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‘...above all, the farm of the colonial settler has to be wrought into being: the whole aspect of the place has to be changed by his own exertions; the forest cleared away, the drainage and irrigation instituted, the fencing originated, the house and the other buildings raised from the ground after careful selection of their site, the garden planned and planted: the sheep, the cattle, the horses, even the dogs and poultry, must be introduced into the solitude; and their multiplication by careful breeding is a work of design with a view to anticipated results. The life of a settler, when colonisation prospers, is a perpetual feast of anticipated and realised satisfaction.’

- Edward Gibbon Wakefield, *A View of the Art of Colonisation*
Abstract

The archaeology of urban environments in New Zealand is typically relegated to cultural heritage management investigation. This type of investigation is restricted by the limitations of the cultural heritage management framework, and urban archaeological investigation is often compelled by heritage regulation rather than academic inquiry. This has contributed to a limited archaeological understanding of an important period in New Zealand’s history – that of early colonial urbanism. Colonial urbanism is not often examined as a phenomenon in and of itself in New Zealand’s archaeological discipline, nor is archaeological theory applied to this context at a sustained and meaningful level. This thesis compiles existing archaeological and cartographic evidence from this period in a geographic information system project and examines its relationship with the ideologies that influenced New Zealand’s colonial settlers.

Wellington was the first urban settlement established by the New Zealand Company in New Zealand in 1840. The Company and its settlers espoused an ideology strongly influenced by 19th century capitalism and British imperialism. This ideology was reified by colonial theorist Edward Gibbon Wakefield and emphasised a perception of land as material. In view of this emphasis, archaeology offers a particularly appropriate approach to an examination of the relationship between this ideology and the urban form created by the settlers.

Using the settlement of Wellington as a case study, this thesis examines colonial urbanism through a unique theoretical framework constructed using archaeological, historical and urban planning perspectives. This framework facilitates an alternative understanding of the colonial urban environment by reinterpreting the city as a material artefact. The data compiled in this research displays how this artefact – the city – is a product of its colonial creators, and, in particular, the ideology that influenced these colonists. It identifies a causal relationship between the motivating ideology of the colonists and the form of the city artefact, highlighting the impact of ideology on the process of urban development.
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1. Introduction

This thesis explores the identity of New Zealand’s first urban centre, Wellington (Figure 1), during the initial 25 years of its development. This exploration uses methodology particular to the discipline of historical archaeology, synthesising archaeological and documentary information to produce an integrated understanding of Wellington’s early urban environment.

1.1. Historical Archaeology and the Urban Environment in New Zealand

For a variety of reasons, the genesis of New Zealand’s urban centres has been relatively neglected within the archaeological discipline and little is understood of their formation. Therefore this thesis attempts to address a gap in our current knowledge of New Zealand’s colonial history through the collection of relevant data from documentary sources and the archaeological record. This research also attempts to reach further than a descriptive summation of collected data, attempting to contextualise data within the broader narrative of colonialism in the 19th century and offer an informed interpretation of colonial urbanism in New Zealand. Focus is placed particularly on the ideological motivation of the New Zealand Company and its colonisation of Wellington in 1839. It is hypothesised that such ideology was so influential as to impact the formation of the urban environment of Wellington during the early years of colonisation, and it is expected that such influence can be identified within the collected data.

Study of the urban environment in New Zealand within the archaeological discipline has traditionally been associated with work undertaken under the auspices of cultural heritage management. Much of the development that threatens the archaeological record occurs within urban centres and under the Historic Places Act 1993. Those threatening this record are obliged to ensure the competent investigation and recording of archaeology that such development destroys. As a result, the majority of archaeological literature concerning urban sites takes the form of consultants’ reports to the managing body, the New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT).

Unfortunately, little academic interest has been taken in the archaeology of New Zealand’s urban environment (although there are exceptions e.g. Macready 1990, Davies 2009, Woods 2013). This is not to demean the work that has been motivated by cultural heritage management which is generally laudable in its investigation and interpretation of these sites. However, the relegation of urban sites to this investigative context has led to a patchy body of knowledge regarding the archaeology of New Zealand’s urban environments in both its
Figure 1. The location of Wellington, New Zealand, and other major colonial settlements. The New Zealand Company was involved in the establishment of all but Auckland. Inset: Major features of the Wellington region, including the Hutt Valley and Wairarapa.
temporal and spatial foci. Instigation of such investigations relies on the location of current development and, as such, cannot possess an independent and more broadly focused research strategy. Restrictions on the resources and priorities of such research often result in work that is very site-specific, often being confined to a single land section, and scattered sites that depend on the location of development projects. On rare occasions large-scale projects are initiated that allow for the investigation of a larger area (e.g. the Wellington Inner City Bypass project (Furey 2010)), however these tend to remain relatively spatially limited.

Such inflexibility in determining the location and context of archaeological investigation in New Zealand leads to an overwhelming bias towards the excavation of late 19th century archaeological contexts. The survival potential of early colonial contexts in urban centres is low, primarily due to the constant occupation of the area since settlement. Consistent redevelopment of the urban environment over time has destroyed many early archaeological contexts. Within a more flexible research strategy it would be possible to identify those less vulnerable areas where archaeological deposits relating to early European settlement were likely to remain. However the limitations of archaeological investigation reliant on cultural heritage management motivations prevent such flexibility in site selection.

The limitations of such an investigative strategy have resulted in a strong preference towards site-specific investigations of late 19th century archaeological contexts, scattered irregularly over the urban environment. Similarly, academic research of New Zealand’s historical archaeology is biased against contexts associated with the first major European migrations of the mid 19th century. Academic research has tended to focus on early 19th century contexts, being primarily concerned with cultural contact between the Māori and European populations (e.g. Coutts 1969; Middleton 2007), or isolated locations with specific functions, such as whaling stations (e.g. Coutts 1976; Smith 1996) and Christian missions (e.g. Middleton 2005). Investigation of later 19th century contexts has also focused on industry, primarily the Otago and West Coast gold rushes of the 1860s (e.g. Hooker 1984; Ritchie 1986).

In New Zealand there has been little, if any, interest in the archaeology of the first years of organised, large-scale European settlements. There are excusable reasons for this lack of interest. The urban environment is difficult to approach archaeologically. Sites are not readily available for investigation – it is much more difficult to adhere to a spatial research strategy in a crowded urban neighbourhood than in undeveloped farmland – and the destruction of early contexts through continuous development has severely impacted the potential for identifying
archaeology associated with the early urban settlement.

The constraints of both cultural heritage management and academic archaeological research have therefore resulted in a limited understanding of the archaeology of an important period in New Zealand’s history. The academic focus on early contact and industrial contexts, and the cultural heritage management focus on later, well-established urban contexts, make a false impression of urban centres springing fully formed from a scattering of small industrial and trading settlements. It is the archaeology of the transitional period between these contexts that this thesis will attempt to elucidate.

