



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

Holly Berghan, Matt Sole, Andrew Flaws and Andrew Pendergast

Donations

Ian Lawlor

Roger Curtis Green 1932 - 2009

kaumatua n a senior member of a tribe; elder

Roger was a kaumatua to many of us. He lived through a time when there were large blank areas on the human history of the Pacific and he helped fill many of them. He approached this in a broad way, bringing together archaeology in its widest sense, historical linguistics, comparative ethnology and the historic record. Those of us who succeed him will be happy enough to fill in much smaller parts of the canvas. Someone may yet match his intellect and energy but the opportunities he had and took will not return. We will not see his like again.

Roger was born in New Jersey but grew up in Albuquerque, New Mexico where his western drawl originated. He had a lifelong love of the Southwest, shown in the turquoise jewellery he often wore. One youthful activity was going to stomps – dances – in cowboy boots where the music was the ancestor of rock and roll. The boots, though, did not survive the conservatism of either Harvard or 1950s Auckland. His initial study of anthropology and archaeology was at the University of New Mexico but his interests were wider. The influx of people to the nearby Los Alamos laboratory helped transform the university from a backwater. His first degree was in geology followed by one in anthropology. He had already commenced research in the archaeology of the Southwest and his first and influential publications were from work there. Postgraduate study

took him to Harvard where he came under the influence of Douglas Oliver and this diverted him to Oceania.

Harvard was a difficult time for Roger, he was impecunious, ill-fed as a result and suffered a period of serious illness. His musical love then was jazz. He could eke out a minimal food or coffee order in a club to stay and listen for hours. His later celebration of good food, wine and classical music and never admitting to being in good health, had some sources there.

He gained a Fulbright Fellowship in 1958 which he used in part to spend a period in Auckland, where he undertook some excavations and other fieldwork, acted as if he was an extra staff member to Jack Golson and prepared for a period of fieldwork on Mangareva, and later Mo'orea. His New Zealand excavations of the period were Tairua and Orongo Bay. He returned to Auckland in 1961, this time as a staff member and continued the project in Mo'orea, expanded into more New Zealand work and commenced his Western Samoan work. He now had students at Auckland University, some the first New Zealand postgraduate students of archaeology.

The New Zealand work included excavations at Harataonga, Taniwhapa, Maioro, Tokoroa, Kauri Point and Castor Bay. The publication that resulted – *The Prehistoric Sequence of the Auckland Province* – summarised a view of the culture history of the wider Auckland area and became his Harvard doctoral thesis. An opportunity to join the staff of the Bishop Museum took him to Hawaii in 1967. There he had a teaching role and also undertook rescue archaeology. Makaha on Oahu was a particular area of rescue work which Roger characteristically approached as if it were research. The inaugural James Cook Fellowship brought him back to New Zealand in 1970, based at Auckland Museum where he commenced research into Polynesian origins through excavations in the Southeast Solomon Islands. Auckland was to remain his home thereafter, cemented by appointment in 1973 to a personal chair at Auckland University. He undertook less fieldwork in New Zealand than in the 1960s but this work did continue, particularly through university field schools including the Puerua project.

Roger has been a consistent supporter of the New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA), its conferences, campaigns and publications. He served as its president in the 1960s. Roger had a decided influence on public archaeology in New Zealand. Apart from the more direct inputs, his roles as a teacher and archaeologist in this country have of course been enormously influential and these extended very much into public archaeology. One ongoing

result is the conservation laboratory at Auckland University which institutionalised the wood preservation work started under Wilfred Shawcross.

In his 1958 stay here he co-authored with Jack Golson NZAA handbook No. 1, *A Handbook to Field Recording in New Zealand*. This was cyclostyled and distributed free to all the members of the newly formed NZAA. It is the ancestor of the now much republished NZAA site recording handbook, and hence a seminal document in the site recording scheme so central to modern public archaeology in New Zealand.

His greatest single contribution was in the early 1970s. At that time there was some debate amongst the heritage community about the inadequacy of the law in protecting artefacts. There was a rapidly developing trade in these. In 1972 Stuart Park, Doug Sutton and Graeme Ward circulated a call to action linking artefacts and site protection as related issues. A response quickly appeared from *Pragmaticus*, thinly disguised Roger. He called on his recent experience in Hawaii where he had a central role in achieving site protection legislation and had been undertaking public archaeology. His message was that you need to keep what you ask for simple and you need to campaign very hard to get it. The two papers were published in the *Newsletter* early in 1973.

Roger came back on to the NZAA Council for two years under Janet Davidson's presidency and had a major role in doing just what he proposed. A pamphlet *Is there a Future for New Zealand's Past?* was published, supported by publishing Jim McKinlay's monograph *Archaeology and Legislation*. An intense letter writing campaign followed. Roger had a large part in orchestrating that. By the end of 1973 the need for legislation was accepted politically and by 1975 it was achieved (Historic Places Amendment Act 1975, Antiquities Act 1975). Others mentioned had major parts in this but Roger's sound advice on how and using all his contacts to good advantage were crucial. In 1974-76 and 1980-81 Roger served on the New Zealand Historic Places Trust Board and took a leading role in directing that organisation as it took up its new responsibilities in archaeology.

