree of coverage.

On the matter of cost: we value the individual records of the New Zealand Archaeological Association at approximately \$150 (i.e., the total file is worth \$0.75M).

The cost of taking such sites through to registration to landowners and councils, using a programme of systematic district by district evaluation of existing records would be \$300 per site (iwi consultation, professional evaluation, field visit, documentation on to cadastral base determination of name and address of owner, cost of document preparation and mailing). To register 15% of all sites currently known would therefore cost in the order of \$2.3M, which could be committed over 10 years.

To our knowledge, the Historic Places Trust has never costed or presented a realistic programme of registration under its statutory programmes. Urgent attention is needed to restore and resource these essential planning needs, and we recommend strongly that you draw this need to the attention of Parliament.

Yours sincerely

Ray Hooker

President

Institute of New Zealand Archaeologists (Inc.)

**Office of the PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT
Te Kaitiaki Taiao a Te Whare Pāremata**

**INVESTIGATION INTO THE SYSTEM OF HISTORIC AND CULTURAL
HERITAGE MANAGEMENT IN NEW ZEALAND**

With the objective of maintaining and improving the quality of the environment (Environment Act 1986, s 16), the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment has decided to review the system of agencies and processes for the management of historic and cultural heritage in New Zealand.

DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. To review the allocation of functions to, and linkages between, public authorities involved in historic and cultural heritage protection.
2. To review identification and listing procedures for the protection of historic and cultural heritage.

3. To report the results to the House of Representatives and to provide advice as appropriate.

SUMMARY OF CRITICAL ISSUES

- **Weak mandate:** Is New Zealand's historic and cultural heritage given sufficient recognition as a component of national identity? There is limited policy at national level and no agency appears to be clearly taking the lead for historic and cultural heritage at either national or regional levels.
- **Weaknesses in the Historic Places Act 1993 (HPA) and unclear linkages to other legislation, notably the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Conservation Act 1987.** The HPA is intended to be the main statute for historic and cultural heritage management; however the main mechanisms for heritage protection are Regional Policy Statements, District Plans and Heritage Orders under the RMA. The lack of reference in the HPA to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi may devalue it in the view of Maori.
- **Allocation of functions and powers between agencies is unclear, notably between the New Zealand Historic Places Trust (the Trust) and local authorities.** The Department of Conservation's (DoC) historic and cultural heritage functions and priorities outside the conservation estate are also unclear at both national and conservancy level. The relationship between the Trust and DoC has changed significantly since 1993 and the effects of these changes are still being felt by both agencies. Local authority policy and practice varies greatly. Some councils do not have a schedule of protected sites in their District Plans, regarding the Trust as the primary agency for historic and cultural heritage, or leaving protection up to voluntary compliance.
- **The Trust has a very wide range of potentially conflicting functions and powers.** Do the decision-making, consultation and administrative structures of the Trust allow effective participation of regional expertise (both staff and membership) and of tangata whenua?
- **Resourcing issues:** Most historic and cultural heritage management functions appear to be significantly under-resourced, especially when public purchase is seen as the best option for protection.
- **Mechanisms for protection:** A wide range of protection mechanisms is theoretically available to agencies, but loss of significant heritage buildings and sites has continued. There seems to be a disproportionate focus of attention on the compulsory regulation mechanisms, which are used very infrequently because of heavy financial and political costs. The implementation of Heritage Protection Orders has often been highly controversial. Recent government policy on taxation and earthquake

insurance coverage has had significant effects on the implementation of protection.

- **Assessment processes:** There have been some criticisms of technical standards and consistency in assessing historic and cultural heritage, both for the Trust and for local authorities.
- **Issuing of authorities by the Trust:** The Trust's criteria and processes for issuing of authorities to destroy, damage, or modify archaeological sites are unclear, and some decisions very controversial.
- **The effectiveness of the Trust's register:** The Register is widely acknowledged to be very incomplete and uneven. The Trust's resources to adequately maintain and develop the Register are very limited. Some sites are not registered because of perceived inadequacies of protection and cultural reasons for non-disclosure; but there is also a widespread misconception that the Trust's registration mechanisms in themselves offer secure protection.