While cultural heritage management investigation has its limitations, it is only through such work that an academic investigation of the early urban environment is able to take place. Over the last three decades reports on the archaeology of Wellington have accumulated, most of them being submitted to the NZHPT. This ‘grey literature’ is unpublished, and little is done with the information once it is submitted. As discussed above, grey literature concerning the urban environment suffers from the disadvantage of being largely disconnected from broader themes and contexts commonly identified within New Zealand history. However, a careful integration of the literature along firm methodological lines may yield a wealth of information regarding aspects of New Zealand’s archaeological history. This thesis attempts such a synthesis as a means of investigating the early urban environment of Wellington City.

1.2. The New Zealand Company and New Zealand’s First Urban Settlements

The absence of archaeological focus on early colonial urbanism represents a thematic hiatus. It is not a lengthy gap in New Zealand’s short colonial history, roughly extending from the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 to the Otago gold rush of the early 1860s. Its importance lies in the process of European colonisation and settlement growth. The first major European colonisation of New Zealand was intentional and organised and the settlements resulting from this colonisation were themselves also intentional and organised. They were the result of decisions made in private homes and gentlemen’s clubs on the other side of the world, carried here and implemented by agents of those same decision-makers. Not only were these settlements the result of decisive planning, their plans were motivated by an ideology of colonisation that had been developing since the colonisation of North America by the British in the 17th century.

This thesis will focus on the idea of intentional urbanism, an urban environment with
characteristics that were the result of previous planning and motivated by the particular values of the planners and those who implemented the plan. The urban centre was organised by a few for the many colonists who were to populate this environment. In New Zealand’s case, ‘the few’ were the members and agents of the New Zealand Company, a small group of men who were influenced by the ideas of Edward Gibbon Wakefield. Wakefield had previously developed the theory of systematic colonisation, a theory that borrowed heavily from similar ideas that had been gaining traction over the previous decades. This thesis will attempt to demonstrate that Wakefield’s theory, as a specific ideology born from the capitalism, shaped the social and economic values that influenced the physical manifestation of Wellington’s urban environment.

The New Zealand Company, as the name suggests, was organised along the lines of a capitalist venture. The Company was not only conducting a social experiment in colonisation but also a business, out of the systematic export of British colonists to New Zealand in the late 1840s and early 1850s. The majority of New Zealand’s first urban settlements – including Wellington, Nelson, Whanganui, New Plymouth, Christchurch and Dunedin – were fully or partially organised by the New Zealand Company. Auckland was the only major exception, being founded by William Hobson in 1840 and established as the capital of New Zealand.

While the New Zealand Company’s urban settlements were intentional and organised, they were undertaken with very little knowledge of the New Zealand’s physical environment and its Māori inhabitants. New Zealand’s early towns were also shaped by the restrictions that the New Zealand environment and indigenous peoples placed on their realisation. Surveyors, agents of the New Zealand Company, were given the task of taking the ideological tenets of their employers and applying them to the natural environment to provide the new settlements with the physical boundaries of a town plan within which to organise their urban landscape. The colonists who settled within these boundaries also had potential to influence this landscape through their personal negotiation of the environment with which they were provided and the ideology imbued within it. Therefore, early Wellington was a mélange of the intentional and organised, adaptation to exterior forces, and reaction to forces developing within the new urban environment.

1.3. A Theoretical Framework

Considering the intentional and organised nature of the Wellington settlement, it seems logical that the New Zealand Company, and the ideology it espoused, had a profound effect
on its physical and cultural landscape. This thesis will attempt to elucidate the way in which this ideology was manifested in the first 25 years of settlement through the synthesis of data collected according to the investigative methods of historical archaeology. However, the relationship between data and ideology cannot be made haphazardly. Instead it is necessary to ground any interpretation in relevant theoretical discourses within the archaeological discipline. Other disciplines such as history, sociology and urban planning may also contribute to a cohesive interpretation of the data.

Theoretical discourse specifically concerned with the discipline of historical archaeology is of most use in this thesis. While the precise definition of the field has been the subject of debate, it is the methodology espoused by this discipline that tends to commonly define it. The use of documents to supplement and enhance the archaeological data, in order to provide a fuller understanding of the evidence, epitomises the investigative approach used by historical archaeologists worldwide. Urbanism and colonialism are not subjects relegated solely to historians. Archaeologists have explored both prehistoric and historic examples to great benefit. Furthermore, research on prehistoric examples, such as V. Gordon Childe’s (1965) work on the urban forms of the Near East, can provide a solid theoretical grounding for research into more recent manifestations of such phenomena.

Several major theoretical discussions are particularly appropriate to the temporal context of this research. Colonialism and capitalism, two primary themes of this thesis, are also two of the four tenets of Charles Orser’s ‘archaeology of the modern world’ (1996). This thesis will attempt to contextualise the collected data within a broader framework of capitalist ideology and the colonisation of, from the European perspective, terra nullius. Gosden’s (2005) model of colonialism provides a theoretical framework for such colonisation, in which material culture is viewed as the primary means of examining the archaeological manifestation of colonialism. The material focus of this model applies itself well to discussion of urbanism in the historical and archaeological disciplines concerning the city artefact (see Summerson (1963) and Garvin (1963)). It facilitates the study of the city as an entity in itself and defines its characteristics in much the same way that archaeologists study ceramic sherds or lithic tools.

1.4. Research Constraints

Due to the size of this thesis, the scope of the research must be somewhat restricted. One of the primary aims of this thesis since its instigation has been a comprehensive synthesis of
information regarding New Zealand’s earliest urban environments. However, the scope of the research had to be limited in order to sensibly approach an inundation of potential data sources. Due to 19th century British bureaucracy a huge amount of information was generated over the first 25 years of urban development in New Zealand. Even with more than 150 years of attrition on the data available it was necessary to constrain the scope using spatial and temporal parameters and therefore create a more precise synthesis of information. The temporal and spatial parameters used to restrict this information are discussed further in 3. Materials and Methods. The description and interpretation of early Wellington presented in this thesis cannot claim to be representative of all colonial urban environments in their infancy, either nationally or internationally. However it does provide an example of such a context, which has potential to influence further study.

Another important aspect of the context under investigation that has unfortunately been constrained is the nature of the relationship of local iwi (indigenous Māori tribes) with the urban environment. Again, the scope of this research simply did not allow for consideration of such a complex issue and it was considered preferable to exclude it from the research focus rather than fail to do it justice. Elements of Māori settlement within the urban centre are included in this research but solely as represented by European colonists. They are not a primary focus. A major theme of this research is the agency of European colonists in constructing and experiencing an urban environment of their creation. This includes consideration of colonial reaction to Māori settlement, such as the restrictions to urban organisation caused by Te Aro pā on the Wellington waterfront, and the ‘Native Reserves’, through which colonists attempted to organise Māori settlement according to their own ideological tenets. However, these elements of Māori settlement are included because they are examples of colonial organisation of their urban landscape. The resistance and agency of tangata whenua themselves have unfortunately had to be excluded.

