NEW ZEALAND
ARCHAEOLOGICAL
ASSOCIATION

ARCHAEOLOGY IN NEW ZEALAND

REVIEWS

Larry J. Zimmerman, 2003. *Presenting the Past*. Archaeologist's Toolkit, 7. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek. Paper, xi + 162 pp, bibliography, index.

Presenting the Past is the seventh volume in a series designed to teach the basics of archaeology. The author of the book, Larry J. Zimmerman, is the head of the Archaeological Department of the Minnesota Historical Society and together with William Green, director of the Logan Museum of Anthropology and adjunct professor of Anthropology at Beloit College in Beloit, Wisconsin, edit the Toolkit series. Previous volumes in the series cover archaeological design, survey and excavation, the preparation and analysis of artefacts and biological remains, and the curation of collections. This seventh volume focuses on the types of audience encountered by archaeologists and how we may best present archaeological material to those audiences. The book came about through discussions and arguments about how to best tell people what archaeologists find and do. It covers diverse kinds of media available to present archaeology from reports, articles and books, to public lectures, poster presentations and electronic publications as well as movies, documentaries and games. It offers a wide range of insights and ideas to produce an effective presentation of the past for the entertainment and intellectual enlightenment of the audience. It also directs the reader to a number of resources to follow up and use to further their skills. The main theme throughout the book is recognising our audience to best present the past in the most appealing way.

The first of the 12 chapters provides a short introduction and the motive driving the book. Chapters 2 and 3 look at recognising our audience and choosing the right type of media for presenting archaeological material. Chapter 3 also takes into account contractual obligations and budgets. Chapter 4 looks at basic writing skills. It discusses citations and bibliographies, and uses selected texts to compare and explain writing styles. Chapter 5 covers the use of computers in archaeology, from basic computer skills to the types of software useful for archaeology and how to go about getting them. Chapter 6 follows with the creation and use of images in archaeological presentation from archaeological drawings to digital photography and video documentation. Modern archaeology requires skills in a number of different areas, from survey to faunal analysis and can often involve a multidisciplinary team effort, so chapter 7 discusses the team approach to presenting the past. Chapters 8 and 9 examine presentation of the past in the form of conference papers and luncheon talks, publishing, peer review

and working with editors. Chapter 10 looks at bringing the past to life through archaeological exhibits and events as well as cartoons, movies and games. Although we have often seen archaeological stereotypes in popular films and games, these kinds of media have nevertheless helped bring archaeology to public attention. The author suggests more archaeologists get involved in filmmaking, even if simply making documentaries of archaeological work. Chapter 11 describes working with the media to publicize archaeological material. It defines media literacy, which is the understanding of the nature and impact of techniques used by mass media. It covers working with reporters, press releases, television and radio. Chapter 12 deals with recent technologies used to communicate archaeology to the public such as producing CD Roms, DVDs and building websites. This kind of media allows engagement with the archaeological material in a way that print media cannot offer. Chapter 12 is followed by a short list of archaeology journals available on the Internet.

The handbook includes boxed tips, samples and recommendations, and its casual written style and conversational tone makes it easily readable. Points are illustrated with anecdotes and case studies ranging from Crow Creek to Easter Island to keep the reader entertained. The book acknowledges the benefits of effective communication within the archaeological community and between archaeologists and the public. It makes the reader aware of the responsibility that comes with archaeological investigation beyond the application of knowledge and skills to understand the human past: that is not only the necessity of making archaeological knowledge available but making it available in a way that can be best absorbed by its audience.

