

Treavor : My background discussion ^{T. Arthur}
paper for the Vic. Heritage
Plan Conference : Laurie Wilson
Rodney Davidson
Pills Lewis
Warwick Forge
Wayne Orchiston
all have copies of
the full Conference papers.

THE ROLE OF HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE CONSERVATION
OF PLACES OF CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE IN VICTORIA

Jane L. Lennon
September 1981

C O N T E N T S

(1)	TERMINOLOGY	1
(2)	REVIEW	3
(3)	LEGISLATION	8
(4)	IMPLEMENTATION DIFFICULTIES	
	a. Administration	10
	b. Registers	13
	c. Documentation	14
	d. Standards for Work	16
(5)	EDUCATION	17
(6)	ARTEFACT STORAGE	18
(7)	PRESENTATION OF RELICS AND SITES	19
(8)	CONCLUSION	20

(1) TERMINOLOGY

Discussion of the term "historical archaeology" is necessary because many people, who are not archaeologists, believe that the term (and the discipline) implies a primary concern with only the excavation of historic sites. Professional archaeologists in Australia have been associated in the past generally with Aboriginal archaeology for which the record has been purely prehistoric and involving excavation. But as Jim Allen has stated:

"the links between the prehistoric and historic archaeology are firstly the primary concern with field evidence - sites, structures and artefacts - as a basic data source, and secondly the similarity of skills needed to handle such data. Whereas the prehistoric archaeologist needs to be versed in other basic skills (or have access to other specialist scientists) in such fields as geomorphology, palaeontology, or palynology, the historical archaeologist requires parallel skills or professional assistance with documentary research, engineering or architecture for example. Historical archaeology is here defined as the combined use of a wide range of data sources and research techniques to interpret the cultural remains of man in this country since the beginnings of recorded history; such remains include the full range of sites from living buildings to sites with no visible evidence above ground; the purpose of historical archaeological research is historical elucidation on a wider front than can be achieved from documentary sources alone. It thus encompasses what is known in Britain as "industrial archaeology," (see Cossons, 1975: 15-36; Raistrick, 1973: 1-14; Hudson, 1976: 15-25) in the same fashion as "historic sites archaeology" (see Hume, 1975: 1-20) or "conservation archaeology" (see preface to Schiffer and Gumerman, 1977) does in North America. It can, and often does involve excavation as a research technique, but need not necessarily do so. In any one situation the dominant research tool might be documentary enquiry, architectural recording, or engineering history; in others, combinations of these and other skills might be employed." (Allen, ed., 1978: A2)

Historical archaeology is the term therefore given to the blending of a range of techniques used in historical resource management in Australia. The term may change as the value of the discipline is realized. As Schiffer and Gumerman wrote (p. xx) of the United States in 1977:

"Salvage and emergency archaeology are terms of a, hopefully, largely by-gone era which emphasized the rapid survey and excavation of endangered sites by archaeologists ... Conservation archaeology as a label underscores that the emphasis is not on simply excavating to 'save' the sites, but rather on protecting and utilizing the cultural remains to their fullest scientific and historic extent."

Although the historical and prehistorical archaeologist share a primary concern with field evidence, they use complementary disciplines differently. The prehistorical archaeologist requires other specialists to help interpret his data, but the historical archaeologist will work best in conjunction with those simultaneously studying the written records, extant structures and technology of historic sites. Ethnography, the technique of recording social systems, can also be extended to "living" archaeological sites. But, above all the historical archaeologist is concerned with recording the evidence of man's activities on the landscape. In other words there is a truly "archaeological" element of history, the potential of which has hardly been developed in Australia. Not only is the historical archaeologist, in his role as fieldworker and interpreter of the landscape, in a position to provide an extra dimension to the existing findings of historians who have used only documentary sources, or architects who have used only structural evidence, but there are a number of areas of investigation where field evidence is itself the primary source. The development of light timber tramways in Victoria is one obvious example (Lennon, 1979a: 49). The historical archaeologist is a correlator of evidence, synthesizing data from documents, maps and field remains to gain a general picture.

The unique perspective of the archaeologist in recording historical sites must not be confused with his excavation abilities, which is only one of his techniques and rarely necessary in interpreting historic sites. Historical archaeology in total is a technique, not a site category, but it is only being applied in current Victorian practice to certain sites and these are largely those with no obvious, above-ground surface remains.

Difficulties in developing legislation to protect "historic archaeological sites" and administering planning and land use controls over such sites have arisen because of the confusion between archaeology as a technique and archaeological site as a type/category.

