



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:

John Warner, Dave and Glennis Nevin

DONATIONS

Council would like to thank Anne Leahy for her donation to the Association

NZAA WEBSITE

The NZAA internet website has a new addition of an Email directory of New Zealand archaeologists and related experts. People are only added at their own request. It is on trial to see how many people want to use it. To access it and to get yourself included, visit the NZAA home page and follow the links.

The web page address is: www2.waikato.ac.nz/c14/nzaa/nzaa.html

1998 NZAA CONFERENCE PICTON

DATE: Tuesday 14 - Friday 17 April 1998
VENUE: Ancient Mariner Motor Inn, Waikawa Road,
Picton
ORGANISER: Debbie Foster
50 Devon St, PICTON
Ph/Fax 03-5736884
e-mail: mamaku@mlb.planet.gen.nz

PAPERS: There is still time to submit a paper, 10-20 minutes in length, on any subject relevant to New Zealand or Pacific archaeology. Please can you supply details to the organiser **ASAP**.

TENTATIVE PROGRAMME:

Tuesday, 14th April: Optional field trip. Steve Bagley is organising a cruise in the Marlborough Sounds departing 8am. An excellent opportunity to visit some well-known historic and archaeological sites. **WE NEED AT LEAST 40 PEOPLE - COST \$25 per person.**

Evening: - Conference Registration, Ancient Mariner.

Wednesday, 15th April: 9am start, general papers all morning.

Afternoon: **Historic Heritage Review** - this will be a major focus of the conference. There will be presentations by a Review Committee and by the Trust followed by discussion.

Evening: Public Lecture. **Trevor Worthy** will talk about the subfossil avifauna from Marfells Beach, Marlborough.

Thursday, 16th April: 9am start, general papers all morning.

Afternoon: fieldtrip - a bus trip from Picton to Port Underwood, with lots of stops and commentary on sites of interest. Cost included in Registration fee.

Friday, 17th April: 9am start, general papers followed by AGM. Half an hour will be allowed for final discussion of Heritage Review before voting on a submission.

Afternoon: We hope to conclude by 2pm

GENERAL: **Accommodation:** please refer to the list sent with your NZAA subscription notices. **BOOK NOW** - being immediately post-Easter, it is a busy time in Picton especially with the school holidays.

DRAFT SET OF PRINCIPLES RELATING TO THE HISTORIC HERITAGE MANAGEMENT REVIEW DISCUSSION PAPER

The Discussion Paper for the heritage legislation review was released by Nick Smith on 2 February. We have until 24 April to prepare submissions. The process of submission writing has been simplified by the provision of a questionnaire. A copy of the Discussion Paper is printed in this issue, courtesy of the Department of Conservation. It is important that we have a consistent "bottom line" set of principles which any new system for heritage management must meet or exceed. These will help members to compose submissions (it is essential that every member with an interest in site protection writes one) and, more important, they will help to deliver a consistent message to the people with the job of analysing the submissions and coming up with a new system. Note that any group of identical submissions will be counted as one submission, so they all have to be individually prepared. At its 24 January meeting NZAA Council agreed to the following draft set of principles, which are largely based on the principles embodied in our Code of Ethics and in current international best practice literature. We will be publishing them in the next issue of *Archaeology in New Zealand* (as a draft), and will discuss them at the Picton conference, where I hope the AGM will agree to adopt them (or any revised version) for release to the press and government as our official line on the way the review should go.

Preamble

The archaeological heritage is a fragile resource which differs from natural and built heritage in being inherently non-renewable. It is steadily disappearing through natural processes, accelerated in many places by land development for housing, farming, forestry, roading and industry. Archaeological sites are an important source of scientific information on human history and past lifeways, as well as the history of the natural environment. Of equal importance to the information these sites contain are the less tangible heritage values which they represent. Much of the archaeological resource is of Maori origin and is first of all of significance to Maori but it is also the foundation of the historic heritage of all New Zealanders. The balance of the archaeological resource is of most direct significance to non-Maori, but the combined total is a communal public resource which makes a major contribution to our identity as New Zealanders and because of this it requires explicit protection provisions. It is essential

that blanket protection of archaeological sites, as legislated for in the current Historic Places Act, be continued in any new system, and that territorial authorities are required to enforce this legislation. This is an important "public good" issue which is more than just special pleading by particular interest groups.

Principles

1. Archaeological heritage protection should be integrated into general planning and resource management legislation.

The current system allows local authorities to pass a large part of responsibility for archaeological heritage protection to the HPT, which is not resourced to operate at local or regional level. The hope is that archaeological heritage protection would be more effective as part of the general planning and resource management system and resourced accordingly.

2. Good planning processes must take archaeological heritage information into account and avoid, mitigate or remedy effects.

The system for archaeological heritage protection should avoid effects to archaeological sites as a first option. If that is not possible, then mitigation must take place. The due process of planning may result in a decision that a site may be destroyed, but there is no excuse for not recovering all significant information. The duty to mitigate must be a statutory obligation. It is not possible to remedy effects on archaeological sites since, unlike most natural resources, archaeological sites do not regenerate and cannot (except visually) be repaired once damaged.

3. Any new system must recognise that there will be non-registered, non-recorded, or as-yet-undiscovered sites, which will also require either avoidance or mitigation.

This is not to say that we are opposed to registration or recording, just that there will always be the problem of undiscovered sites.

4. Developers must be made responsible for funding the appropriate management of heritage issues associated with development projects.

At the same time, however, systems for assistance to private landowners, in the form of tax relief and other incentives, need to be developed.

5. Individual sites must be seen in a district, regional and national context, and any new system must consider sites as part of a wider

archaeological landscape.

With the existing system, sites are often considered in isolation and not as a significant part of the present whole, and as a remnant of what once existed.

6. Any new system must take seriously the principle that archaeological values be considered at the same time as are all the other environmental values during land management processes.

They will be reinforced by these other values, where they exist, and reinforce the other values when the archaeological values are more significant. Formal linkage of the Historic Places Act and the Resource Management Act would go some way towards achieving this.

7. Where sites of significance to Maori are involved, the representation, involvement and participation of Maori in all relevant processes must occur as a matter of course.

8. Public agencies must be required to protect, manage and conserve responsibly the archaeological heritage on the land which they administer.

These include central government agencies, local and regional authorities and state-owned enterprises.

9. Any new system of archaeological heritage management will require a central agency to monitor standards and to manage a centrally funded inventory.

Devolution of the Historic Places Trust's statutory functions to local government poses serious risks to archaeological heritage protection. A central agency has been found necessary in other countries with effective historic heritage protection systems, to monitor standards and to administer incentives and central funding. Consistency in the practice and effectiveness of heritage management will be difficult to achieve unless a national policy statement is provided by government.

Chris Jacomb, President