After a period of serious illness in the mid 1990s Roger's capacities were somewhat impaired but his energy was not. He engaged with his wide circle of colleagues to sustain his output of work and was as eager as ever to expand any idea into a piece of research. His late publications, many of which are yet to appear, will show that his lifetime habit of working and publishing jointly with colleagues only increased.

Roger had a generous and welcoming nature. The time he put into reviewing drafts of papers for others went far beyond the call of duty. One only had to reflect a small part of his curiosity and energy to have it returned in great measure. He was generous with his support, ideas and knowledge. He

often remarked on the egalitarian nature of the participants in New Zealand archaeology. It suited him well. He was a lifelong friend to many of those he worked with.

His honours include Fellow of the Royal Society of New Zealand, Member of the United States National Academy of Sciences, Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London, Hector Memorial medallist, Marsden Medal for services to science, and an Officer of the New Zealand Order of Merit. He was an honorary member of our Association.

Roger is survived by his wife Valerie. She and Roger have created the Green Foundation. It supports a broad range of anthropological research, consistent with their interests. The family ask that in memory of him, donations might go to further its work. Green Foundation, C/- Ellis Gould, PO Box 1509, Auckland 1140.

A bibliography of his enormous output prepared by Dorothy Brown appeared in *Oceanic Culture History – Essays in Honour of Roger Green*. (1996). A series of essays on Roger will also appear in the March 2010 edition of *Archaeology in New Zealand*.

Garry Law

NZAA President's Report

Review of Heritage Legislation

The Historic Places Act 1993 (HPA) and the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) archaeological and heritage provisions are coming under review by the present Government. The direction this review will take is far from certain.

Two separate processes are involved, the first being a comprehensive review of the HPA by the Ministry for Culture and Heritage (MCH), which will look specifically at the archaeological provisions, consider how the interface of the HPA with the RMA can be improved, and consider the potential for the statutory protection of archaeological sites to be integrated into the RMA.

The second process is part of Phase 2 of the RMA reforms (RMII-H) being undertaken by the Ministry for the Environment (MfE). A cabinet paper on this process has been posted on the MfE website (<http://www.mfe.govt.nz/cabinet-papers/progress-phase-two-resource-management-reforms.html#content>). One of the outcomes sought in this process is avoiding duplication of processes under the RMA and other statutes, and we know that the overlap of resource consent processes with authority processes has been seen as a problem for some time. MfE will consider the outcome of the MCH review in identifying options, but it is not clear at this stage how the two processes

relate to each other. The only assumption that can be made is that the heritage provisions in both Acts are unlikely to remain the same following these current reviews.

One direction identified in the past has been removing the archaeological provisions from the HPA and migrating them to the RMA. However, it is unlikely that all current the provisions would be included in the RMA – the loss of initial blanket protection of archaeological sites would be a more likely outcome. On the other hand, the RMA has considerable strengths in requiring the effects on sites to be avoided in the first instance, and in allowing the direct protection of sites through scheduling in district plans.

The two main options for the future of archaeological site protection legislation in New Zealand appear to be:

1. Retention of the archaeological provisions of the HPA, and possibly amendment of the HPA provisions (being considered in the review of the HPA by MCH); and
2. Repeal of the archaeological provisions of the HPA, so that archaeological site protection would be provided for through the RMA (as proposed by the 1998-1999 Historic Heritage Management Review, and as referred to in the recent RMI Cabinet paper).

The NZAA Council's view is that it is critical that the NZAA is an integral part of these processes of review rather than just another submitter after the main policy decisions have been made. However, no consideration has been given to the NZAA in current review processes to date, and the NZAA has not been included in the initial stakeholder consultation for the MCH review.

I have therefore written to both the Minister for Culture and Heritage and the Minister for the Environment requesting meetings with ministers and/or their officials to discuss what input NZAA could have into both processes, and to offer technical advice on the various options being considered. The Council has established an informal sub-committee made up of myself, Garry Law, Aidan Challis and Sarah Macready to consider the various options from an NZAA perspective so that we can do this effectively. We are in the process of developing an NZAA position paper as a basis for discussions so that our views and advice can be taken into account at an early stage in the process. So far we have received a response from the MCH agreeing to a meeting and assuring us that the NZAA will be consulted on the discussion paper currently being developed.

The approach we intend to take is to state the outcomes that NZAA feels should be provided for in any legislation relating to archaeological site protection, assess the strengths and weaknesses of two options in terms of achieving the outcomes, and consider the options in terms of international best practice.

We do not intend at this stage to argue for one option over another. As a first step in the process we have developed the following draft outcomes and aims:

Long term outcomes (end outcomes; benefits for all New Zealanders)

1. Continued visibility of archaeological sites in New Zealand's cultural landscapes.
2. Security of archaeological sites as resources for future historical and scientific research.
3. Retention of archaeological information of significance to present and future generations.
4. Maori archaeological sites retaining their cultural, spiritual, and traditional qualities.
5. All New Zealanders valuing archaeological sites as important to identity and sense of place.