Comment: In a preliminary assessment of the above issues in order to develop draft Terms of Reference, it seems clear that the most fundamental issues relate in the first instance to the overall system for historic and cultural heritage management, notably the functions and powers of statutory agencies. Performance aspects are certainly not unimportant, but may not be resolvable until the system itself is less ambiguous.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA will be developed during the early part of the investigation.

SUGGESTED STRUCTURE

The investigation report will include:

- Overview of statutory provisions and organisational structure for historic and cultural heritage protection;
- discussion of assessment and listing procedures;
- discussion of protection procedures;
- discussion of 3 to 5 case studies, selected to provide field information on a representative range of historic and cultural heritage issues and to interpret the Terms of Reference. Provisionally, the case studies will include cultural heritage issues involved with a proposed subdivision at Ngunguru Sandspit in Northland, management and protection of stonefield sites on the Auckland isthmus, and protection of historic buildings and precincts in two metropolitan and/or regional cities. Most of the case study detail will be presented in a background report;
- conclusions and recommendations.

INVESTIGATION TEAM

Paul Blaschke (Team Leader)

Gill James

Consultant peer reviewer(s) may be contracted

Phil Hughes

Kirsty Woods

PRELIMINARY TIMETABLE

Nov 1995-Jan 1996: Discussion on draft TOR and assessment criteria,
information gathering and field visits
end Dec 1995: Finalise TOR, outline of draft report
early March 1996: Complete draft report for review
May 1996: Table report in Parliament

Editor's Note: Comments from NZAA Members on the Draft Terms of Reference should be directed to the Commissioner for the Environment.

THE KING AND THE PYRAMIDS

In October/November the *Sunday Star Times* ran a series of articles 'The Secrets of the Pyramids' on the lines of Von Daniken. At least one piece of correspondence on the series will be of interest:

The King and the pyramids

Regarding "Secrets of the Pyramids" (October 22), I am surprised you failed to provide your readers with insight into modern developments of great importance.

Geometry demonstrates that straight lines through the earth connect the Great Pyramid at Giza, the CN Tower in Toronto, Canada, and the site of the Sky Tower in Auckland.

It is no coincidence that three erections of such size and astounding geometrical symmetry - just look at the number of ridiculously perfect right angles in the Sky Tower - should be completed before the end of the millennium.

Observation of the workmen at the Sky Tower suggests that they must be under the influence of some extraordinary power. How else can we explain their accomplishments?

But what is the significance of the rising of this mighty triumvirate?

Both the CN Tower and the Sky Tower will have powerful

telecommunications antennae at their summits.

The Great Pyramid at Giza was capped with gold, a perfect conductor, making it an ancient communications tower. We conclude that these towers together are capable of *receiving* and *magnifying* extraterrestrial signals.

But what signals? The millennium is associated with the birth or rebirth of kings. If a king is to appear in a blaze of extraterrestrial power who will it be?

Near Memphis (named after the ancient Egyptian city), Tennessee, lies *Graceland*, which geometry demonstrates is connected by a straight line through the earth to the Great Pyramid.

The answer is clear; the year 2000 will see the rebirth of *The King* (have you ever looked at a computer enhanced image of the face on the Sphinx?).

Amazing, but true and all before the invention of the guitar, although who knows what New Age archaeology will discover in the mysterious pyramids.

PETER J. SHEPPARD
Auckland

OBITUARY

Sir Grahame Clark, archaeologist, born July 28, 1907; died September 12, 1995

HUNTER-GATHERER OF PREHISTORY

From every part of the world, archaeologists owe and acknowledge a great debt to Grahame Clark, who has died aged 88. For more than six decades, he has played a central part in laying the foundations of a 'world archaeology', whose aim was to link human societies irrespective of the absence, presence or duration of human records - in his words "to uncover the community of men".