(2) REVIEW

Historical archaeology has hardly been practised in Victoria in the past because its potential in the conservation process has not been understood. Although amateur historians with an antiquarian bent were examining sites in the past [for example, Mr. Grant Robertson's 1873 survey of the 1803 Settlement at Sorrento (Coutts, 1981: 14), and an excavation of part of the Corinella Settlement Site undertaken about 1943 (Kellaway and Johnston, 1981: 13)], the first major archaeological survey of an historic site was that undertaken by William Culican and John Taylor at the Fossil Beach Cement Works, Mornington in the late 1960s. However, this excavation was undertaken for pleasure on weekends over two years and documented as an act of "archaeological duty" in the hope that future generations and those of the present interested in "humble industrial ruins will not count our efforts of little avail" (Culican and Taylor, 1972: 5).

In 1973 the Australian Government established a Committee of Inquiry into the National Estate, which was defined to include all sites of heritage significance, both natural and cultural. The Report of the National Estate was tabled in Parliament in August 1974. One of its recommendations was that a national inventory of historic sites be compiled (p. 340). To discuss the problems of compiling this inventory a "Conference on Historical Archaeology and the National Estate" was held at the Australian National University in December 1974. Problems of definition, legislation, field techniques, site recording format and education were discussed and the formation of the Project Co-ordination Committee on Historical Archaeology was recommended to assist the Interim Committee of the National Estate. Among its terms of reference were:

- to formulate draft themes or checklists for historic sites and works in Australia other than historic buildings (except where these form part of an historic site);

- to develop a uniform recording procedure;
- to organise the collection of lists of all known historic sites in Australia;
- to re-evaluate and redraft the draft themes (checklists);
- to organise the identification of additional sites in the light of information collected;
- to distinguish significant areas towards which major work should be directed.

This Committee took until February 1978 to report on its pilot studies in compiling site information. The fact that this Committee took three years to report is significant because there was much debate in the interim on the methodology. General consensus was finally reached on the type of standard recording and the necessity of employing professional site recorders (Allen, ed, 1978).

During the period of the deliberations of the Project Co-ordination Committee, the role of archaeology as a technique in assessing the value of an historic site was demonstrated in Victoria, when workers digging a pit for the new Beechworth municipal swimming pool unearthed an old rubbish tip on the site of the first gold diggings in the town beside Spring Creek. Local historians were very concerned that valuable evidence of the initial settlement might be destroyed. Dr. Jim Allen and archaeology students from the Australian National University conducted a salvage survey in July 1976 and concluded that the site had been subsequently flooded then used as a garbage tip until the turn of the century. Thus its value as a site from the initial mining days was shown to be very limited and the greatest benefit of the survey was the provision of new evidence on the sociological history of Beechworth after the gold rush. Some of the artefacts collected were catalogued as a reference collection and construction of the swimming pool proceeded (Lennon, 1978: 124-126).

The Anthropological and Archaeological Society of Victoria was asked by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works to assist in documenting the homestead site of the Reverend James Clow, a pioneer settler (ca 1840)

V. M. 07
of what is now the Dandenong Creek Metropolitan Park. A major excavation of the house site was conducted over summer 1979 and well publicized. The major aim of this excavation was to document the layout of the settlement site and interpret it to Park visitors. Some of the artefacts uncovered are displayed in the Park Visitor Centre.

The Anthropological and Archaeological Society of Victoria was also asked by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works to investigate the feasibility of identifying and protecting archaeological evidence for interpretation purposes on Board land along the Yarra River - the Dight's Flour Mill site and former cottage sites near the junction of the Plenty River where bottle diggers had been looting the sites.

The need for legislation to protect historic archaeological sites located outside of special reservations was raised in 1977 and in 1978 the Anthropological and Archaeological Society of Victoria presented a case to the Minister for Conservation. This was supported by the Director of the Victoria Archaeological Survey which then only had responsibility for undertaking Aboriginal archaeology. At this date there is no legislation specifically protecting historic archaeological sites, although non-Aboriginal archaeological work has been undertaken on some sites subjected to redevelopment/reuse pressures. These will be briefly discussed now:

- (a) An archaeological survey of the 766 ha ICI Australia Ltd. property at Point Wilson, north east of Geelong, was undertaken in 1978 to identify and record sites which may have been threatened by the development of an industrial complex on the property. Although no definite Aboriginal archaeological sites were found, a range of European historical sites dating from the period of early settlement (1850s) were recorded. These included a number of stone dwellings and associated outbuildings, stone fences, stone jetties and quarries. Recommendations were made for their management as the property is developed (Hughes and Wesson, 1978).