Medium term outcomes (intermediate outcomes; preconditions needed)

1. Effective and easily understood archaeological site protection legislation.
2. Clear national policy on archaeological site protection, fully taken into account.
3. Nationally consistent implementation of archaeological site protection processes.
4. Maori exercising kaitiakitanga (guardianship) of archaeological sites important to them.
5. Minimised risks to archaeological sites from subdivision, land use, and development.
6. Clear national strategy to maximise the effectiveness of archaeological investigations.
7. Easily accessible good quality reports from all archaeological work.
8. Increased public profile of archaeological sites and their protection.

Aims of archaeological site protection

1. To ensure that archaeological sites and areas of archaeological value are preserved.
2. To avoid where possible the destruction, damage, or modification of archaeological sites.

3. Where the protection of an archaeological site cannot be achieved, to minimise the destruction, damage, or modification of the site.
4. Where the protection of an archaeological site of importance to New Zealand history, culture, or science cannot be achieved, to carry out and report on an archaeological investigation of the site.
5. To provide for archaeological research investigations which comply with accepted good practice standards.

We would like feedback from members on these draft outcomes and aims, and comment on the two options set out above. You can provide this to us by email (sarah@clough.co.nz).

ArchSite

You can now download site record forms at any time day or night. ArchSite is an essential tool for consultants and the New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT), and also a powerful tool for territorial local authorities (TLAs), the Department of Conservation (DOC) and anyone managing heritage resources or administering heritage databases. As you are aware, after a tremendous effort the NZAA launched ArchSite (www.archsite.org.nz) at the Wellington conference this year. ArchSite is an online database and GIS which incorporates information from NZAA's Site Recording Scheme and Upgrade Project. I would like to thank all those involved in both the upgrade project and development of ArchSite and for the support of DOC, NZHPT, the Lotteries Commission and the Department of Internal Affairs.

Work on ArchSite is ongoing – finalising the upgrade, auditing the paper files and refining the service. The Council is now actively promoting the service to TLAs and is expecting that subscription to the service will enable recruitment of an administrator and remove some of the load from Nicola Molloy (DO C).

NZAA Website

We have also started re-development of the main NZAA website. Garry Law and Simon Bickler have set up a new content management system (CMS) to allow for the website to expanded and provide a range of possible new features for NZAA members. They are in the process of moving content from the old site to the new and will then start to bring new features online over the

next year. You can check out progress at www.nzarchaeology.org/cms and any volunteers to help with the migration are welcome.

Publications

As announced by the outgoing President at the annual general meeting, Council has created a structure where all publications of the Association are grouped together for budgeting and accounting purposes. The publications manager, Louise Furey, has responsibility for monographs, the journal and *Archaeology in New Zealand*, and reports directly to Council. With the resignation of long-standing *New Zealand Journal of Archaeology* editor, Janet Davidson, and business manager, Foss Leach, the Council has taken the opportunity to initiate changes to the refereed journal.

The *Journal of Pacific Archaeology*, edited by Atholl Anderson, will be produced twice a year and also be available in electronic form. We have taken this step to widen the readership and subscription base of the journal, and a new name was appropriate given the multiple changes made.

Two monographs, *Auckland Islands* and *Lapita: Ancestors and Descendants*, have been published this year. The latter, edited by Sheppard, Thomas and Summerhayes, is a collection of papers presented at the Lapita Conference in Honiara in 2008.

Rod Clough

Journal of Pacific Archaeology

The refereed publication of the Association is to undergo changes after 30 years as *New Zealand Journal of Archaeology*. The new name of the journal is *Journal of Pacific Archaeology*, edited by Atholl Anderson, and will be produced twice a year starting in January 2010. The journal will have a new style, size, and will also be available electronically. There will be a mix of New Zealand and Pacific papers, and book reviews. The first issue has New Zealand papers on Wairau Bar, Karamaea midden and historic rubbish pits.

Go to <http://www.pacificarchaeology.org> to subscribe or contact the business manager. The contact details are on the enclosed flier and also on the NZAA website. Existing subscribers will be contacted and invited to follow directions on the website for subscription to *Journal of Pacific Archaeology*.

Louise Furey

Skinner Fund

The Royal Society of New Zealand have advised that the Skinner Fund has been increased from \$3000 to \$6000. The purpose of the fund is to pro-

mote 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. This includes the detailed analysis of all cultural, artistic, or physical remains recovered as the result of such investigations. To this end, the Skinner Fund committee deems research projects that have survey, recording, and excavation as their goal, to have equal weight with those which propose to treat analytically and comparatively materials already so recovered. Preference is given to well-documented research plans that specify methodology and anticipated outcomes of the proposed research.

Grant allocations are normally up to about \$1000. Application should be made before May 1st each year. Details are on the Royal Society web page www.royalsociety.co.nz.

Bruce McFadgen