This is not to diminish the importance of the Māori contribution to Wellington’s urban landscape, nor does it mean to imply that the role of iwi in shaping Wellington’s urban landscape was inherently passive. It merely reflects the original motivation for this research, an interest in the ideology that propelled colonisation of different parts of the world by European peoples, and how that ideology was expressed or changed in the colonial environment. This thesis deliberately focuses on the colonial perspective in an attempt to understand the creation of a colonial urban centre within the context of its ideological framework.
1.5. In Summary

This thesis relies on three major investigative tenets. The first is the examination of New Zealand’s first urban centre in order to more fully understand the urban environment as it was first manifested in this country. The use of methods particular to historical archaeology are ideally suited to this task in that they take full advantage of sources of information available to the researcher concerning colonial New Zealand. It is hoped that this thesis will provide some answers regarding a knowledge gap in the archaeology of New Zealand’s colonial history.

Secondly, it is hoped that the data produced in this research will have a practical application in providing a research tool for archaeologists working in cultural heritage management. Admittedly archaeologists working in Wellington will benefit most directly from the collation of this data. However, the creation of a methodological template for the organisation of such data creates potential for similar projects to be undertaken for other urban centres. This is particularly pertinent to the abundance of data currently generated by the archaeological work being undertaken in inner city Christchurch as a result of the Canterbury earthquake of February 2011. This template may aid in the integration of historical and archaeological information for such urban centres, and help connect site-specific research with the surrounding historical environment.

Finally, while it was considered preferable to undertake research that had potential for practical application in the heritage industry it was also necessary that the research be firmly embedded in current theory and methodology of historical archaeology, and more particularly the archaeology of colonialism and urban centres. Such theoretical grounding aids in the interpretation of the data in providing a richer understanding of the historical archaeology of Wellington’s colonial urban context. Theoretical approaches to such contexts help connect separate archaeological examples to broader contexts through space and time. It is particularly relevant to this thesis that theoretical approaches concerning the urban entity and the archaeological expression of colonialism be explored in order to connect the data to considerations of the ideological motivation for colonialism and how this ideology was expressed in the urban environment.
2. Archaeology, Urbanism and Ideology

The following review is organised according to the three primary theoretical themes of relevance to this research – colonialism, urbanism and ideology. The discussion of urbanism is focused towards different theoretical approaches to examining the urban centre. Similarly, the discussion of ideology is further refined with particular emphasis on the ideology of capitalism and its relationship with the theory of systematic colonisation, with reference to the New Zealand Company and its colonial activities.

These themes have been fervently discussed within the historical archaeological literature and several major projects and theoretical treatises concerning them are examined here. Particular attention has been paid to instances of thematic crossover. For example, explorations of capitalism in colonial contexts, and examinations of the urban forms of colonised societies. Examples from prehistoric archaeology have also been referenced when considered particularly relevant. Similarly, relevant work from disciplines such as sociology, history and urban planning have also been included.

The work discussed in this review covers examples from all over the world, although they are tended towards the British colonial diaspora. This bias is a reflection of the way in which historical archaeology developed, with an initial focus on North America. As the discipline expanded the archaeology of different colonised societies became the focus of investigation, and the subject colonialism developed as one of the definitive aspects of the discipline. Examples from North America and Australia dominate this review, the first because it was the area in which the methodology and theory of historical archaeology were initially developed, and the second because of its similarities to New Zealand, both in its colonial past and its current archaeological procedures.

Due to the scope of this thesis this literature review has had to be highly selective, and cannot claim to be an entirely comprehensive examination of all the relevant work. However, it is hoped that the major influences currently affecting the examination of these themes in archaeology have been considered.

2.1. The Archaeology of Colonialism

Colonialism has been integral to historical archaeology since its genesis, to the extent that it has been used to define the discipline. The eminent American historical archaeologist James Deetz (1996) considered the post 15th century colonialism by Europeans and its impact on
indigenous populations to be essential to the definition of historical archaeology. In the early years of the field colonialism was often interpreted as the simple transplantation of European population into new and unfamiliar environments (Orser 1996: 58).

Colonialism was considered such an inexorable aspect of historical archaeology that it largely went unquestioned and was rarely examined as a complex process with causes and effects beyond unilineal cultural flow and eventual indigenous assimilation (Orser 1996: 59). For example, research has tended to focus on acculturation, the reaction of indigenous peoples to European colonisation and the impact of European culture on indigenous lifeways. In essence it focused on the ‘effectiveness’ of colonisation by assessing material culture change in indigenous sites.

While acknowledging Deetz’s considerable influence on historical archaeology, Croucher and Weiss argued that his interpretation of colonialism was too restrictive, confined as it is ‘within the panorama of the Atlantic Ocean’ (Croucher and Weiss 2011: 3). From Croucher and Weiss’ intentionally postcolonial perspective, the ‘modern world’ of historical archaeology could not merely be interpreted as the Atlantic World, but the themes prevalent in such archaeological research can be explored in different areas all over the globe. As a result Croucher and Weiss also take issue with Deetz’s neglect of one of the most important of these themes, that of capitalism, and Marxist terminology in general.

In contrast, Orser’s (1996) redefinition of historical archaeology was structured around temporal parameters and thematic cores, and therefore does not restrict the discipline to the Atlantic. Orser listed both colonialism and capitalism in his four ‘haunts’ of historical archaeology, along with Eurocentrism and modernity. He argued that these aspects could be identified in all historical archaeological contexts in some way, shape or form, and his thesis has provided the ‘most recent pop-definition of the field’ (Croucher and Weiss 2011: 3). In this definition, colonialism was considered more than just the transfer of objects from a dominant to dominated culture, and examples were given of studies that highlighted indigenous resistance to dominance and acculturation, and explored the complexities of colonial interaction beyond material categories of assimilation (e.g. Rubertone 1989).

Orser emphasised that while colonialism can be examined through material remains, the assumption that the process consisted of only unilateral transfer and influence is incorrect and outdated and ignores the many subtleties of a complex process (Orser 1996: 64).
At its very base, colonialism is men and women from one place confronting men and women from another place. These interactions created wonder, fear, apprehension, misunderstanding, cooperation, and a host of other emotions and reactions. Each contact was unique and transforming.’ (Orser 1996: 65).

Jordan (2009) echoed Orser’s criticism of acculturation emphasis in early archaeological studies of colonialism. His assessment of the relationship between historical archaeology and colonialism highlighted the need to examine the complex power relations between colonisers and indigenous groups in an effort to redress the passive role commonly assigned to indigenous people during the colonisation process. Therefore his summary of current historical archaeology focuses on projects emphasising indigenous reaction towards a dominant colonial culture. This assessment suggested that historical archaeology too readily glosses over the process of colonialism from the perspective of historic outcome, treating domination of subaltern peoples by the colonists as inevitable rather than the open-ended process it actually was (Jordan 2009: 34).