- (b) Mill's Cottage, Port Fairy , was the house of a pioneer whaler and settler of the 1840s and is listed on the State Register of Historic Buildings under the provisions of the Historic Buildings Act 1974. The owner applied under Section 16 of the Act to alter the site by adding a new building to the rear of the vacant land. The Victoria Archaeological Survey was asked to investigate whether there had previously been building over the site proposed for the additions. The results of their investigation enabled a permit for alterations to be granted with conditions providing for protection of in-situ evidence.
- (c) The site of the first major European settlement in Victoria, albeit temporary, by Captain Collins and 467 persons in 1803 was subject to a planning permit application for further residential subdivision. The Victoria Archaeological Survey was asked to undertake a survey to determine whether there were any archaeological remains dating from the original settlement. They recommended that because of the established historical significance of the land adjoining the graves reserve that it be acquired by the State and managed by the National Parks Service as an Historic Site. However, they concluded that, although a "comprehensive archaeological survey of both European and Aboriginal archaeological resources be conducted before management plans for the area are established," the prospects for locating archaeological remains are not good. This is due to the continuous subdivision and development of the land since 1875, the reported deliberate destruction of archaeological evidence by previous land-owners and continuous cliff-top erosion since 1803 (Coutts, 1981: 28-29).
- (d) Corinella was the site of a military settlement from December 1826 until March 1828 to forestall any French attempts at settlement. The Commandant's House, recorded in the London Record Office as our first Government House was completed by March 1827. Brick-making, vegetable gardening and timber-milling were undertaken and cottages and roads were constructed before the settlement was abandoned. The present owner of the land on which the Commandant's House is thought to have been located applied for a planning permit to build a new house on the site. The National Trust legally objected on the

grounds of its outstanding historical significance and urged the Government to undertake an urgent archaeological investigation of the area (Kellaway and Johnston, 1981). The decision on the town planning appeal has been postponed pending the outcome of the archaeological investigation now in process.

- (e) At Limeburners Point, a little to the east of the Geelong Golf Links, an industrial archaeological site dating from the 1840s has been offered to the National Trust for the management of the important site features by the Geelong Harbour Trust, who requested that a security fence should be erected. The initial fencing proposed skirted tightly around the four lime kilns built into the cliff and excluded the associated chimneys, foreshore, cobblestone roadway to the jetty area and other significant features (Elphinstone, 1980). This proposal has now been rejected and a comprehensive archaeological survey is to be undertaken to identify the former features and extent of the site before protective fencing is constructed.
- (f) Western Mining Corporation prepared a report on a proposed exploration decline for its Stawell Gold Development Project in January 1981. As part of this an archaeological survey of the proposed site was undertaken by Mr. I. Stuart, who located 15 sites related to the previous mining era. Of these, five will be destroyed by construction works. The report concluded that "the condition of these sites does not warrant their salvage" (Western Mining Corporation Ltd., 1981: 19). Yet, although the current condition of the sites was described and they were accurately measured, no detailed historical investigation was made into their origins and so their significance could not be assessed in relation to the total mining history of Stawell and the State.
- (g) When the 1853 prefabricated iron house, located at 59 Arden Street North Melbourne was being relocated to the National Trust iron houses complex in South Melbourne, the architects in charge of the relocation called in an archaeologist (Michael Pickering) to help identify and interpret in-situ evidence. As the building is listed on the State Historic Buildings Register and was being relocated as a museum piece because the previous owner planned to redevelop the Arden Street site, this effort to further document the history of

(3) LEGISLATION

Currently in Victoria there is no legislation specifically protecting historic archaeological sites and resources probably because of the ignorance of the value of such sites and the lack of practitioners lobbying for such protection. It is now realized that many aspects of the colonial period are not well documented - many of the first European settlers were illiterate and so left no written accounts of their activities. Historical archaeologists have an obvious role in filling this information gap. The visually non-spectacular, often derelict sites of sealing, whaling, pastoral and agricultural settlement, mining, shipwrecks, industrial activities and administrative functions contain much evidence of the former occupants and their lifestyles when investigated archaeologically. But many of these ghost towns and abandoned sites are under threat:

"Four wheel drive vehicles, the monetary value of old bottles and television's lure of the 'big country' image have ended the isolation of such time capsules, subject previously to natural decay but largely insulated from human interference" (Mulvaney, 1979: 3).

In the face of such threats and the slow realization of the heritage value of historical archaeological sites there has been renewed pressure for legislation.

Existing legislation controlling State property management and planning has some powers to protect historic archaeological sites providing these sites come within their jurisdiction, have been identified and have a priority for financial commitment, (for example, see Crown Lands Reserves Act 1978, Section 4; Forest Act, 1958, Section 50; National Parks Act, 1975, Sections 17 and 18; Historic Buildings Act, 1974 and Town and Country Planning Act, 1961, Third Schedule, Clauses 8 and 8b). Unfortunately, most of these acts aim to set aside historical sites as features in their own right but they do not control the activities permitted in or on them which can jeopardize their inherent, often unrealized heritage values.

