



NEW ZEALAND
ARCHAEOLOGICAL
ASSOCIATION

NEW ZEALAND ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION NEWSLETTER



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/>.

THE PACIFIC SCIENCE CONGRESS, DUNEDIN, 1983 -
PAPERS FROM THE PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY SYMPOSIUM

Graeme Ward
Australian Institute of Aboriginal
Studies
Canberra

The Pacific Science Association was established in 1920; during February 1983 its Fifteenth Congress was held at the University of Otago in Dunedin, New Zealand. Included in its programme for the first time was a symposium on "Public Archaeology in the Pacific".

In recent years, Pacific Science Congresses have been held in Canberra, Vancouver and Khabarovsk. The Fourth Congress in Batavia in 1929, produced the related Far-Eastern (now Indo-Pacific) Prehistory Association; meetings of the FEPA/IPPA have been held in association with the PSC or other congresses. While archaeology has been an integral part of the Pacific Science Congress for many years (e.g. Solheim, 1970), little attention at its meetings has been given to Public Archaeology and Cultural Resource Management.

The Fifteenth Congress

The opportunity came with the planning of the Dunedin congress and with the organisation by Foss Leach of Section K, the Social Sciences and Humanities symposia to include, albeit somewhat apart from the other archaeology and prehistory components and listed with meetings concerned with dictionaries and investment patterns, a symposium entitled "Public Archaeology in Pacific Countries". The initial organiser was to be Jim McKinlay of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust but he withdrew, and in March 1982, I was asked to fill his place.

Following correspondence with possible participants, five topics were suggested for inclusion in the proposed symposium:

1. Role of indigenous communities in applied research management.
2. Evaluation of site significance.
3. Integration of research objectives, applied and pure.
4. Ownership of research results and report copyright.
5. Archaeological sites and educational aspects of visitor information and control.

More than 300 individuals and agencies in 20 Pacific Rim and Pacific Island centres were circularised with an announcement of the Symposium and proposed session topics with an invitation to offer papers or short discussions in these and to suggest any further topics. Replies were received from about 50 people offering contributions or indicating an interest

in the sessions proposed. Eventually a revised list of topics and a programme of more than 30 speakers was prepared. Because of time constraints and to lessen the formality of the Symposium, abstracts and pre-Congress circularisation of papers were not requested. It was arranged to divide the time available - four relatively informal sessions of three hours each - among those who would read a brief paper and those who would come prepared to act as informed discussants for each of the five topics. There were last minute withdrawals and the final programme was somewhat reduced; the presenters/discussants were as follows:

Wednesday 2 February: Regional viewpoints: Nancy Farrell, Los Angeles; Bruce McFadgen, Wellington; Maeva Navarro, Papeete; Stuart Park, Auckland; Scott Russell, Saipan

Thursday 3 February: Role of indigenous communities in applied research and management: Rosemary Buchan, Adelaide; Mike Fleming, Saipan; Luke Godwin, Armidale; Ian Lawlor, Auckland; Ian Lilly, Canberra; David Snyder, Koror.

Thursday 3 February: (a) Evaluation of site significance (b) ownership of research results and report copyright: Peter Coumts, Melbourne; Kevin Jones, Wellington; David Snyder, Koror; Graeme Ward, Canberra.

Friday 4 February: Integration of research objectives, applied and pure: Kari Barz, Canberra; John Craib, Sydney; Laila Haglund, Sydney; Kevin Jones, Wellington; Jim Stockton, Canberra; Jane Wesson, Victoria; Dan Witter, Canberra.

Many others participated in the sessions. Following requests from several present that the details of participants be available, the names and addresses (then current) of those completing a form were circularised to others attending and are listed here (Appendix 1).

Following the conference in May 1983, participants were sent a letter requesting responses as to whether, (a) they would like to see the initiative of a Public Archaeology Sub-section continued, and (b) would support the publication of contributions to the Dunedin symposium. About one quarter of the participants responded and all supported the continuation of the Sub-section initiative within the Pacific Science Congress; they all supported the intention to publish contributions to the symposia.

Further conferences?

