



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/>.

SUGGESTIONS TOWARDS A SYSTEM FOR INTEGRATING
MAORI PERSPECTIVES WITH THOSE OF ARCHAEOLOGISTS
INTERESTED IN SITE PROTECTION

Roger Green
Department of Anthropology
University of Auckland

In commenting on Alex Nathan's (1988) paper on Waipoua Wahitapu, I outlined a scheme in which to consider the vexed question of traditional/archaeological sites. No claim is made to have resolved the issues involved, but the following suggestions were offered as a basis along which discussion might proceed.

The basis of the discussion develops from the Treaty of Waitangi. Clearly equal say in these matters between Maori and Pakeha needs to be at the basis of any procedures adopted. In my view it requires that we recognise that there are many many "traditional" sites and places known in oral and historical sources, and that only some of these are wahitapu. It also requires the recognition that among these many places known in memory, song, and stories, only a much smaller number can be identified archaeologically. Finally it requires recognition that there are numbers of places and sites discoverable by archaeological methods that either are no longer known in tradition, or now lie beyond that kind of knowledge.

From this it follows that the simple division between traditional and archaeological sites as used in most current discussions totally confuses the issues. Nothing sensible will ever be sorted out to the satisfaction of either Maori or Pakeha if that division continues in use. I adopt the view of landscape archaeology, that is, that all orally known places or archaeological sites are significant, and that one has to work with them all. A purist or highly empiricist archaeological stance will not do. Thus in what follows I have tried to break the possible categories down in a logical manner.

Sources of knowledge of culturally significant places (sites)

A. - Oral or traditional history - no signs of human activity evident or likely to be recovered if investigated archaeologically.

- i. able to be assigned to a physical place and thus available for physical protection.
- ii. able to be assigned only to some general area, or actual

physical place no longer known, or no longer in existence, so unable to be protected except in song or memory.

- B. - Both oral/historical and archaeological - physical place known either through oral, traditional, or historical records which is able to be investigated archaeologically - ie mapped, excavated.
- C. - Archaeological only - oral, traditional, or historical records lacking, or not in possession of present land holders (if found move to category B) - ie knowledge of existence result of archaeological activity whether by Maori or Pakeha.

Values placed on culturally significant places through Maori concepts of tapu and noa

Not being expert in these matters, I have closely followed here the Maori approach to wahitapu of Nathan (1988), and adopted, as he does, the definition of such places from the Treaty of Waitangi (State-owned Enterprises) Bill, Section 27d. There, a wahitapu has been defined as "land of special spiritual, cultural or historical tribal significance". Thus it is much more than a cemetery (*Urupa* or *Ruawhakautu*) or burial ground.

- 1. - *Wahitapu* - land of special spiritual, cultural, or historical tribal significance.
- i. Permanent tapu - *Ruawhakautu* or *Urupa*; other places where *tupapaku* or *koiwi* rested or were placed; battlefields and *pa*, other sites where death occurred, or blood and body fluids entered the earth; *tuahu*; places where body parts or personal items were buried; canoe landings and building places.
- ii. Temporary tapu - *wahi rahui*, *wahi kai*, places where traditional materials were gathered - or so called cultural resource sites.
- 2. - *Wahi noa* - places known and unknown not assigned to the wahitapu category.

A matrix classification of culturally significant places

Using the cross-cutting categories above, a partnership system might be set up that encompasses both Maori and wider community interests in assessing values to be placed on places (and sites) that document Maori culture history. This would form the basis of an attempt to protect them under a revised Historic Places Act. (Fact: with the best will in the

world, we cannot save everything.)

Basis of Knowledge	Category 1: Wahitapu (Permanent or temporary tapu)	Category 2. Wahi noa
A (Oral only)	Merits determined solely on Maori values, and argued and presented by tangata whenua. Only cases for A(i) will be able to get legal protection, but A(ii) should be given recognition in any general assessment.	Other places mentioned in oral and historical accounts, that can be recorded and listed as traditional sites but for which legislative protection will seldom be sought.
B (Oral, history and archaeology)	Merits and significance judged by Maori values assisted by scientific evidence where called for in support.	Merits and management judged largely through scientific assessment assisted by Maori input.
C (archaeology only)	There will be very few sites in this category, assigned to it because they prove on investigation to be wahitapu, although this is not known at the time to tangata whenua at the time of investigation - merits to be judged under B/1.	There will be a number of "archaeological" sites which both Maori and Pakeha will find, that were unknown to either, whose merits will need to be judged under B/2 procedures.

Principles under which all investigations and evaluations would take place

1. As in existing NZHPT legislation and regulations, consent of the tangata whenua or other appropriate Maori authority is to be required prior to any scientific investigation being undertaken.
2. A/1 - these cases involve Maori input only, and distinction between A/1 and A/2 is made by them, as the "paramount concern" to the tangata whenua is for protection and preservation of their wahitapu.

3. B/1 and B/2 - these cases involve a balance between Maori values and scientific assessments. They are determined in the first instance by a decision of Maori interests on the status of the place as constituting a *wahitapu* or not. This is followed, where appropriate by archaeological investigation after that decision, to further enhance knowledge about the site useful to its protection.
4. C/1 - when once demonstrated through archaeological investigation that a site is of this type, it then comes under B/1 type procedures.
5. C/2 - these sites are assessed as in B/2 cases.

CONCLUSION

If under a revised Historic Places Act, New Zealand is going to achieve adequate protection for places that document Maori cultural history, then it will have to reflect primary Maori values and accommodate these to ways they intersect with archaeological interests, and those of the wider community. For archaeologists (whether Maori or Pakeha) it is partnership that grows out of shared concern with New Zealand's past established through a long and changing relationship. Problems within it will not be resolved by adopting binary oppositions in which traditional places are seen as one category and archaeological sites as another, each to be dealt with by quite separate means. Rather, as in the scheme proposed here, oral or traditional (historical) as well as physical archaeological evidence are both recognised as valuable and worthy of full consideration in protecting and enhancing knowledge of the past. Each has a role to play and it is not possible or wise to attempt to completely separate them as in the current legislation.

This discussion was initiated by Alex Nathan on the Maori side; my response is that of an equally concerned Pakeha archaeologist. Perhaps the wider community on both sides now needs to join the debate. We have a common goal - to protect and preserve the *taonga* of the past in Aotearoa. Comments will be welcomed.