In order to find an interim solution, the Ministry for Conservation sought the opinion of the Crown Solicitor on the extent of the powers of the Archaeological and Aboriginal Relics Preservation Act, 1972, as this had previously only been applied to aboriginal archaeology. Legal opinion

expressed the view that if relics possessing an archaeological characteristic were on or suspected of being on an historic site, then the provisions of the Act are capable of being applied. Accordingly, in March this year, the Victoria Archaeology Survey were advised by the Ministry that they could undertake archaeological work other than that associated with Aboriginal relics, but only on a small scale, concentrating solely on the most important projects and that they must continue to give priority to prehistoric sites.

Guidelines for historic archaeological work were set down:

- (1) All projects will be referred to the Director of Conservation for approval before any commitment is made. The recommendation will inter alia specify where the funds are coming from and the staff time to be used.
- (2) The approval of the Government Land Manager or private owner is required.
- (3) In the case of Government Land Managers, the excavation details are to be worked out with them and they are to be involved in the work, unless they do not wish to be.
- (4) Results will not be published without the Land Manager's or owner's approval and all information will be made available to them.

It is implicit in these guidelines that they apply to historical sites where the excavation techniques of the archaeologist may be required to unearth evidence of the occupation of the site so that its significance may be properly assessed and preservation commitments made in relation to competing demands for public funds. However, as the Victoria Archaeological Survey now have a mandate for historical archaeology they wish to demonstrate that archaeology involves field recording, not just excavation, and wish to undertake regional site surveys from which to develop a priority list of sites requiring protection and further research.

It is recognised that the Act as it is presently framed has shortcomings in respect of the administration of historic archaeological relics and will need amendment. It has not been decided whether the current Act should be amended and cross-reference the appropriate provisions in and sections of existing Acts already discussed or whether a new Act should

be introduced which encompasses and supercedes the existing Acts. The example of the New South Wales Heritage Act 1977 is pertinent where the archaeological evidence is encompassed within a broader concern for the environmental heritage comprised of significant buildings, works, relics or places (Temple, 1979: 63-4). A sensible approach must be adopted in framing the legislation, otherwise everything could be construed as an historic site, given the Victoria Archaeological Survey's interim definitions: "An historic site is a place or area of land connected with non-Aboriginal human activities and which may or may not contain visible, above ground surface relics in the form of buildings, structures, machinery or earth-works and which is important. An historic site is an historic archaeological site when a substantial part of the superstructure of the buildings, structures, machinery or earth-works is no longer extant and which has sub-surface features which can be archaeologically investigated."

The problem is how to set up legislation that will work in a dynamic state around the obvious shortcomings: inadequate data base, framing definitions which will take account of changing social attitudes and changing perception of what is "historic", co-ordination with existing Acts and agencies.

(4) IMPLEMENTATION DIFFICULTIES

(a) Administration

The Victoria Archaeological Survey has been directed to compile an interim register of historic archaeological sites and to implement those sections of the Act relating to the issuance of excavation permits and the protection of important sites. Excavation and detailed surveys of historic archaeological sites are to be limited to important projects which are of some interest to the Government and where adequate financial resources are available outside of those provided for prehistoric archaeology.

Under the existing Archaeological and Aboriginal Relics Act according to the recent legal opinion, sites are already protected if a professional archaeologist states that they contain archaeological relics.

.../11

Implementation of the existing Act is impractical if notification of the site contents and classification is left to an archaeologist. A more practical interpretation suggested by Dr. Coutts may be that any site dating from 120 years B.P. (before present) be automatically considered an historical archaeological site, and anything after that (from 1860 until the present) be considered an historic archaeological site if the Advisory Committee on the Archaeological and Aboriginal Relics Act agrees after assessing the site documentation. The site could then be gazetted and the owner/occupier could have the right of appeal. Once gazetted, the sites would become "relics" and have the same protection that is currently given to Aboriginal archaeological sites.

Alternatively, historic archaeological sites could be recommended for listing on the Historic Buildings Register and submitted to the classifications sub-committee of the Historic Buildings Preservation Council, if that sub-committee were expanded to include members with appropriate expertise in historical archaeology. After registration, administration of legal protection through the provisions of the Historic Buildings Act (with amendments) could be undertaken by the staff of the Heritage Unit, Department of Planning. The initial investigation, documentation and assessment of the significance of historical archaeological sites for declaration/registration would be undertaken by Victoria Archaeological Survey. The control and issue of excavation permits would be the responsibility of Victoria Archaeological Survey, whereas permits to alter sites of buildings would be the responsibility of the Historic Buildings Preservation Council. However, evidence from both archaeological and architectural investigations must be integrated and assessed simultaneously so that they combine to form complementary conditions for permits. This should have been the procedure with the application for additions to Mills Cottage, Port Fairy instead of separate investigations twelve months apart. Hopefully, the historic structures report now in the process of compilation for "Woodbine," Port Fairy will show this integration of evidence and therefore indicate accurately the components for restoration and reconstruction instead of the whole project being a conjectural restoration or an historical approximation

of the 1850s house, although my pious hope may be wishful thinking as a draft historic structures report has appeared based on historical evidence and architectural investigation without any archaeological investigation or results incorporated. Physical restoration works to the building should not be undertaken until all the research is complete. The waste of funds and defrauding of the public by presenting them with approximations or "plastic history" would be stopped by correct investigations and integration of the results as the first step in the conservation process. Any decision to alter the historical resource must be preceded by investigation.