Jordan’s assessment demonstrates that much of current historical archaeology, in North America at least, is now emphasising indigenous reaction to colonisation in order to rectify previous neglect of this area (e.g. Jordan 2009; Kelly 2002; Lightfoot 2005). However, other studies have examined the way in which colonisation affected the colonising community. These include an examination of creolisation in colonial society at the Cape of Good Hope (Jordan and Schrire 2002) and the development of colonial identity in a Spanish presidio in California (Voss 2005). These studies provided fresh insight on this more traditional focus of colonial archaeology by emphasising the process of colonisation, rather than taking the results of colonisation as a given. The importance of process was emphasised by Jordan:

‘As a discipline fundamentally concerned with long time spans, archaeology should study not only realized domination but also the processes by which it was established and resisted.’ (Jordan 2009: 34).

While colonialism plays a prominent role in Orser’s understanding of the modern world, Croucher and Weiss point out that useful definitions of colonialism within historical archaeology are rare (Croucher and Weiss 2011: 5). The term is usually used in reference to Spanish or British, and sometimes French, colonialism. Such European exclusivity seems to define modernity as the age of European colonisation - a ‘particular set of relations between the West and the Rest’ (Croucher and Weiss 2011: 5). Croucher and Weiss interpret Gosden’s *terra nullius* colonialism as occurring later than this traditional definition, when capitalism...
had become the dominant economic system, motivating the evolution of new colonial forms that exploited the raw materials of colonies for burgeoning industries (Croucher and Weiss 2011: 6). Therefore, Gosden’s modern epoch is defined by the dominance of capitalism, and facilitated by the possibilities made available by colonialism.

Gosden’s (2004) thesis on the archaeology of colonialism is arguably the most important theoretical contribution to the archaeological study of colonialism in recent years. It provides a model by which to study colonialism from prehistory to the modern world through material remains. It focused on the role material culture plays in the actualisation of colonialism, defined as ‘a particular grip that material culture gets on the bodies and minds of people, moving them across space and attaching them to new values.’ (Gosden 2004: 3). In arguing that values are ‘created and carried through our bodily relations with material culture, so that our unconscious and habitual acts in the material world are vital, especially through patterns of consumption’ (Gosden 2004: 5), Gosden credited artefacts with the power to destabilise the traditional values of both the coloniser and the colonised, and therefore change them.

Reflecting the concerns of both Orser (1996) and Jordan (2009), colonialism is not interpreted as a one-way flow of material culture and values from incomer to native, but rather the transformation of both through the process of material culture circulation (Gosden 2004: 4). Therefore the colonising culture could be defined as much by its colonies as by events that happened within the home centre. This was considered particularly true of colonialism that occurred after 1750 when the strength of the symbolic centre began to disintegrate due to the increased availability of new and exotic materials. For example, tea drinking is considered to be a quintessentially English practice, but it could not have developed without the material (tea) becoming available through British colonial activities in China.

Gosden’s model of colonialism is organised in three categories defined by differences in the human relationship with the material world. These were colonialism within a shared cultural milieu, middle ground colonialism, and terra nullius colonialism. Terra nullius colonialism is the type applicable to the colonisation of New Zealand after 1840. The settlement of Europeans in New Zealand prior to this date is more resonant of Gosden’s second colonialism type, ‘middle ground colonialism’. Terra nullius colonialism can include, but is not necessarily defined by, the creation of settler societies; the mass killing of indigenous populations through war and disease; active deployment of domination and resistance; technologies of transport, communication and production; and sophisticated militarism.
Terra nullius colonialism took place within a wider capitalist world system and was motivated by this system’s drive to seek new raw materials and markets. Simultaneously the Christian Church provided further ideological justification in its quest to save the souls of pagans through such organisations as the British missionary societies. Such attitudes gave sustenance to the racial categories that were being solidified at the time, creating a hierarchy of humanity and providing each stratum with particular roles in human organisation. It was within this context of both economic and moral justification that terra nullius colonialism was enacted through the appropriation of new lands.

The ideological basis of terra nullius colonialism was based on the writings of English philosopher John Locke (Gosden 2004: 27). Locke’s ideas concerning persons, property and power have become so fundamental to an occidental worldview that today they are taken for granted. Gosden argues that they were the product of post-Columbian colonial relations. Locke’s thesis was developed in the colonial American context, and framed the indigenous lifeways negatively, to be redeemed by European civil society. Locke argued that land could not be considered the property of an individual, or group of individuals, until it was improved by some agricultural use. Therefore uncultivated land was considered terra nullius and could be appropriated as private property by any individual or group who intended to improve it. This concept provided powerful moral justification for the appropriation of land by colonists – if indigenous peoples did not ‘improve’ land they could not hold sovereignty over it, whereas a civil society (the colonial society) would cultivate it and therefore exercise legal title over it.

The idea was extended by Adam Smith in his An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations. In this work Smith devoted a section to the ‘Prosperity of Colonies’, in which he emphasised the benefits that colonisation by a ‘civilised nation’ could effect on waste land not yet improved:

‘The colony of a civilized nation which takes possession, either of a waste country, or of one so thinly inhabited that the natives easily give place to the new settlers, advances more rapidly in wealth than any other human society.

The colonists carry out with them a knowledge of agriculture and of other useful arts, superior to what can grow up of its own accord in the course of many centuries among savage and barbarous nations. They carry with them too the habit of subordination, some notion of the regular government which takes place in their own country, of the system of laws which support it, and of
a regular administration of justice, and they naturally establish something of the same kind in their new settlement.’ (Smith 2008: 334).

*Terra nullius* colonialism was exercised in various ways during the major post-Columbian imperial expansions. In the case of the British Empire this included the colonisation of major continents such as North America (the United States of America and Canada), India, South Africa and Australia. New Zealand was one of the last landmasses to be colonised by the British, over 50 years after Australia was established as a penal colony. The appropriation and improvement of land by colonists under *terra nullius* colonialism converted what was a wilderness in the eye of the colonist into something imbued with human value (Gosden 2004: 114). It is this appropriation, whether by the crown or the individual, that Gosden argued distinguished modern (*terra nullius*) colonialism from previous forms. Instead of an emphasis on rights over persons and objects, the emphasis was on rights over land.

Modern colonialism was unique in the unprecedented amount of people and materials that were placed in new locations around the world. This mass-movement established new ‘networks of connectivity’ formed from the circulation of both people and things between home countries and colonies, and between the colonies themselves. Land taking was the first step in planting a population and establishing these networks. This was considered an ‘act of cultivation’ by the colonisers, intended to create ‘model societies’ in unspoiled locations (Gosden 2004: 126). The city was considered the centre of such civilised societies. It would serve both as a cultural centre and a place of safety for the settlers in the surrounding wilderness. Gradually common modes of both urban layout and architecture were established on the landscapes of various colonies, with minor regional variations.

Gosden gave material culture a pivotal role in motivating and maintaining colonialism, and it can be argued that land itself is the material that was key to *terra nullius* colonialism. The emphasis on legal rights over private property, rooted in Locke’s ideas of personhood and improvement, transforms an immutable landscape into alienable parts that can be personally possessed. Land was conceptualised by the colonists as a commodity, a material object that functioned in much the same way as any material object previously circulated in previous modes of colonialism.