While each of the books in the Toolkit series is described as being equally useful for practicing archaeologists and archaeologists in training, this guide represents an especially beneficial resource for students. It covers the basics in archaeological presentation from writing abstracts to the preparation and delivery of papers. It offers practical advice, tips and case studies aimed to help the reader with particular focus on problem solving in cultural resource archaeology. Even so, the book has something for everyone. It represents a ready reference to the latest information on archaeological methods and techniques and provides strategies for presenting the past with style for archaeologists of all ranges of skill and speciality. It serves as an excellent introductory for how to best present archaeology to a diverse range of audiences**.**

Jacinta Beckwith, Anthropology Department, University of Otago

Alan Mayne and Tim Murray (eds.), 2001. The Archaeology of Urban Landscapes. Explorations in Slumland. ***Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. xi + 192 pp, paper. ISBN 0521 77975 8. $AUD59.95.***

This publication is a welcome addition to the archaeology of the historic period. The focus is urban archaeology, more specifically urban areas that were labelled "slums" in Britain and associated settler-colonies from later eighteenth century and into the early twentieth centuries. The editors argue that "slums are constructions of the imagination", elite-driven stereotypes that have tended to homogenise and simplify the melange that comprised working class communities and effectively marginalised the inhabitants. An area being labelled a slum has also in many cases around the globe underpinned the justification for its subsequent obliteration and redevelopment. These are stereotypes which persist today and have clouded attempts to examine in finer detail the complexity of these components of the urban landscape in presenting alternative narratives.

The editors outline the scope of the book in the introductory chapter. They background the limitations of archaeology and historical documents in isolation and once again repeat the long called for need of disciplinary interaction. The book comprises twelve chapters grouped into two parts: "Setting, scope and approaches" and "Applications and conclusions". Geographically the case studies are located in Australia (2), Britain (2), Canada (1), South Africa (1) and the United States (5). The authors include eleven archaeologists and five historians. It is an eclectic collection of papers all held together under the 'slums' theme. A number of the papers demonstrate little specific archaeological component (Ross, Solari, Malan and Van Heyningen) and therefore no demonstrable integration as advocated by the editors. However rather than detracting from the volume these papers provide analyses of slums through more of a political, economic or anthropological perspective which ultimately provides a more robust interpretive framework. The papers are not detailed here to any extent, as they all follow a generally similar format with varying degrees of historical or archaeological input which tend to confirm with varying degrees of success the editors claim of slums and their inhabitants having been groundlessly categorised and marginalized. Such correspondence in the conclusions of 11 papers might be seen as somewhat orchestrated and a potential weakness in the publication.

Specific comment may be made on the paper by the editors themselves, as it touches on a number of issues of wider concern in Australian urban archaeology which are particularly pertinent to New Zealand. Murray and Mayne's paper offers a reinterpretation of the late 1980s excavations, carried out by a consultant archaeologist, of a so-called urban slum named 'Little Lon', a city block in the centre of Melbourne which dated from the mid-nineteenth

century. In line with themes outlined in the introduction, they argue through various strands of historical and archaeological data that 'Little Lon' has been misrepresentated throughout its history from its beginnings through to archaeological investigations of the 1980s. In summary they present a very broad model outlining a research strategy for global material culture in urban settings (p. 104).

One of the wider concerns touched on by the authors is the fact that although large number of urban sites have been, and continue to be, excavated in Australia, archaeological analysis rarely proceeds beyond the level of descriptive catalogues, and is almost always devoid of contextual input. It must be said that this problem and situation is not restricted to archaeology of the historic period in Australia but is a general problem which has direct parallels in New Zealand. This is a long running debate which concerns all associated with the discipline. It is important to emphasise that specific criticism and any potential solutions must be aimed at the core of the problem, which is essentially how very robust legislation (Historic Places Act 1993) has been interpreted and implemented over the last decade or so. The ideological climate during this period has confined state or quasi-state participation to that of regulation (on private land at least) while practice has largely been placed in the hands of consultants or other private bodies. Due to a combination of factors, including regulatory underfunding and a competitive tendering system that has a tendency to favour economic imperatives over issues of archaeological quality, the research potential of a particular site or landscape is not often fully explored.

For more than a decade now there have been increased calls for more focused research on the archaeology of the historic period in New Zealand (Bedford 1996; Prickett 2003: 384; Smith 1990). Numerous post-1769 excavations have been happening in association with salvage requirements throughout the country but as emphasised above, research is not the driver and certainly very rarely is there any effort, in the form of publication, to attract the attention and imagination of the wider community.