Ideally, the existing resources of the Victoria Archaeological Survey, the Heritage Unit of the Department of Planning and the office handling the proposed Historic Government Buildings Register should be integrated for economy, efficiency and technical expertise. Such amalgamation could occur under the auspices of a Victoria Heritage Council or Commission which would be responsible for controlling historical resource management overall in the State. This would help to avoid the current confusion, duplication, competition, delay and neglect of vital components of our heritage conservation process which are revealed when quick action is required (as at Sorrento or when an historic building is an individually insignificant building but is a vital part of an historic precinct as in the main street of St. Arnaud) or in expert reviews of recent restorations (see Dr. Miles Lewis' comments in "The Way We Weren't - Are our Restorations Architectural Forgeries?" The Age, 19.8.81)

Each major government instrumentality undertaking construction activity and land management should employ a full-time archaeologist to assist in documenting their impacts so that the historic evidence is not lost. This should have been the case with MURLA on the construction of Melbourne's underground railway or the State Electricity Commission with its brown coal open cut mines. Departments such as the Forests Commission and National Parks Service whose management activities result in landscape change (through clearing of the forest or revegetation) should employ archaeologists to record the existing historical evidence which is transformed so quickly. The recent study by Sumner and Johnstone of a former dairy site at Organ Pipes National Park illustrates the value of recording and assessing historical site

This situation is common overseas especially where large government agencies are continuously involved in environmental impact/assessment procedures. In New South Wales the Department of Main Roads, the Forestry Commission and the Land Commission have appointed permanent archaeologists. In Victoria archaeologists could work full-time in the major land management agencies but on secondment from the Victoria Archaeological Survey which would provide laboratory facilities, technical expertise and professional assistance so as to avoid duplication of these support services.

(b) Registers

The current situation is that there are three registers operating statutorily in Victoria: the register of aboriginal sites under the provisions of the Archaeological and Aboriginal Relics Act, 1972, the Historic Buildings Register under the Historic Buildings Act 1974 and the Register of the National Estate under the Federal Government's Australian Heritage Commission Act, 1975. In addition, a register of historic archaeological sites is proposed under the provisions of the former Act and a register of historic government buildings is proposed under amendments to the Government Buildings Advisory Council Act, 1972. Numerous historical sites with archaeological potential are statutorily protected in town planning schemes, as in Maldon, by the provisions of Clauses 8, 8A and 8B of the Third Schedule to the Town and Country Planning Act, 1961. Other historic sites are protected statutorily without being included on any State register but when they are of unquestionable historical significance - for example, Stieglitz Historic Site under the National Parks Act, 1975; Central Deborah Mine, Bendigo, under the Crown Land (Reserves) Act, 1978; Lal Lal Blast Furnace Reserve under the Forests Act, 1958.

This multiplicity of "registers" highlights the need for integration, co-ordination overall and clear objectives because registers can be set up with three aims: to list all sites of a type (Section 10A of the Archaeological and Aboriginal Relics Act requires every aboriginal site to be listed by the Victoria Archaeological Survey), to list all known sites which meet a set of criteria (the aim of the Register of

the National Estate), or to list a representative selection of best examples (as with the Historic Buildings Register). Unfortunately, the latter register does not contain a representative selection when tested against the "Checklist for an Inventory of Historic Sites and Works" drawn up by the Project Co-ordination Committee on Historical Archaeology (see Allen, ed., 1978: A32-A34).

(c) Documentation

The multiplicity of registers is paralleled by a variety of documentation both in content and type. With regard to historical archaeological site recording, this multiplicity in Victoria was briefly summarized in 1979 in a report to the Archaeological Sites Co-ordination Committee of the Australian Council of National Trusts (Lennon, 1979, (b): 1-8) which is yet another body trying to compile inventories of archaeological sites for listing on registers!

Variety of documentation is predictable given the diverse nature of sites being recorded, but there should be a greater compatibility between recording forms and computerized data storage systems so that rapid information retrieval and comparison is feasible when policy decisions for protection are required. Flood (1979: 29-31) has described the selection of sites according to the above-mentioned checklist and then the components of site recording and a site report form. This checklist and modified form were used in major regional surveys of historic sites in Victoria for the Land Conservation Council's North Central and Ballarat Study Areas (see Jacob, Lewis and Vines, 1979 and 1980) and also in "The Survey of Areas of Historical Significance in Central and South Gippsland" prepared for the Latrobe Valley Strategy Plan Task Force (Aitken, 1981).