In fact, Gosden argued that disconnection from an object’s intrinsic value is one of the characteristics of modern colonialism. Where previous forms of colonialism had created systems based on both the quality and the quantity of an object, in *terra nullius* colonialism
quantities and a capitalist economic system dominated (Gosden 2004: 36-39). In essence *terra nullius* colonialism was ‘an invasive extension of one network, which ignores and destroys existing values, but has ultimately created radically new global links and forms of consumption.’ (Gosden 2004: 40). The attitude of the European colonisers generally failed to recognise the values associated with land by indigenous peoples, and indigenous peoples were likely shocked by the superficiality of the colonising attitude (Gosden 2004: 122).

2.2. *The Archaeology of Urbanism*

Vere Gordon Childe (1965) was one of the first archaeologists to pay attention to urbanism as an institution of human history. His linear model of social evolution synthesised theoretical surmise and archaeological evidence from Egypt, Mesopotamia and the Indus Valley, from the paleolithic era to the development of the state. Childe identified the ‘urban revolution’ as one of the key transitions in prehistory, following the ‘neolithic revolution’ and the adoption of agriculture. To Childe the key agents in the transition from village to urban centre were the development of new technologies (primarily metallurgy), increased economic specialisation, and population growth. These agents were associated with political processes such as the development of kingship, and increased social differentiation and segmentation. Newly emerged elites, often identified with religious prestige, began to control the accumulated wealth and surplus that characterised the specialisation of economy and labour.

While Childe provided an interpretation of the transition from self-sustaining village community to the complexity of the urban centre, he failed to provide a definitive discussion of the settlement form. He focused more on the economic transition associated with urbanism than on the nature of urbanism itself. It can be inferred that Childe’s definition of urbanism is rooted in his emphasis on economic specialisation and surplus within this transition, and indeed several important elements of urbanism are discussed in detail. However, his discourse avoids any discussion of the definitive characteristics of the city, town, or urban centre.

In contrast, Lewis Mumford (1961) thoroughly explored the form, function and nature of the urban centre throughout history. While rooted in the sociological discipline, the first chapters of his work *The City in History* draw heavily on archaeological evidence and interpretation as he attempts to define the urban form in its initial manifestations in the Near East. His focus on the urban form prompts discussion not only of the processes that contributed to the transition to urbanism but also of the physical and social institutions that characterise this settlement form. Having identified these characteristics Mumford continued to reference them when
discussing changes in the urban form over the course of history.

Mumford emphasised the growth of urbanism from the village settlement, the first settlement form to be characterised by permanence in residence and the exertion of human control over natural resources (Mumford 1961: 11). He stated that the embryonic structure of the city existed first in the village in the form of five key institutions: the house, the shrine, the spring, the public way, the stronghold and the marketplace (Mumford 1961: 19; 31). It is the dynamic relationship between these institutions that defined the urban centre. They represent the beginnings of organised morality, government, law and justice.

Eventually the village was forced away from basic concerns of sustenance and reproduction and its components were reorganised in a more complex and unstable pattern which itself promoted further change and development (Mumford 1961: 29). Human capabilities were expanded, and economy and society were reorganised in the way outlined by Childe – agriculture intensified, surplus was produced and specialisation in labour developed. Concurrently the power of religious deities and political figures intensified, and social stratification deepened. However, while Mumford adhered too much of Childe’s interpretation, he rejected the use of the term ‘revolution’ to describe the transition, insisting that its implied progression from outmoded forms neglected the pivotal role of older institutions in the transition of village to city (1961: 31). The key components of the village participated in the general enlargement and concentration of human population associated with urbanism, and it was the new structural differentiation of the urban environment that provided them with recognisable forms.

Mumford instead described the transition to urbanism as an implosion (1961: 34) where scattered and diverse elements were drawn together and packed under pressure within the city’s walls. The city acted as both a magnet for and a container of humanity, and the pressure and control it exerted over both human society and the natural environment associated the urban form with a new mythology of power. This contributed to a diverse but concentrated population being increasingly isolated and differentiated, one of the characteristic marks of the new urban culture (1961: 48). Mumford stated that ‘With the very foundation of the city one should expect definitions and boundaries, limits of sacred authority, royal jurisdiction, and property.’ (Mumford 1961: 65). Increased differentiation, both social and economic, was therefore a crucial component of urbanism.
An increased population and settlement density could be considered one of the more obvious characteristics of an urban environment. However, Mumford argued that such increases do not necessarily define an urban environment. Instead, it is ‘the number that can be brought under unified control to form a highly differentiated community, serving purposes that transcend nurture and survival, that have decisive urban significance.’ (Mumford 1961: 62). It is important, therefore, to distinguish between a dense conglomeration of urban structures, indicative of an increase in population, and the complex and dynamic organisation of a city. This is characterised not only by a concentration, but also a polarisation, of power (Mumford 1961: 85).

Mumford sought to define urbanism first by its social core before its physical manifestation:

‘To define the city one must look for its organizing nucleus, trace its boundaries, follow its lines of force, establish its subsidiary centres for association and communication, and analyze the differentiation and integration of its groups and institutions. While the city brought together and welded into a visible unity village, shrine, stronghold, workplace and market, its character altered from region to region, from age to age, as one or another component dominated and colored the rest. But always, as a living cell, the organizing nucleus was essential to direct the growth and the organic differentiation of the whole.’ (Mumford 1961: 93).

In fact, the physical translation of ideas and customs came to be one of the most important functions of urbanism in that it presented to the city’s population and the world the ideological framework that sustained it. Mumford argued that one of the great marks of the city is its ability to transmit a ‘representative portion of a culture’ in symbolic forms and social patterns (Mumford 1961: 93). These were materialised in art, architecture and monumentalism and later in the development of writing. Such phenomena functioned as methods of social storage and, to continue Mumford’s metaphor, increased the city’s capacity as a container. Larger portions of culture could be transmitted to more distant generations and the boundaries of the city both in time and space were enlarged (Mumford 1961: 98). Through the process of materialisation, ‘the physical structures of the city’s past events, decisions made long ago, values formulated and achieved, remain alive and exert influence.’ (Mumford 1961: 113).

Later literature, focusing on both the prehistoric and the modern city, has continued to view complexity and differentiation as a constant in the definition of urbanism (e.g. Trigger 1972). However, emphasis has also fallen on two further factors in the quest to define this term. The first is the function of the urban centre, in that the city is a unit of settlement that performs specialised functions to a broader hinterland in the form of necessary, non-agricultural
services. For example, Grove (1972) postulated a hierarchy of urbanism, in which the city, at its apex, holds the most influence over the largest area. He posited that the operation of urban services require an inter-relatedness that directly impacts the physical form of the city, and that compactness and density are a necessary condition of urban life because inhabitants are primarily restricted to movement on foot. Therefore the status of an urban centre is reflected in its physical manifestation:

‘The higher the rank of a centre, the greater the variety of buildings and spaces within a small compass, and the more complex the relationships between them. Equally so, the greater is the variety of people who rub shoulders there. And these features...are surely the most widely perceived criterion of a town. Perhaps they are what most people *mean* by town.’ (Grove 1972: 562).