The support for the continuation of the Public Archaeology Sub-section was transmitted to the President of the XV

Pacific Science Congress, to the Chairman of the Pacific Science Congress Standing Committee on Scientific Activities, and to the Secretary of the Pacific Science Association with the suggestion that it might, more appropriately, be considered as one of a group of archaeological symposia. The next Congress is to be held in Seoul, (South) Korea, during August 1987. Unfortunately, it appears that there is unlikely to be an archaeology session there but two other possibilities for the continuation of the Public Archaeology initiative are apparent. In the longer term, the prospect could be raised for the following, XVII, Congress presumably scheduled for 1991. More immediately, the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association - with which the 1983 Pacific Science Congress Social Sciences and Humanities Section was organised - could be interested in giving time to this field in one of its more frequently scheduled meetings; the most recent IPPA Congress was held in the Phillipines during January 1985 and the next meeting is planned to be held in 1987. Guam is a possible venue and, given the proportion of archaeology that takes place as contracted archaeology in Micronesia, this would be an appropriate place to continue and expand upon the Dunedin discussions.

Discussions focussing upon Public Archaeology and other CRM related topics have been held at other regional gatherings, notably at the 49th ANZAAS congress in Auckland during January 1979 which produced the useful volume edited by McKinlay and Jones, Archaeological Resource Management in Australia and Oceania, and at subsequent ANZAAS congresses in Perth during May 1983 (Smith, 1983) and in Canberra the following year (Ward, in press). However, ANZAAS is moving away from specialist symposia to a 'festival of science' format and there is unlikely to be discussion of any aspects of Public Archaeology (except as archaeology affects and is affected by "Aboriginal Perceptions of Heritage") at the next congress in Melbourne this year. While the subject has been one of several foci of national meetings (at New Zealand Archaeological Association and Australian Archaeological Association conferences and Australian Association of Consulting Archaeologists meetings and workshops for examples), there clearly is further need for supra-national and regional forums at which discussions of the 'public' facets of archaeology and Cultural Resource Management can be pursued.

While it would be premature to suggest that the topics broached at Dunedin were exhausted - and cultural and resource managers and consultant archaeologists are, no doubt, continually stumbling against other problems of general interest - there is another area which might be the subject of attention at any further meeting. This relates to the lack or inadequacy of legislation (see the discussion by Prott and O'Keefe, 1984 of the scope and implementation of heritage legislation in the Pacific region) and personnel to manage archaeological resources in some

Pacific Rim and Island countries, and the potential and actual adverse effects of local and overseas-funded 'development' upon archaeological resources in countries where no or little such ameliorating influences exist. Are archaeological resources and other aspects of the regional cultural heritage being lost to such activities at the rate that some reports suggest? If so, what can be done to influence those with power of control over such resources? What is required to persuade wider communities that such cultural resources might, in the longer if not the short term, be of importance to their perceptions of their heritage? Such discussions might focus on problems of identifying those areas which lack heritage laws and cultural resource managers and whether they are, indeed, necessary given other influences such as a well-established local community concern to protect remembered ancient places, and whether international 'aid' donors and agencies do or should oblige themselves to take into consideration the effects of any development projects which they are sponsoring or promoting, and whether they have the expertise to assess the likelihood of such adverse effects.

Any volunteers to promote a symposium at the next suitable regional meeting?

Publication of the Public Archaeology papers

It is impossible to summarise the contributions to each session. No audio recordings were made. Most symposia topics were approached from several perspectives and prompted lively and wide-ranging discussion with questions and answers and comments taking a major part of the time of each.

Unfortunately, few participants in the Dunedin symposium finally produced the expected papers; certainly there are not enough for a conference volume. One paper, at least, has been published elsewhere (Godwin and Creamer, 1984). Those which we do have are those by Andrea Seelenfreund, Kevin Jones and Ian Lawlor along with a paper from Earl Neller. This last was offered to the first Symposium session but was not presented when Earl was unable to travel to the Conference. Formal papers and abstracts were not required before or at the symposium but two contributors, Nancy Farrell and Dan Witter provided abstracts and these are also presented here.

The first session saw a wide range of regional contributors. Seelenfreund is a doctoral student at the University of Otago with particular interest in obsidian sourcing; her paper is an interesting discussion of the slow development of protective legislation and public archaeology in Chile.