The strength of the publication is its thematic approach and the use of specific case studies from around the world. It is unfortunate that a very suitable New Zealand example could not have been included (e.g., Macready and Robinson 1990; Macready and Goodwyn 1990). Arguments as to the robustness of particular conclusions relating to single artefacts and a number of the analytical approaches could be widely debated, as is acknowledged by a number of the authors, but the editors are to be congratulated for bringing to publication a collection of mostly development driven projects that too often languish in the grey literature.

References

Bedford, S., 1996. Post-Contact Maori—the ignored component in New Zealand archaeology. Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 105 (4):411–39.*

Macready, S. and J. Robinson, 1990. Slums and self improvement. the history and archaeology of the Mechanics Institute, Auckland, and its Chancery Street neighbourhood, Vol. 1: The Site (R11/1589). Science and Research Internal Report*, 91. Department of Conservation, Auckland.*

Macready, S. and J. Goodwyn, 1990. Slums and self improvement. the history and archaeology of the Mechanics Institute, Auckland, and its Chancery Street neighbourhood, Vol. 2: The artefacts and faunal material. Science and Research Internal Report*, 92. Department of Conservation, Auckland.*

Prickett, N. 2003. Changing views and changing programs in New Zealand archaeology. In C. Sand (ed), Pacific Archaeology: assessments and prospects (Proceedings of the Conference for the 50th anniversary of the first Lapita excavation. Kone-Noumea 2002)*, 379–385. Les Cahiers de l'archeologie en Nouvelle-Calédonie, 15, Noumea.*

Smith, I. 1990. Historical archaeology in New Zealand: A review and bibliography. New Zealand Journal of Archaeology*, 12: 85–119.*

Stuart Bedford, New Zealand Historic Places Trust, Auckland

Jeff Benedict, 2003. *No Bone Unturned.* Harper Collins, New York. xii + 304 pp, photos, bib, index. Paper, $NZ34.99.

No Bone Unturned is a book of many parts. Ostensibly it is the "…adventures of a top forensic scientist" Doug Owsley of the Smithsonian Institute. The book sets out to cover his early life and career as well as several of his more interesting cases, both modern and prehistoric, and to give the general reader an insight into his profession. All of which it accomplishes. Along the way, however, it also becomes a detailed account of the intricacies of the Kennewick Man case, a thought provoking essay on the conflict between science and politics, a secular hagiography of Owsley (or Doug as we are encouraged to think of him), and a political thriller full of copious adverbs, adjectives and purple prose.

The first third of the book deals primarily with the beginnings of Owsley's academic career, his childhood in Wyoming and the development of his interest in the natural world. After completing his undergraduate degree at Wyoming, Owsley began his PhD at the University of Tennessee under the renowned Dr. William Bass. Having graduated he became a curator in Department of Anthropology at the Smithsonian's Museum of Natural History, and the book follows him on several cases. These include identifying two American journalists who had gone missing in Guatemala in 1985; investigating lead coffins containing the remains of some of Maryland's earliest, and wealthiest, colonists; and

identifying the comingled remains from the Branch Dravidian compound at Waco for the FBI. The final case in this section, the Spirit Cave Mummy (dated to ca. 10 640 BP), leads nicely into the case that occupies the second half of the book, the Kennewick Man. The issues and data relating to the settlement or possible multiple settlements of North America are briefly laid out, and we are told that Owsley comes down on the side of multiple migrations to North America, including early movements by boat from Asia. This belief was reinforced by evidence showing the Spirit Cave mummy has closer morphological ties with the Ainu and Polynesians than with any Native American group.