Grove’s hierarchy of urbanism relates to the second emphasis, that urbanism is a continuum rather than a threshold, a continuum that stretches from the pre-urban village to the modern city (Tringham 1972, Smith 1972). The levels of complexity, provision of services, and extent of influence vary within this continuum, but all are considered to some degree to be definitive of urban settlement. The emphasis of urbanism as a continuum highlights the difficulty in devising a blanket definition that applies to all its manifestations across time and space. However, the fact remains that despite variation in form the urban centre has always been considered unique.

Despite uncertainty in defining urbanism and the city, ‘urban archaeology’ is commonly used to describe archaeology undertaken within urban boundaries or pertaining to an urban context. The following provides examples of urban archaeological projects undertaken in Australia, England and the United States. These examples demonstrate how urbanism has been investigated using the methods of historical archaeology and how such investigations can provide interesting and varied interpretations of urbanism in the past.

In assessing the urban archaeology of Australia Lawrence and Davies (2011) reflected on the limitations placed on archaeological investigations in urban areas by development and planning (Lawrence and Davies 2011: 261-262). These processes determine the size and footprint of the excavation site with no reference to historical boundaries or contexts. There is often little scope for the archaeologist to design research strategies that are independent of these restrictions. Furthermore, the large scale of many development sites tends to lead to a research focus on the neighbourhood rather than the individual home or business, or conversely the wider urban environment.
However, some urban projects have challenged the way in which such projects are undertaken and the results interpreted. For example, ‘Exploring the Archaeology of the Modern City’ in Little Lonsdale Street, Melbourne (Mayne and Lawrence 1998; 1999; Mayne, Murray and Lawrence 2000) successfully deconstructed the data in order to interpret the site on a household/single section basis. This interdisciplinary project ‘developed an approach that works outwards from individual excavated households to encompass neighbourhoods, the city, and finally to comparisons with nineteenth-century households around the world’ (Lawrence and Davies 2011: 252).

Lawrence and Davies also examined projects that have used urban excavations to compare the historic urban environment in Australia to other cities around the globe (Lawrence and Davies 2011: 262-263). They emphasised the rapid growth of large urban centres as characteristic of the 19th century, and archaeology as a means of investigating how different cities around the world met the challenges produced by this growth. Mayne and Murray (2001) are cited as an example of successfully comparing an aspect of city life evident in the archaeology, here the occurrence of urban ‘slums’, to similar international contexts, i.e. contemporary working class neighbourhoods in cities around the world.

The 19th century slum and the creation of working class identity has been an important theme for some of the largest archaeological investigations of urban contexts in the past decades, both in Australia and internationally. Some of the most well known of these projects include The Rocks, Sydney (Karskens 1999; Godden Mackay Logan 1999); Five Points, Manhattan, New York (Historical Archaeology 2001) and Cyprus Freeway Replacement Project, West Oakland (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 2004). While major projects have been undertaken, Mayne and Murray (2001: 2) have criticised the lack of synthesis in archaeologies of historical urban contexts, pointing to an absence of ‘compelling intellectual frameworks and questions to drive enquires’, and lament the lack of purely academic research in this area.

Archaeological studies of ‘slums’ have been prevalent in the archaeology of the historical urban context in recent years, many as direct result of major development projects. This research has tended to focus on working class inhabitants’ resistance to stereotypes created and perpetuated by dominant elites, in much the same way that much of the recent archaeological work on colonialism focuses on subaltern resistance to dominant colonial culture. However, this research does offer some interesting aids to interpreting the archaeology of historical urban contexts.
Several studies have examined the creation of a working class ‘cultural landscape’ within physical landscapes constructed by dominant elites. Malan and van Heyningan (2001) demonstrate the contradiction between the public domain of the street front and the private domain of the backyard in Capetown’s District Six of social housing. This contradiction is reflected in the idealised streetscapes of official maps and plans, and the archaeological evidence of the ‘manipulation of the material world by inhabitants’ in order to subvert the intended purpose of the area created by elite designers (Malan and van Heyningan 2001: 56).

Bedford (2001) undertook a similar investigation of ‘the crofts’, a working class neighbourhood in Sheffield, England. He focused on the manipulation of the urban space and the subsequent ‘evolution of an arena in which social differences are displayed.’ (Bedford 2001: 108). Again, a dichotomy is demonstrated between the theoretical control of the landowners and the actual control of the people on the ground, expanded to mean not only leaseholders but also land agents and surveyors. Bedford notes the differences between the Crofts, in which the irregular streetscape is interpreted as control by those inhabiting the spaces, and the development of a later suburb carefully controlled by the landowner. The conscious effort by the landowner to impose a particular character on this space is manifested in the regular grid plan.

Beaudry and Mrozowski (2001) further explored the subversion of controlled urban spaces by working class inhabitants, emphasising the expression of working class identity within a context that epitomised 19th century capitalist practices. Lowell, Massachusetts, was a factory town founded in the 19th century by several major manufacturing companies. As a result, company policy played a dominant role in creating and controlling the urban environment that company workers inhabited. The authors stressed the importance of documentary and cartographic evidence, as well as architectural and archaeological, in understanding Lowell in the broader context of 19th century industrial capitalism. This evidence was interpreted as reflecting attempts by the companies to design their city with the greatest economy, efficiency and control (Beaudry and Mrozowski 2001: 128).

The subversion of company control by workers was interpreted from the ‘bits and pieces of everyday life’ that made up the archaeological record, which illustrated the expression of a working class identity beyond the control of the companies (Beaudry and Mrozowski 2001: 122). This subversion threatened the ‘carefully constructed bourgeois façade that was Lowell’s built environment’ and therefore the capitalist ideology it was built upon, in which
the working class was expected to remain largely invisible outside of the workplace (Beaudry and Mrozowski 2001: 121).

2.3. The Urban Centre as Space and Place

Spatial patterning has been a core concern of settlement archaeology since its beginnings, and since the waning of processualist archaeological theory the relationship between social relations and spatial structure has been paid increased attention (Ashmore 2002: 1173-1174). Settlement archaeology habitually examined the settlement patterns of ancient societies as a means of interpreting their social organisation (e.g. Flannery 1976). However, Ashmore (2002: 1173) has pointed out that spatial archaeology can be undertaken on a range of scales, not just at the settlement level but also ‘individual buildings or monuments, caches and burials, settlements, landscapes and regions.’ Quoting Winston Churchill – ‘We shape our buildings and they shape us.’ – she illustrated the reciprocal relationship between space and social behaviour, stating ‘space is not passive; it is socially constituted and constituting, materialised in architecture and also, if less tangibly, in customs of social interaction.’ (Ashmore 2002: 1176).

Analysis of social processes and behavioural decisions as they were materialised in architectural design became popular in the 1980s (Ashmore 2002: 1175). One of the most well known of these studies is Leone’s (1984) analysis of William Paca’s garden in Annapolis, Maryland, in which he explored the role of architectural space in the expression of ideology, power and social control. Ashmore distinguishes two popular lines of enquiry at this scale. The first considers the expression of political authority through civic architecture and its reinforcement through social practice and ritual. The second is commonly termed ‘household archaeology’ and is particularly prevalent in historical archaeology. Less overtly politically charged than the analysis of civic spaces, household archaeology concerns the spatial arrangement of domestic social units such as buildings, rooms, furnishings and outdoor spaces.

