NEW ZEALAND
ARCHAEOLOGICAL
ASSOCIATION

ARCHAEOLOGY IN NEW ZEALAND

REVIEWS

Sian Jones. ***The Archaeology of Ethnicity: Constructing Identities in the Past and Present.*** **Routledge. London. 1997.**

This volume promises some very interesting reading. In her introduction, Sian Jones asserts that she will examine the ways in which archaeology treats ethnicity and from this, investigate two issues: the relationship between ethnicity and material culture on the one hand, and the relationship between archaeology modern conceptions of ethnic identity on the other. Both issues are highly relevant to current concerns within the discipline of archaeology, living as we do in the age of increasing indigenous rights, debates over cultural resource management and the challenges of extending and deepening our understandings of ancient societies on a social as well as an ecosystemic level. Unfortunately, in trying to come to grips with two such large and complex subjects, Jones falls a little short of the mark with both.

In the first two-thirds of the book, Jones provides a cogent and thorough summary of the existing literature on the history and meaning of the concepts of ethnicity in social anthropology and culture in archaeology. Her intention is to proceed from this treatment to a new understanding of the way in which ethnicity might be understood archaeologically. Her proposal ultimately is that ethnicity is a complex and historically constituted phenomenon. By proceeding in particular from Bentley's (1987) reading of Bourdieu, Jones argues that we can approach ethnicity as a feature of social existence that is determined by a complex mixture of habitus and more idiosyncratic strategising based upon the particular conditions in which individuals or groups find themselves with regard to those around them.

Clearly drawing on the work of Hodder and others in the post-processual school of British archaeology, Jones argues that whilst ethnicity cannot be determined simplistically from the archaeological record, we can nevertheless recognise the creation and maintenance of ethnic identities in the archaeological record through the manipulation of symbolic and stylistic information in material culture. Her case study of Roman Britain clearly offers hints of some useful and interesting examples of this phenomenon at work. However, she seems unwilling to take her readers into the actual mechanics of her analysis of Roman-period British sites as an example of ethnicity in action and this is one of the most frustrating things about this volume. Moreover, her analysis of the material indices of ethnicity in the Roman British situation seem unnecessarily tentative.

If Jones had provided us with more contextual information on her case study and the criteria that she herself used to identify different kinds of ethnic identities she believes were being asserted in these situations, we might be in a better position to evaluate for ourselves the soundness or otherwise of her argument. In any case, Jones' timidity is a little disappointing given the cogent discussions of criteria of proof provided by Wylie (1992), Preucel (1991)and others.

The cynical might be forgiven for identifying Jones' treatment of the subject as yet another example of armchair theorising in the grand tradition of British philosophe archaeology. I myself am more of the opinion that at least part of the fragmented nature of this work probably results from some fairly hasty editorial decisions, and from the clear fact, acknowledged by the author herself, that this is a revised version (fairly obviously of only selected parts) of her doctoral dissertation. For similar reasons, Jones' treatment of the relationship between archaeology and modern ethnic politics is very poorly integrated with the rest of her book and is basically discussed only in the introduction and (briefly) in the conclusion. The absence of a more focussed and insightful treatment of this subject was disappointing especially since it could clearly have been produced if this had been the sole aim of the monograph.

In conclusion therefore, I would recommend this book as a fairly thorough introduction to the general literature on the ethnicity in social theory and an insightful historical and theoretical treatment of the culture concept in archaeology. However, readers wanting a more critical and fully-operationalised application of modern ethnicity theory to the

archaeological record will have to look elsewhere.

References

Bentley, G.Carter. 1987. Ethnicity and practice. *Comparative Studies in Society and History 29*: 24-55

Preucel, Robert W. (ed). 1991. Processual and Postprocessual Archaeologies. *Occasional Papers no.10.* Center for Archaeological Investigations, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Carbondale, Il.

Wylie, Alison. 1992. The Interplay of evidential constraints and political interests:recent archaeological research on gender. *American Antiquity 57*: 15-35.

Christopher Fung
University of Auckland

***New Zealand Historical Atlas*. Malcolm McKinnon, editor, with Barry Bradley and Russell Kirkpatrick. David Bateman in association with Historical Branch, Department of Internal Affairs. 1997. 292 pages, 228 in full colour. Price: $99.95.**

I love maps and can spend hours looking at them, planning journeys, imagining landscapes, looking for structural trends in mountain ranges, comparing political maps with topographic maps, and so on. The recently released *New Zealand Historical Atlas* sounded like it was going to be a real treat.

It isn't.

It is awful. There is lots of information entangled amongst its entrails, some of it important, some of it new, some of it trivial, some of it wrong, and most of it no doubt extremely accurate. But what a mess!