The largely complete skeleton of Kennewick Man was discovered in July 1996, eroding out of the banks of the Columbia river near Kennewick, Washington. The two physical anthropologists who initially examined the bones both came to the conclusion that the skeleton was that of a Caucasian male, and was probably historic in age, although the stone spear point embedded in the pelvis was a problem. One of the local tribes in the area, the Umatilla, had instructed the Army Corps of Engineers (responsible for remains discovered on federal land) to "treat the skeleton as Native American until proven otherwise", however it was not until the radiocarbon dates on the skeleton came back as 9215–9485 BP that things started to get ugly. The Umatilla and other associated tribes in the area demanded that the skeleton be returned to them for reburial immediately and were furious that they had not been told that it had been studied or dated. The federal government deemed that, based on the dates (i.e., pre-AD 1492), the skeleton was Native American and they ordered that it be returned to the Umatilla for reburial as they were required to do under NAGPRA (Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act). The scientists (including Owsley) objected on the basis that they believed the skeleton did not have any racial or cultural links with any existing Native American group. Despite some attempts at negotiation, the two sides were unable to come to any agreement and in February 1997 the scientists took the case to court in order to stop the repatriation of the bones.

The US government argued that under NAGPRA any human remains in North America that dated before 1492 must be Native American by default, while the Umatilla said that they did not accept the archaeological evidence for human settlement of North America at all. Their creation myths told them they had always been there, so no matter how old the skeleton might be, it was related to them. The archaeologists argued that NAGPRA was simplistic and ignored archaeological evidence for other early groups in North America (such as the Spirit Cave mummy and other early skeletons), as well as the likelihood that groups such as the Vikings had been present pre-1492. During the initial court case the Corps of Engineers dumped tons of rock and gravel over the site on the

river bank, and the two femurs went missing from a secure facility (later to mysteriously reappear). The skeleton was then moved to the Burke Museum in Seattle where it was studied by a team of government appointed scientists. Their conclusions agreed with what Owsley and the other scientists had been saying all along, Kennewick Man did not resemble modern Native Americans. The judge ruled that the government not return the bones until it had made a final determination on whether Kennewick Man was affiliated with any Native American groups.

In 2000 the government announced that Kennewick Man would be returned to the Umatilla as there was a relationship based on geography and oral tradition. The scientists appealed the decision, and in June 2001 were back in court to argue their case yet again. In August 2002, just over 6 years since the skeleton had been discovered, the scientists were finally given the right to study Kennewick Man. At this point the book stops, with the scientists on a high and preparing to study the bones.

However, the decision was appealed a month later by both the government and the tribes, and the courts eventually blocked any study of the bones pending the outcome of the appeal. Seven years after the bones were discovered, on the 4th February 2004, the Federal Court of Appeals again sided with the scientists and ordered them to submit a plan for studying the skeleton. The government and tribes have 45 days to appeal this decision, or 90 days to take it to the US Supreme Court, although at the time of writing they have not done so.

Benedict lays out the various twists and turns of the case well. He also raises some very serious questions that scientists around the world, whether archaeologists or not, need to ponder: questions such as the rights of scientists versus the rights of indigenous peoples; the government's (and hence the public's) role in deciding this; the support, or lack thereof, from public institutions such as museums and universities for such controversial research; the definition of 'indigenous' (something very topical in NZ at the moment); and the gagging or promotion of scientific enquiry for political reasons.

So much for the good stuff. One of my main problems with this book is that Benedict fails to address any of the big questions this case raises. He is so firmly in the scientists' camp, and so in awe of Owsley, that he is unable to give the government or the tribes a fair go in terms of explaining their views in any form that doesn't paint them as control freaks, irrational, devious or plain stupid. Benedict has also filled it with a lot of extraneous, and, to my mind, intensely irritating detail. You learn about people's hairstyles, what brand of clothing they wear, and what kind of car they drive. They are "burly" or have "Meg Ryan good looks". The book reads like some sort of second rate thriller. Benedict has personalised the story to such a degree, and become so enamoured of Owsley,

that he has lost any sort of perspective on his subject. For example, after doing some reading on the Kennewick Man I have begun to suspect that Owsley isn't quite as central to the case as is made out in this book.