An example is Beaudry’s (1986) research using the colonial home-lot of North America as the unit for investigation. This was motivated by what the author perceived as prevailing homogeneity in the interpretation of social and economic circumstances of this period. Traditionally archaeological approaches to colonial sites in North America have focused on the material and statistical analysis of refuse as representative of consumer practices. Beaudry (1986: 38) argued that such analysis demonstrated only a broad cultural pattern and did not
aid the understanding of social and economic differences. This analytical process also ignored the economic and symbolic use of space as a means of social reproduction. Beaudry argued that the study of historical land use needed an integrative approach that drew on the analytical procedures of prehistoric archaeology but relied on documentary research for its interpretive strength.

Beaudry attempted to identify the archaeological signature of the occupying household within the spatial organisation of the home-lot, and the way in which ideological factors influenced this manipulation as a means of social display (Beaudry 1986: 38). The project used as its theoretical basis the assumption that colonial New England society ‘uniformly adopted a quantitative measure of power in a capitalistic society’ (St George 1982: 160). Power was expressed through the acquisition of material goods, and more so through the accumulation of land. Land itself was a material good, transformed into a cultural artefact through the manipulation of space. In such a system landscape was categorised as either ‘waste’ land or ‘improved’ land and the transformation from the former to the latter increased its actual and symbolic value (Beaudry 1986: 40).

Landscape archaeology characterises the broader scale of spatial analysis referred to by Ashmore (2002). It is concerned with landscape that is characterised by the ‘interplay of humans and environment’, distinguishing it from the non-social landscape. This interplay can be conscious or unconscious and involves the organisation or alteration of space by humans for various purposes. Renfrew (1986) was one of the first authors to use landscape as a means of interpreting past social organisation, but in his work landscape largely remained a setting within which social interaction occurred. Later authors have acknowledged that landscape is not always passive, but takes a part in shaping human behaviour within the landscape (Metheny 1996: 384). The relationship between landscape and human behaviour is seen as dynamic, each responding to and affecting the other. Therefore the archaeological study of landscape is useful in interpreting how humans responded to and altered the landscape in which they operated. In this way landscape ‘functions as two different artefacts – one that is physically shaped by human activities and another that is a symbolic archive of past social relations.’ (Branton 2009: 55).

The development of spatial archaeology resulted in an emerging concept of place by the end of the 1980s (Ashmore 2002: 1176). This concerned the formation of specific locations through repeated human action within them. This repetition imbues the location with social
meaning and is referred to as the ‘socialisation of space’. The concept also considers the role of place in the political, economic and social spheres of human society, emphasising the reciprocal relationship between space and society. Place is an important concept in landscape archaeology. In fact, Thomas (2001: 173) describes landscape as ‘a network of related places, which have gradually been revealed through people's habitual activities and interaction, through the closeness and affinity that they have developed for some locations, and through the important events, festivals, calamities, and surprises which have drawn other spots to their attention, causing them to be remembered or incorporated into stories.’

Several archaeological studies have been made of the landscape and spatial organisation of the civic centre. Ashmore and Sabloff (2002: 201) have argued that civic centres are unique in that they materialise ideas of ‘proper’ or ‘correct’ spatial organisation. This perspective relies on the assumption of intentional civic design influenced by ideological factors. The authors used Mayan civic centres to illustrate how Mayan political ideology was materialised spatially. Important buildings that emulated those from other sites were interpreted as representing political affiliations between the two centres, because the construction of a place in emulation of a recognised seat of authority instructs the society that interacts with said place to act accordingly (Ashmore and Sabloff 2002: 203).

Colonial architecture in the Americas is used as an example of such influenced design - the colonists recreated capitals of their European past as a means of control, at the same time destroying indigenous places and their associated authority. It is questionable whether the material reiteration of a place of authority is representative of the masses whom the place was supposed to effect, but it does reflect the leader’s, or dominant group’s, decisions to reproduce the social and political order from which the place’s form was derived (Ashmore 2002: 1178).

Ashmore and Sabloff (2002: 202) also pointed out that the length, complexity and stability of local political histories impact on the clarity with which ideological factors are reflected in the archaeology. Centres with relatively short, simple or stable political histories are simpler to interpret than those that experienced significant political turbulence. This contrasts with Beaudry’s metaphoric ‘palimpsest’ with which she endorses urban archaeological sites as being particularly suited to temporal analysis due to their continuous occupation through time (Beaudry 1986: 38). The difference lies in the relative extent of the archaeological sites under investigation. The limited size of the home-lot unit allowed Beaudry to successfully manage
the complexity of change over time. In contrast, the urban centre that Ashmore and Sabloff investigated was a far larger spatial unit, and the spatial complexity of this unit rendered long-scale temporal change too complex a factor to approach. Therefore, the study of Mayan centres was undertaken according to a relatively static temporal framework.

Spatial interpretations of urban centres have also been undertaken within historical archaeology. In their examination of the 19th century manufacturing city of Lowell, Massachusetts, Beaudry and Mrozowski cite Lefebvre’s (1991) framework for multidimensional spatial organisation (Beaudry and Mrozowski 2001: 121). This posits that one space can be used by different people for different purposes, known as ‘moments of space’. The first ‘moment’ is perceived space, referring to material space and spatial practices, in essence the concrete world in which daily life is lived. The second is conceived space, planned space as envisioned by the architect or urban planner. The third is representational space, for example squares, streets and buildings that become the loci of social expression. In the context of 19th century Lowell, the companies were interpreted as controlling the conceived space, in their control of the street plan, the location of the mills, the nature of worker housing, and the location of parks and green areas, as a means of social control. Workers therefore attempted to control their own lives within their own perceived space, the space in which they enacted their private lives. The accumulation of these private acts resulted in the formation of a social identity that in turn led to the creation of representative space as this identity was eventually expressed in public spaces such as streetscapes.

An example of an archaeological landscape in a colonial context is Kealhofer’s (1999) investigation of settler identity in colonial Virginia. Kealhofer asserted that settlers consciously transformed their new environment in order to create new lives and authenticate new identities. She identified three scales at which these constructed landscapes were constituted – the spatial e.g. gardens and tobacco plantations, the material e.g. built, planted and cleared places, and the social e.g. the household, the plantation and the community. The construction of smaller landscapes, such as gardens, allowed the colonists to materialise their ideological values, such as the need to create order from wilderness, before such practices were constituted at a larger scale such as the community.

2.4. The Urban Centre as Material Culture

Beaudry’s (1986) analysis of the colonial New England home-lot compares the process of
land improvement to the accumulation of material goods. Within a capitalistic framework, the manipulation of space transformed the home-lot into a cultural artefact. There is therefore potential to explore space as material culture, and use method and theory concerned with archaeological material to interpret place and space.