It contains a timely warning of the importance of resources and personnel to implement preservation laws, notice of hopeful recent developments, but a realistic if not despairing end note regarding the political circumstances needed to prompt effective action in this area.

Neller's paper also belongs to the "Regional perspectives" topic. He describes the situation in a state with some of the most comprehensive CRM laws and the potential to make a considerable contribution to the conservation and management of its fascinating archaeological heritage but in which (for reasons of state politics and/or vested interests?) the laws are not being implemented. At the same time, the state agency continues to receive federal funds which might remain unspent. Neller's 'Requiem' for Hawaiian archaeology appears final but readers might like to write him (and others at the appropriate time) with some encouragement. The head of the Historic Preservation Office in Hawaii appears to be a Mr Susumo Ono.

Also contributing to the Regional Perspectives session was Nancy Farrell, who works as an archaeologist for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in Los Angeles. Her paper dealt with her role in guiding the military developers through the federal and state laws in southwestern U.S.A. and focussed particularly upon the management of coastal sites. The paper was a valuable insight into another aspect of how the United States regulates conflicting interests in this area. In the same session, Scott Russell, the Trust Territory's Historic Preservation Officer, detailed the application of the federal laws to the American central Pacific and the particular adaptations which made them work there.

Ian Lawlor's paper firstly addresses the need for archaeologists working in New Zealand to deal with Maori scepticism concerning their research motives. Despite some damning criticism he finds two sources of hope that relationships will improve: a growing appreciation by Maoris that archaeological research can assist them, and an increasing realisation by fieldworkers that they must consider Maori interests and sensibilities. His discussion of problems and solutions contains some useful concrete examples as well as being set in a broader conceptual framework.

Kevin Jones' brief paper belies the size of his contribution to the "Evaluation of Site Significance" session. It provides a useful summary of a range of points and provides an introduction to a comprehensive suite of basic reading in this area.

In the fourth session, Dan Witter's paper addressed a regrettably too little considered aspect of survey methods.

He illustrated the problem and ways of dealing with it through examples drawn from his own extensive Australian fieldwork.

The prepared contributions were kept short - presenters had been asked to stimulate discussion and to avoid dry, lengthy papers - and discussants led off the subsequent response with more or less prepared talks: all contributions elicited considerable responses from the participants present and each matter was pursued to some depth. The abstracts and papers follow this introduction; there is no doubt that some of the papers here will continue the controversy aroused.

References

- Godwin, L 1984 Ethnology and archaeology on the North
and H. Creamer Coast of New South Wales. Queensland Arch-
aeological Research 1(1):103-116.
- McKinlay, J.R. 1979 Archaeological Resource Management in
and K.L. Jones Australia and Oceania. New Zealand Historic
Places Trust, Wellington.
- Prott, L.V. 1984 Law and the Cultural Heritage. Volume 1
and P.J. O'Keefe Discovery and Excavation. Professional
Books, Abingdon, U.K.
- Smith, M. (ed) 1983 Archaeology at ANZAAS 1983. Western Aust-
ralian Museum, Perth.
- Solheim, W.G. 1970 International Congress and Symposia.
Asian Perspectives (for 1967) 10:1-8.
- Ward, G.K. in press Papers presented at Section 25A, Archae-
(ed.) ology, of the Fifty-fourth ANZAAS Congress,
Canberra, May 1984.

APPENDIX 1: Participants in Public Archaeology Symposium

- Kari Barz, C/- Department of Prehistory & Anthropology Faculty
of Arts, Australian National University, Canberra, A.C.T. 2601.
- Rod Brown, 782 Buenavista, Ventura, CA 93001.
- Rosemary Buchan, Heritage Conservation Branch, Department of
Environment and Planning, Adelaide, SA 5000.
- Peter Coutts, Director, Victoria Archaeological Survey, 29-
31 Victoria Avenue, Albert Park, Victoria 3206.
- John Craib, C/- Department of Anthropology, University of
Sydney, Sydney, NSW 2006.
- Edward Douglas, Centre for Maori Studies & Research University
of Waikato, Hamilton.