Hundreds of historic sites were identified and recorded but the documentation now needs to be transferred to the Register of the National Estate and then assessed for selection of representative State examples for inclusion on the Historic Buildings Register. The time-lag is significant in that sites may be lost in between initial identification and documentation and statutory protection through the

listing process. A greater uniformity and interchangeability of documentation procedures would speed up this process. As well as regional surveys, the need for detailed documentation as a necessary pre-requisite for selecting representative types for preservation has been established. Lennon (1979a:47-50) discussed this for railways and recently the Australian Railways Historical Society completed a five volume survey of railway station complexes in Victoria which established typologies and recommended those which are the best examples of each type. It is hoped that these recommendations will assist the Railways Property and Disposal Board in implementing the Lonie Report on closure and sale of railway systems. The study of Cemeteries of Victoria undertaken by L.P. Planning in 1980 for the Department of Planning also established procedures and criteria for assessing the historical significance of cemeteries and recommending those which require urgent repair works.

In addition to regional surveys of historic archaeological sites, the identification and documentation of such sites should be a mandatory part of the brief for environmental effects statements required for major projects such as pipeline or water reservoir construction. The Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works investigated the impact of its Upper Thompson Dam on flora and fauna, but did not record any archaeological sites, prehistoric or historic archaeological sites associated with the Walhalla goldfields, which will be inundated. The Water Resources Commission has failed to record historic archaeological sites important to understanding the transport routes through the Mitchell Valley as part of its assessment of the Mitchell River Dam. Again it has failed to record the historically important Coimadai village and former limekilns which will be flooded by the final stage of the Lake Merrimu project. This lack of documentation will mean the loss forever of the evidence of an important early industry and superceded technology. It is an essential moral and professional obligation to document such sites when their destruction is planned and agreed to in the current community interest. Any such documentation for essential archival purposes should be of a standard to enable future generations to understand the site in its total context. The token gesture to documenting the former sites to be destroyed in the Western Mining Corporation proposal at Stawell is not

of a high enough standard for us to understand their previous function, let alone for future scholars! Such documentation should be of a standard similar to that for the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) or the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER).

(d) Standards for Work

In a new and rapidly evolving discipline, when there are few practitioners, inexperienced clients and a deluge of urgent investigations, it has been difficult to establish and enforce professional standards. Many archaeologists operated with a "have trowel, will travel" mentality, which resulted in little publication of survey results and then only as description with little attempt at synthesis and explanation (Schiffer and Gumerman, 1977: xix). Today archaeology is practised within a framework of research and reporting as part of the long range management of historical resources. This philosophy is espoused by the Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (The Burra Charter) which sets down policies for conservation objectives, processes and practice. Article 24 establishes standards for archaeological work where physical disturbance to a place is likely as part of the process.

The need for a handbook or manual of historical archaeology in Australia describing methods and techniques has been recognized by the Australian Society for Historical Archaeology who propose a similar handbook to that published for aboriginal archaeology by the Victoria Archaeological Survey.

Australian archaeologists involved in contract archaeology consulting to developers and governments have formed an association (Australian Association of Consulting Archaeologists - AACA) to set fees, code of ethics and practice guidelines. However, a vast amount of work remains to be done by volunteers and good amateurs, under professional guidance to produce competent results.

(5) EDUCATION

Education is the major requirement for historical archaeology in Victoria today at all levels. Failure to understand what archaeology can contribute leads to the continued destruction of sites by weekend recreationists using metal detectors for "treasure hunting," by architects who believe that its sole function is the exposing of buried foundations, by developers who believe that it is too expensive and will add nothing new to their projects, by bureaucrats who are ignorant of the existence of sites in places under their jurisdiction.

Popular information has to be available through newspapers and television so that both the bulldozer driver and the retired volunteer can see a role. Courses have to be arranged through Centres for Adult Education, weekend seminars like the New South Wales National Trust ran at Goulburn in February 1979, and summer schools on field projects such as the Victoria Archaeological Survey conduct for aboriginal archaeology. Participants could be graded and accredited so that they could assist in other projects under professional supervision. No government can afford to establish the ideal system for the practice of historical archaeology but there is a vast amount of community knowledge and goodwill which could be harnessed and co-ordinated to provide useful background data, manual field assistance and curatorial roles. The membership of historical societies need to be reorganized into study groups to investigate the wide range of related topics such as processing techniques, the artefacts (glass, ceramics, metal), land ownership and social history of the sites. This will then assist in providing the historical data for documentation of archaeological sites. At the same time, tertiary studies need to be integrated so that historians, architects, surveyors, geologists and engineers have an appreciation of the role of archaeology in their professional practice. The training of qualified professional archaeologists should lead to a raising of standards. This has happened elsewhere in Australia and currently, the first graduates in archaeology from Latrobe University (the only university in Victoria with a full-time undergraduate course in Archaeology) are coming onto the job market.