The big problem is that the small army of historians, cartographers and editors who put it together seem to have been mesmerized by the ease with which digitally stored maps can be computer-distorted into all sorts of unfamiliar projections, perspectives and proportions. It is claimed that each projection has been 'chosen for its unique kinds of distortions which best the purpose of the map and the data portrayed'. I am happy to admit that there

is scope for different projections to illustrate different kinds of information, and that good old Mercator isn't the answer to everything, but I still think it is reasonable to expect north to be somewhere near the top of the page, and if it isn't then there should be a little pointy arrow somewhere on the page to show where north is. And a scale is handy too. But the creators of this book insist on such extreme distortions in some maps that there is no point in adding a scale, because it varies so much across the map. It is claimed that north arrows are always included when north is not at the top of the page, but this is not true.

The worst maps are a series of nine 'Papatuanuku' plates supposedly displaying Maori traditional information. Here, it is explained, (and I paraphrase) it was deemed politically incorrect to use conventional cartography 'given the link between cartography and the Pakeha colonisation of New Zealand' (p.10). Instead these plates view chunks of New Zealand as they might be delineated by an imaging radar satellite in low earth orbit. Lowlands are in bilious green, hill country is in bright yellow, mountains are a rich reddish brown. The general impression created is that of a spinach lasagna with a cheese topping scrumptiously grilled - see in particular the South Island in plate 25 viewed from about 80 km above Rangitikei. Sprinkled about in the topping, like chopped up oregano, is lots of semi-legible text. These plates are, the preface proudly informs us, prepared by digital manipulation, and, as if to prove a point, all the rivers are broken up into little en-echelon 'bits' as though they have come through a fax machine.

Another awful map in the same oblique genre is that of the British invasion of Waikato, plate 38. This time the perspective is from a point over Auckland looking south. The idea of this is supposed to be that we get a sense of the action moving from the north 'up' into the south - from the foreground to the background. It also happens to be the way General Cameron saw the campaign (and contemporary British maps of the Waikato were in fact drawn with south to the top of the page). It certainly isn't the way the Maoris, shown as retreating steadily into the background, would have portrayed the war. A conventional vertical perspective would have been far more politically neutral. At a more practical level, a conventional map would have avoided having all the complicated action late in the campaign, from Paterangi to Orakau, being squeezed to unintelligibility in the background.

My main gripe about all the distorted and disoriented maps is that it becomes very difficult to compare one map with another.

There is a 'How to Use' section near the front of the Atlas. It tells us that 'The larger the graphic, the more important is its message'. We might therefore expect on the subject of European voyaging (plate 27) a big chart, showing, in a multitude of colours, the routes of Tasman, Cook, du Fresne, d'Urville, and all the rest, right? Wrong! Tasman and Cook get tiny maps on which New Zealand is 0.8 mm long. So does Magellan. A big two-page spread is, however, devoted to the voyaging of Charles Bishop. Who? Umm, well.... the Atlas doesn't actually say who he was, but he did put into Dusky sound in 1801, apparently, which at least makes him more relevant than Magellan. his route 'shows the extractive and opportunistic nature of Pacific trade in the years between 1790 and 1820' - or so we are told.

Cook gets another look-in on plate 33 for the crime of 'appropriating the landscape' by renaming it. According to this map Cook named, or renamed, an 'Admiralty Bay' inside Queen Charlotte sound as well as the one near D'Urville Island. Ooops! It turned out to be the Atlas that goofed, not Cook.

And, oh yes, D'Urville's 1827 route appears, unexplained, inexplicably and anachronistically, in a big map of 'Battles and migrations, 1830s' (plate 29)!

Images, the preface tells us, add value to content. And there are lots of images. How much value they add is debateable. On plate 28, for example, there is a cluster of images concerned with 'Cost of one musket'. There is a picture of one musket, apparently adding value to the concepts of 'musket' and 'oneness'. Then a date, 1827, with a kit of spuds and ten little pigs, and another date, 1820, with a bigger kit of spuds and more little pigs. In case the added value of these images escapes the reader's mental cash register, there is also an old fashioned verbal explanation. In 1827, we learn, a musket is worth 120 baskets of potatoes or ten pigs, while in 1820 a musket was worth 200 baskets of potatoes or fifteen pigs. This in turn shows that 'Muskets were most costly when they were most in demand - at the time of the great northern taua to the south'. On the plus side, the next plate has some good maps of routes taken by war parties and migrations, although it grates to see the laborious, embattled, footslogging heke of Ngati Toa depicted as a smoothly curved arrow whizzing by sea from Kawhia to Kapiti, without even popping in to Taranaki on the way.