For the general audience who knows nothing of the ways in which science operates, and the seeming miracles that physical anthropologists can work with a few bones, this would be a great introduction. They may also be less irked by the writing style than someone such as myself, more accustomed to dry scientific journal articles where the researcher's expensive shoes are not so frequently mentioned. Benedict also provides an extensive bibliography and anyone who wishes to delve further could do so with ease. Owsley, as depicted by Benedict, is clearly a fascinating and talented individual.

For more information on the Kennewick case, these websites offer a good starting point:
http://www.newscientist.com/news/news.jsp?id=ns99994666
http://www.kennewick-man.com/kman/news/story/4707996p-4658830c.html
The official judgment (Bonnichsen v. United States) may be found at:
http://www.ca9.uscourts.gov/ca9/newopinions.nsf

Jacqueline Craig, Anthropology Department, University of Auckland

Bruno David and Meredith Wilson (eds.), 2002. *Inscribed Landscapes: Marking and Making Place*. University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu. viii + 303 pp, figs, index. Cloth, $USD55.00.
Thegn Ladefoged and Michael Graves (eds.), 2002. *Pacific Landscapes: Archaeological Approaches*. Easter Island Foundation, Los Osos. 273 pp, figs. Paper, $USD26.00.

The first section of three in the volume edited by David and Wilson is "Rock-art", and the first paper, by Ballard, presents a modern rock-art example. Indonesian army graffiti around the Freeport mine in Irian Jaya/West Papua inscribes on the landscape the terror inflicted on the Amungme people. The Amungme express resistance through the landscape also—they do not always interpret Indonesian iconography in the way in which its authors may have intended, and continue to maintain their own symbolic links with the landscape. This idea of resistance is a common thread in many of the papers. McNiven and Russell's paper, though 75% introduction followed by a brief review, demonstrates how Australian Aboriginals responded to European colonisation within the context of indigenous knowledge systems. Rock-art demonstrates the practice of sorcery aimed at Europeans, and was used to mark ownership of the land in ways that, though very visible to Aboriginals, seem not to have impacted on the colonists.

David and Wilson look at the modern social context of urban graffiti and then seek parallels in Northern Australian rock-art. I don't find the discussion of graffiti all that convincing—its characterisation as resistance to established power structures is both overly simple and overinterpreted. It covers much of the same territory as McNiven and Russell's paper, with Wardaman rock-art/graffiti marking resistance to often violent colonial incursions. While the graffiti comparison seems a little strained, a useful point is made that it the act of marking place, rather than the specific message, that is often most important. This is made explicit in Rainbird's paper comparing the engraved rock-art of Pohnpei in the Pacific and Ilkey Moor in England. In both instances the rock-art sites are not visible from the habitation zones, but the act of engraving would have created sounds that could readily be heard. The short-term ritual act of creating the rock-art had specific meaning *at that time*, expressed in sound. Today the archaeologist only *sees* the art, and so, overemphasising the visual, leans heavily on a restricted interpretation of rock-art as a marker of place (as the book title suggests), a way of taking a topographic landscape and making it into a long-term lived landscape.

The second section is entitled "Monuments" and provides a number of stimulating papers from Europe and the Americas, again emphasising the visual aspects of monuments in an altered landscape. Particularly interesting was Allen and Gardiner's discussion of recent recognition that Mesolithic features may be found at such Neolithic sites as Stonehenge. The discovery of large post pits there shows that some sort of memory of landscape use has 'survived' for about 4500 years! They suggest that initial Mesolithic forest clearance left a permanent biological mark that continued to signal that this place was special in one way or another, a nice example of the affects of long term interaction between people and environment in shaping human culture. Stonehenge (or the idea of Stonehenge) continues to resonate in modern Western culture. Strange to think that it has done so for 8–9000 years.

The third section, "Beyond the Mark", largely consists of sociological studies, less immediately useful to archaeologists, though not without potential. Pulvirenti's paper on the way Italian Australian migrants have adapted to their new home, for instance, may provide useful ideas to the study of Pacific colonisation and "transported landscapes."