Publication of archaeological investigations, even at an initial stage, will lead to greater public awareness and support as was demonstrated in May this year when the media covered the excavations at Hyde Park Barracks in Sydney and hundreds of people volunteered their manual labour, while others wrote to politicians urging continued support for the project. Publication of large format, attractive, "coffee table" style books such as Australian Pioneer Technology will help to promote the value of historical archaeology as a tool in understanding Australia's cultural heritage by reaching a large audience unquestionably fascinated by its recent past. The Australian Society for Historical Archaeology (ASHA) has published newsletters for the past ten years which contain details of historic archaeological investigations and they now propose, in addition, to publish a scholarly journal. Information programmes aimed at communicating with all sections of the community are a pre-requisite for the conservation of historic sites which have no visible means of above ground support.

(6) ARTEFACT STORAGE

Where excavation is necessary and artefacts are recovered, their ownership and control should be established. Aboriginal artefacts are the property of the Crown and are lodged with the National Museum after documentation and research. Should the Science Museum, as the major State institution collecting and caring for artefacts resulting from changing technology, store historical artefacts recovered from authorized excavations? Or should it only take the best examples of a vast range of types. This range is described in Peter Milner's December 1980 report, "A Computer-Based System for the Recording of Industrial and other Artefacts". It should be remembered, however, that many artefacts unearthed are but pieces of a total object and require skilled restoration for exhibition, for example, fitting together the shattered pieces of a fine English china vase or jug. The need to consider artefacts as part of our national heritage has been recognized (Raistrick, 1973: ch. 15; Report of the Committee of Enquiry on Museums and National Collections in Australia, 1975), but this need still requires translation into effective, comprehensive policies with government commitment. Handcrafted works are increasingly taking their place as national treasures, works of folk-art with a unique place in our

cultural heritage and the survey of pioneer crafts undertaken by Murray Walker, and presented as both a book and the first exhibition of nineteenth and early twentieth century functional and decorative craft held within a state fine art gallery, highlights another new direction in presenting the evidence of our past.

(7) PRESENTATION OF RELICS AND SITES

Much has been written about the presentation of historic sites and relics in Australia and its generally poor quality, Disneyland approach (see Allen, ed., 1978: A12-A21, Mulvaney, 1978: 59-67). The rapid eruption of inauthentic, poor quality open-air folk museums or historical parks for unsuspecting, uneducated tourists seems to have subsided and, although their Darwinian struggle for survival has resulted in the loss of much historical evidence by the rapid relocation of uncatalogued artefacts, retrospective research and more honest presentation should ensure a proper concern for the collections already assembled.

The concept of in-situ preservation and presentation, spectacularly displayed by the Ironbridge Gorge Museum complex around the original sites of the Industrial Revolution in Britain, has been best practised by the state National Park Services with Hill End in New South Wales as a prime example. The current Corinella investigation may give rise to a Victorian counterpart to Colonial Williamsburg, which realizes both the academic research and free-enterprise tourist potential of historical archaeology. Recreations, such as Sovereign Hill, can only be a tourist attraction based around an historical theme. This in turn has highlighted the case for preserving relics in-situ and leaving ruins as reminders of the sense of isolation and European failure to impose its impact on this New World landscape of ours.

Management plans have been prepared for a range of historic sites aimed at preservation of features in-situ and their interpretation to the public (see Lennon 1976 for plans for Stieglitz in Victoria and Lennon 1979c for plans for the Port Essington ruins in Northern Territory). Historic site management must be seen as the final, integrated result of the historic resource management process and its objectives should be reached only after a systematic progression through the steps of the conservation

(8) CONCLUSION

Historical archaeology has a central and pervading role to play in the conservation process and as the discipline is still in a state of flux, the emphasis over the next few years should be directed towards:

- an increase in the basic recording of all forms and types of historic sites;
- legislative protection for historic sites;
- conscious restraint in excavating sites;
- more intensive integration of historical evidence of all forms.

As Hume (1975: 2) has succinctly said: "In the final analysis ... it must be recognised that historical archaeology is but a tool with which to dig out information to enlarge, focus and define historical perspectives. It is the servant of the historian - and a rejected servant ultimately starves or turns to crime, in this case to the useless looting and destruction of the nation's historical resources".