A tiny map on plate 36 purports to show mission stations to 1845. Amongst the Wesleyan stations, the main station on the Waikato west coast, Ahuahu in Kawhia harbour, has been omitted while lesser stations at Whakatumutumu

and Mokau included. Amongst CMS stations the historically significant one at Puriri in the Wauhou swamplands is omitted. The omissions are simple drafting errors rather than research deficiencies - the source map, drawn in 1940 for an earlier historical atlas which never happened, shows both missing stations, but the draftsman who drew the present map never noticed them amongst the wealth of detail in the earlier map. Available in the Turnbull Library, the earlier map, incidentally, gives an idea of what the 1997 atlas could have been if it had maintained 1940 standards of scholarship. It shows all the outstations on the mission circuits as well as the base stations, and the like of it has never been published.

Most field archaeologists at one time or other will have run across strange concrete structures on remote headlands which locals explain as something left over from World War II. Plate 81, 'Fortress New Zealand: Military installations in 1943' won't be much help in identification. There are all sorts of quite important installations left out, and, conversely, some quite insignificant installations put in, such as coast watching stations at Cape Egmont and Albatross Point. Amongst the important sites left out are the big RNZAF stores bases at Te Rapa, Hamilton and Weedons, Canterbury. The strategic dispersal airfield built for US bombers in inland Canterbury, at that time the longest runway in New Zealand, is absent. The map seems particularly weak on airfields, with that at Raglan amongst those left out, despite being featured as a 1970s Maori land claim (Eva Rickard's golf course) on plate 99. The naval radar at Cuvier Island has fallen victim to a drafting error, and has slipped down to Great Mercury. The radar at Hot Water Beach is present, but the Port War Signal Station at Opito is not. There are numerous unexplained 'civilian factories' scattered around the Southland and Canterbury plains. The classification of installations is somewhat weird. Coastwatching stations have their own symbol, while coastal radars, which performed the same function electronically, are lumped in with other varieties of 'station'. 'Maritime defence' excludes minefields (lumped with 'stations') and coastal batteries (lumped with anti-aircraft batteries). Altogether a thoroughly useless map. To cap things off the base map for all this is a fuzzy 1970s-vintage Landsat mosaic - a totally gratuitous anachronism, presumably intended to give a 'top-secret spy satellite' flavour to the compilation. And why, oh why, couldn't this map have also shown the routes (well documented but not widely known) taken by enemy raiders and submarines round the New Zealand coast during the war, and the Japanese spy-plane flights over Auckland and Wellington?

There are some 8 plates (9-16) out of 100 given over to prehistory and archaeology, and a number of other plates of archaeological significance. Despite some very good information being condensed into them it is still doubtful how much a non-specialist browser will get out of them. Like innumerable graphics throughout the Atlas these graphics, while being very valuable as illustrations in a specialist treatise, are likely to be useless or unintelligible in isolation. What use, for example, is a 1912 street map of Waihi showing the residences of strikers and strike breakers (plate 64) unless we happen to be reading a book about the Waihi industrial conflict? Some examples in the prehistory field:

- There are three small maps based on Geoff Irwin's work showing computer-simulated upwind voyaging and downwind returns. Fine. But without reading Irwin's book will a browser be able to make sense out of a whole lot of empty circles of varying diameter identified only as 'island screens'? These maps are probably meaningless to anyone who hasn't read Irwin.
- There is a small plan of the Hawksburn moa-butchery site. 'Excavations' are delineated much more boldly than hutsites, middens, ovens etc. There is nothing to indicate that the 'excavations' were done by Pakeha archaeologists rather than by prehistoric moahunters. Looking at the map without knowing it was (originally) drawn by an archaeologist, it would be natural to assume that the moahunters located all their huts, ovens, etc. in rectilinear 'excavations'. Perhaps to shelter from the wind?
- A map showing stone resources of the Maori has enormous great black blobs obliterating the Rotorua-Taupo graben and the east Coromandel ranges. Black blobs, the legend tells us, indicate obsidian sources. Some school kid trying to write an essay on the stone tools of the Maori would have to be forgiven for not noticing a tiny little dot in the Bay of Plenty called Mayor Island, which is also coloured black. The same kid is even less likely to notice a vague little grey patch near Nelson labelled argillite. Whatever argillite is, the kid would conclude it was obviously less important than the great yellow blob labelled silcrete covering half of Otago, or the pink blob called porcellanite covering one quarter of Southland. It is a dead cert that the kid would never notice that a tiny corner of Coromandel sticking out from under the obsidian blob is called Tahanga and is coloured brown for basalt. Would it not have been better to have had circles proportional to the amount of stone utilized centred on each of the source localities?

There is an excellent index.

Owen Wilkes