- Margreet Duffels, Amsterdam.
- Nancy Farrell, Archaeologist, US Army Corps of Engineers, 300 N. Los Angeles St, Los Angeles, CA 90012
- Michael Fleming, Staff Archaeologist, Division of Historic Preservation, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Saipan, CM 96950.
- David Frankel, Division of Prehistory, La Trobe University, Bundoora, Victoria 3083.
- Jean-Christophe Galipand (Universite de Paris I) ORSTOM, B.P. A5, Noumea, New Caledonia.
- Luke Godwin, C/- Department of Archaeology and Prehistory, University of New England, Armidale, NSW 2350.
- Les Groube, Department of Anthropology and Sociology, University of Papua New Guinea, Post Office, University, PNG.
- Laila Haglund, Consultant, Balmain, Sydney, NSW 2041.
- Wendy Harsant, Otago Museum, George Street, Dunedin.
- Rosalind L. Hunter-Anderson, 2605 Topeka St, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 87102 USA.
- Kevin Jones, Survey Archaeologist, N.Z. Historic Places Trust, Private Bag, Wellington.
- Ian Lawlor, Conservancy Archaeologist, N.Z. Forest Service, P O Box 38, Auckland.
- Ian Lilly, C/- Department of Prehistory, RSPacS, ANU.
- Bruce McFadgen, Archaeologist, N.Z. Historic Places Trust, Private Bag, Wellington.
- Maeva Navarro, Director, Department of Archaeology of French Polynesia, B.P. 110, Papeete, Tahiti.
- Stuart Park, Auckland Institute and Museum, Auckland.
- Herb Pettit, P O Box 473, Robinvale, Victoria 3549.
- Nigel Prickett, Archaeologist, Auckland Institute and Museum.
- Neville Ritchie, Archaeologist, N.Z. Historic Places Trust, Cromwell.
- Annie Roses (Universite de Paris I) ORSTOM, New Caledonia.
- Scott Russell, Director, Office of Historic Preservation, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Saipan, CNMI 96950.
- Andrea Seelenfreund, Chile.
- David Snyder, Department of Anthropology, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois, 62901 USA / Archaeologist, Historic and Cultural Preservation Commission, Republic of Belau, Koror.
- Jim Stockton, 213 Blaxland Road, Wentworth Falls, NSW 2782.
- T.I. Su'a, C/- Department of Anthropology, University of Otago, Dunedin.
- Graeme Ward, A.I.A.S., Canberra, A.C.T. 2601.
- Jane Wesson, Archaeological Research Consultants Pty Ltd., 370 Yan Yean Rd., Yarrambat, Vic, 3091.
- Lyn Williams, Canterbury Museum, Christchurch.
- Dan Witter, C/- Department of Prehistory, RSPacS, ANU.

APPENDIX 2: Abstracts of contributed papersBias and survey archaeology

Reliable data and theory are as important for management decisions and policy as they are for academic research. Biases derive from methodological, technical and operational factors. They are probably much greater than generally believed, and can have drastic effects on survey results. This condition is not likely to change unless all person engaged in survey work (academic and management) recognise the problem and work together on it.

Dan Witter
Department of Prehistory
Australian National University

Protecting and managing coastal archaeological sites;
The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in California

The Corps of Engineers has a major role in military, navigation, and water-resources-related construction in the United States. Most of these projects in some way impact archaeological and/or historical properties. During the past two decades, there has been a growing awareness in the U.S. concerning protection of the environment, cultural as well as natural. A number of Federal, state and local regulations have been promulgated. As a result, archaeologists and other specialists have been brought into the Corps to facilitate the implementation of these laws. As a construction and regulatory agency, the Corps has the opportunity and responsibility to address the protection and management of archaeological and historic properties.

With early integration of cultural resources data into the project planning process, adverse impacts to sites can often be avoided. Mitigation excavations, if necessary, may be carried out in conjunction with a number of preservation techniques including stabilisation, burying of sites, and in situ interpretive displays for the public. In other areas with rapidly developing coastlines, the lessons learned in cultural resource management on the coast of California may be of use. The management process is one of balancing conservation and scientific interests with those of economic development. With early planning and innovative approaches, satisfactory resolutions are possible even with limited resources.

Nancy Farrell
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Los Angeles