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aitken, R., 1981, Areas of Historical Significance in Central and South Gippsland, report for the Latrobe Valley Strategy Plan Task Force, Ministry for Economic Development
- Allen, J. (ed.), 1978, Report of the Project Co-ordination Committee on Historical Archaeology, 155 pp.
- Australian Society for Historical Archaeology, Newsletters, vol 9 (nos. 1-4), 1979
- Birmingham, J., Jack, I. & Jeans D., 1979, Australian Pioneer Technology - Sites and Relics ... towards an industrial archaeology of Australia, Heinemann, 200 pp.
- Commonwealth of Australia, 1974, Report of the National Estate, 415 pp.
- Commonwealth of Australia, 1975, Museums in Australia, Report of the Committee of Inquiry on Museums and National Collections including the Report of the Planning Committee on the Gallery of Aboriginal Australia, 156 pp.
- Cossons, Neil, 1975, The BP Book of Industrial Archaeology, David and Charles, 496 pp.
- Coutts, P.J.F., 1981, Victoria's First Official Settlement, Sullivans Bay, Port Phillip, Victoria Archaeological Survey, 68 pp.
- Culican, William and Taylor John, 1972, Fossil Beach Cement Works, Mornington, Victoria, an essay in industrial archaeology, 79 pp.
- Elphinstone, Rod, 1980, Report on Limeburners Point Historic Site, National Trust of Australia (Victoria), 30 pp.
- Flood, Josephine, 1979, Identification and Recording of Historic Sites in Proceedings of the New South Wales National Trust Seminar on Industrial and Historical Archaeology, pp 29-36
- Hudson, Kenneth, 1976, Industrial Archaeology, a new introduction, Baker, 240 pp.
- Hume, Ivor Noel, 1975, Historical Archaeology, Norton, 362 pp.
- Hughes, P.J. & Wesson, J.P., 1978, An Archaeological Survey of the ICI property at Point Wilson, Victoria, A report prepared for ICI Australia, 22 pp.
- Jacobs, Lewis and Vines, 1980, Historic Sites Survey - Ballarat Study Area, 144 pp.
- Jacobs, Lewis and Vines, 1979, Historic Sites Survey - North Central Study Area, 153 pp.

Kellaway, C. & Johnston, C., 1981, Report on 1826 Settlement, Corinella, National Trust of Australia (Victoria), 33 pp.

Lennon, Jane L., 1976, Steiglitz Historic Site - Proposed Management Plan, National Parks Service, 29 pp.

Lennon, Jane L., 1978, Problems of Preservation in the Face of the Loss of the Physical Evidence, in The Tide of Australian Settlement - Conservation of the Physical Evidence, Australia ICOMOS Proceedings, pp. 124-128

Lennon, Jane L., 1979 (a), Re-use Aspects of Industrial Archaeology: Abandoned Railways - A Case Study from Victoria, in Proceedings of the New South Wales National Trust Seminar on Industrial and Historical Archaeology, pp. 47-50

Lennon, Jane L., 1979 (b), "Industrial Archaeology in Victoria", Report to the Archaeological Sites Co-ordination Committee of the Australian Council of National Trust, 8 pp. & appendices

Lennon, Jane L., 1979 (c), A Report on Management of Historic Sites on Cobourg Peninsula, Northern Territory, National Trust of Australia (Northern Territory), 55 pp.

Mulvaney, D.J., 1978, Future Pleasure From The Past? Protection of the Physical Evidence; the Range of Conservation Policies and Priorities for Funding in The Tide of Australian Settlement - Conservation of the Physical Evidence, Australia ICOMOS Proceedings, pp 59-67

Mulvaney, D.J., 1979, The Heritage Value of Historical Relics: A Plea for Romantic Intellectualism, in Proceedings of the New South Wales National Trust Seminar on Industrial and Historical Archaeology, pp. 3-6

Milner, P., 1980, A Computer-Based System for the Recording of Industrial and Other Artefacts, Technology Report, TR-80/4, Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Melbourne

Planning, L.P. 1980, Cemeteries of Victoria, a National Estate Study for the Department of Planning, 159 pp.

Raistrick, Arthur, 1973, Industrial Archaeology, Paladin, 314 pp.

Schiffer, M.B. & Gumerman, G.J., 1977, Conservation Archaeology - A Guide for Cultural Resource Management Studies, Academic Press, New York, 495 pp.

Temple, Helen, 1979, The Listing and Control of Archaeological Sites under the New South Wales Heritage Act, in Proceedings of the New South Wales National Trust Seminar on Industrial and Historical Archaeology, pp 63-65

Sumner, R. & Johnstone P., 1981, A Report on the Proposed Office Site, Organ Pipes National Park, Historical Services Branch, National Parks Service, 13 pp.

Walker, Murray, 1978, Pioneer Crafts of Early Australia, Macmillans, 178 pp.