As a young graduate and then fellow of Peterhouse College, he ranged across the intellectual and ideological landscape of Cambridge searching for a way to invigorate prehistoric studies. The scope of that search is evident from his writings, including *The Mesolithic Age In Britain* (1932), *The Mesolithic Settlement of Northern Europe* (1935) and *Archaeology and Society* (1939). The most enduring of his explorations were into ideas emerging within economics and ecology in which he saw the potential for understanding past human societies on their own terms.

This led him to establish the Fenland Research Committee, and to team

up with the botanists Harry and Margaret Godwin to explore mesolithic hunter-gatherers at Shippea Hill, Cambridgeshire. The project was a remarkable forerunner of what is now the well established field of environmental archaeology. In 1935, he also played a central role in opening up the Prehistoric Society of East Anglia, which became a major force in disseminating findings in prehistory world-wide. In the same year he took up an assistant lectureship in the Cambridge Department of Archaeology.

Post-war he continued his collaboration with Godwin and his group and worked on the mesolithic hunting camp of Star Carr in Yorkshire. This project remains the world-wide classic of its type, and a major source for understanding human environmental relations through time. Its importance lies, in part, in the high quality of preservation within the site, but probably more so in the lively - and ongoing - debate about the lives of hunter-gatherers that Clark so skilfully drew out of the project.

He was elected, in 1952, to the John Disney chair of Archaeology at Cambridge, which he held for 22 years, consolidating the department's status as a world force. An integral part of his later public lectures was a series of slightly faded slides, each displaying a clutch of soggy and diffident undergraduates on one of his wetter excavations. Clark would introduce them one by one - here we see the professor of this Australian university, there the curator of that national museum - and so on. His graduates went on to dominate archaeology and heritage management in all corners of the globe.

Throughout his time as Disney professor, he sustained the momentum of a world archaeology explored through past economic and environmental relations. The three editions of his *World Prehistory* (1961, 1969, 1977) each made a lasting impact. The economic approach to archaeology further developed by one of his graduates, Eric Higgs, has been one of the most influential in recent decades, brought to fruition in Clark's major research project into the early history of agriculture which Higgs directed.

At the end of his tenure of the Disney Chair, Clark accepted the mastership of his lifelong college, Peterhouse. In his and Lady Clark's hands, the lodge became a very human place, combining the functions of formal reception and entertainment with those of a family home, where parties were held for college children under the Christmas tree. Displayed in the lodge was Clark's quite remarkable collection of art and ceramics, which remained a passion throughout his life.

He retained his sharp mind and intellectual curiosity all through his final years, always seeming to have new ideas for a book in mind. Even in his final months, he was working on a new text, *Man The Spiritual Primate*. He enjoyed meeting younger generations of archaeologists and quizzing them on new developments. At a recent dinner he met archaeologists from the Republic of Kazakhstan who were keen to build a new archaeology for their country. Clark

well understood that sentiment and had many times emphasised the diversity of human cultures. He was adamant, however, that the exploration of that diversity should be interwoven with an exploration of humanity's common inheritance, for which he stressed archaeology's close links with the natural environment. Having pioneered the ecological approach to the common quest for food, he advocated both scientific dating, which brought all local archaeologies within a common time frame, and biological methods that confirm and document our common ancestry. For Clark, that intimate fusion of an artefact - based study of cultural diversity and a scientific study of the common human inheritance was what world archaeology was all about.

A proud grandfather, he suffered, in later years, the loss of two of his children. Yet he retained a vitality, an inquiring spirit and an unsuppressible optimism about the future of the academic field to which he had devoted a life's work. He leaves his widow, Mollie, and a son.

Martin Jones

Published in The Guardian, Thursday September 28, 1995