The editors, in their preface, tell us that they use the term "pre-History" rather than "prehistory" in order to "avoid the evolutionary loadedness of the notion of prehistory" (p. vii). This sort of preciousness detracts from the usefulness and interest of the book. Also, there is a fine line between being theoretically informed and theoretically burdened, a line that some of the papers

cross, but overall the book is a stimulating collection that should inspire further thought and research.

Assuming that the application of a set methodology is not in itself a theory, many of the papers in the Ladefoged and Graves volume take an entirely different stance—they are thoroughly atheoretical. In a 1967 paper Bruce Trigger said, of the newly trendy settlement archaeology, that the term 'settlement' was appearing with such regularity in publications and grant applications that it sometimes seemed merely an excuse to get money to do the sort of work archaeologists had always done anyway. Today 'landscape' is the new trendy term, but generally the papers presented here are the sort of settlement study that archaeologists have always done anyway.

Sheppard *et al.* provide an exception, of sorts. They seek to explain "transformations" in shrine type in the Solomon Islands (from stone-faced shrines with no accompanying assemblages of material culture to unfaced shrines that are repositories for shell valuable, skulls, etc.) and the correlating change in political and social structures (the rise of central chiefdoms) in evolutionary terms. The attempt is hardly convincing—they themselves conclude that "our explanation … is not evolutionary in the Darwinian sense" (p. 57)—but it is interesting. However, there is a dislocation between theory and practice—the same interpretation could have been reached without the unnecessary theoretical burden.

Green's paper "A retrospective view of settlement patterns studies in Samoa" is at least clear-sighted enough not to put "landscape" in the title. The old master shows up the arrivistes with a useful and thoughtful summary of work to date, one of the better papers presented here. Despite the modesty of the title Green comes closest to what I would regard as an integrated landscape concept when he outlines an analysis of settlement patterns based on Levi-Strauss's idea of the "house society." Green is also a historical linguist and is well aware of the long-term structuring affects of the *'aiga* (Proto-Polynesian **kainga*) as the basic social unit, and its likely influence on settlement patterns. What is more, he points out that the post hole excavated by the archaeologist once held a post, *pou* in many Polynesian languages, which held up not only the house, but helped support the social structure and the ancestral body. Similarly pathways, *ara*, connect not only what archaeologists call features, but also social elements, in a structured way that visibly inscribed social hierarchies on the landscape and meant they were physically walked on a daily basis. Such concepts don't enter much into the subsequent discussion, but they ought to be increasingly considered in the Pacific. The richness of the ethnographic and ethnohistoric record in this part of the world means we are ideally placed to carry out research into the way concepts of this kind are reflected archaeologically.

Sand, in his examination of new Caledonian landscapes, seeks to show how "different environmental constraints have led to different cultural responses. With the identification of major patterns and trends in prehistory, the archaeology of New Caledonia can be compared to other islands in the Pacific" (p. 13). I don't wish to single out Sand unfairly—his is merely the first paper in the collection—but this quote nicely sums up the problematical old-fashioned nature of much of the volume. The prioritising of the environment shows the legacy of the environmentally determinist mindset of several decades ago, while the emphasis on comparison is the equally detrimental legacy of the islands-as-laboratories framework of the same era.

I'm not saying that the papers here are without merit, but mostly they are "more of the same", and do we really need that? There seems to be a failure of the imagination, or at least a failure to grasp the imaginative possibilities that concepts like landscape (which are no longer new) can offer in Pacific archaeology, which by comparison with much of the rest of the world seems to be caught in a time warp. At the end of his paper Green calls for "a renewed burst of investigation by the next generation of Pacific archaeologists" (p. 149). I, for one, hope this will happen, but first we must think about what the question is, and then look for the right tools to answer it. David and Wilson's volume shows me that we won't have to look far.

Matthew Campbell, Anthropology Department, University of Auckland