The city as an artefact has only been lightly touched on in the archaeological literature, and the theory has its basis in the historical discipline. In the early 1960s, Summerson (1963) suggested that an examination of the city artefact was a more complete approach to urban history, in contrast to a traditional focus on city architecture. He commented that traditional urban history tended towards descriptive catalogues of buildings. The huge abundance of raw data for such an approach meant that such studies of an entire urban centre could never be complete, and therefore analysis would be biased towards certain elements of the urban environment.

Summerson advocated for an analysis of the whole physical mass of the city as a means of understanding the city’s nature. Given the large data set this required, he suggested that certain limits be imposed, but these were theoretical rather than physical. He suggested that the social, economic and industrial history of the city, a traditional focus of the urban historian, should be acknowledged as influences but not a primary concern. Instead he advocated for the study of urban form:

‘The main issue, all the time, is tangible substance, the stuff of the city, and that implies form…It is the study of urban form as the resultant of a complex of social, psychological, and economic forces which is the essence of the kind of history I am postulating. The role of the historian in relation to the city as an artifact lies here.’ (Summerson 1963: 66).

Summerson conceptualised the urban community as an organism, stating that ‘the fabric of the city is the integument of organic life; it is produced and increased by the growth and movement of the organism which it protects and of which it is, in certain aspects, the tool.’ (Summerson 1963: 167). This type of symbiotic and dynamic relationship between human society and space is identical to that emphasised in spatial and landscape archaeology. Summerson warned that the danger of neglecting this concept in any analysis of the urban environment would result in the analysis being essentially enumerative and incomplete unless the entirety of the urban fabric is catalogued.

Summerson’s suggestions were put into practice by Garvin (1963), another historian, in his analysis of colonial Philadelphia as an artefact. Garvin worked with an archaeological
definition of artefact, ‘a product of human workmanship especially one of the simpler products of primitive art as distinguished from a natural object’. In discussing the term’s application to an urban context he acknowledged that no particular authority had at that time extended the definition to include ‘the processes, social structure, and infinitely complex relationships of even the smallest urban community.’ (Garvin 1963: 177). Garvin asserted that ‘artefact’ could be used to describe ‘all those aspects of the city and its life for which the material structure, buildings, streets, monuments were properly the tool or artifact.’ (Garvin 1963: 178). Therefore, the city is an artefact of the entirety of the urban environment, not any one aspect taken alone, such as economy or political system. Garvin advocated for a cumulative analysis of urban fabric, involving such institutions as structures, site selection, subdivisions, architectural styles and nomenclature, in order to understand less tangible elements such as religion, value systems and social structure.

Garvin asserted that colonial Philadelphia could be interpreted as an artefact of the religious, and economic intentions of the colony’s Proprietor, the English Quaker William Penn. Penn was granted a Royal Charter for colonisation in 1682. The ‘great city’ of his colony, Philadelphia, was ‘an artifact for which documents provide the equivalent of craft manuals.’ (Garvin 1963: 179). Penn’s initial vision for Philadelphia was interpreted and modified by his surveyor, Thomas Holme, when he platted the city in 1682. Therefore the city plan reflected both Penn’s political, religious and economic philosophies, and Holme’s experience as a town surveyor in English military towns in Ireland.

Penn envisioned an unorthodox urban centre in comparison to earlier Puritan towns in New England. The boundary between city and countryside was to be blurred, and houses were to be placed ‘in the middle of its plat, as to the breadth of it, that so there may be ground on each side for gardens or orchards or fields, that it may be a green country town which will never be burnt and always be wholesome.’ (Garvin 1963: 189). Penn’s only concern in terms of commerce was that the storehouses be located on the middle of the quay, which would also serve as a market for the statehouses. Land was to be allocated to ensure the eminence of the Proprietary and the families of early investors, mostly wealthy Quakers (Garvin 1963: 185). This ensured that Penn’s values influenced the political, social and religious direction of the new settlement.

Holme took Penn’s instructions and adapted them to fit the most advanced town planning system known at the time, the military town structure he had engaged with in Ireland. His city
plan retained the essence of Penn’s vision while allowing for more practical considerations of city living. Holme added 10, 000 acres of liberty lands outside the boundaries of the city proper to allow for the inevitable development of the city, but tempered this with a large greenbelt of rural parks in order to maintain Penn’s vision of a blurred urban-rural boundary (Garvin 1963: 192). The allocation of property demonstrated Holme’s attempt to distribute sections systematically while providing the Proprietary administration with a primary share in both the amount of land and the best locations and wealthy Quaker investors with valuable sections that cemented their dominance. He also assured a concentration of wealthy merchants near the two riverfronts in order to promote commerce.

Holme considered the practical requirements of an urban centre, which Penn either neglected or misconstrued. However, this was not to the detriment of Penn’s philosophy. Holme firmly agreed with Penn’s vision of a plan which suited Quaker religious values, promoted the Proprietor’s interests, strongly linked the metropolis with the surrounding rural area and encouraged commercialism within the urban centre. Garvin emphasised that ‘between Penn’s idealism and Holme’s practical survey there was no conflict of objective but only a difference of execution.’ (Garvin 1963: 195). Colonial Philadelphia can be interpreted as an interesting and complex combination of Penn’s philosophy tempered by Holme’s practicality.

Upton (1992) discussed the city artefact within an archaeological framework of material culture studies. He asserted that while both historians and geographers have explored the idea of the city artefact, it has been neglected by students of material culture. In the context of Garvin’s analysis of Philadelphia, he defines Penn’s plan as an idea given physical form, in short, an artefact (Upton 1992: 51).

Upton suggested that material culture studies ‘focus on the cultural in a rather limited sense’ (Upton 1992: 51) in that they rely on typologies, assemblages, and classifications in order to illuminate social structures, values and lifestyles. This approach rests on the assumption that there is a clear and intentional subject-object relationship between person and artefact. It is precisely this connection between person and artefact that needs scrutiny in the study of the city artefact, moving beyond traditional quantificatory and classificatory methods to question this relationship between the object, i.e. the city, and its makers.

Upton cited Deetz (1977) to encourage a broader understanding of material culture within historical archaeology. Deetz challenged the idea that material culture was synonymous with
individual tangible artefacts. A broader definition of artefact emphasises just ‘how profoundly our world is the product of our thoughts, as the sector of our physical environment that we modify through culturally determined behaviour.’ (Upton 1992: 52). The modification of living objects, such as animals in selective breeding programmes, is provided as an example of this process and Upton extended this to include human gesture, movement and speech. The definition of artefact is thus extended beyond the intentionally manipulated to include culturally determined behaviour, the incidental byproducts of cultural action (Upton 1992: 52). The study of the city artefact should therefore include intention and reaction, action and interpretation.

‘In short, a material culture analysis can make a distinctive contribution to understanding the city-artifact by probing the experience of the urban landscape, of which intentional creation is only one element.’ (Upton 1992: 52).

Upton focused his analysis on the ‘cultural landscape’, a term he defined as the fusion between the physical fabric of the city and material culture of the residents with imaginative structures that residents use in explaining and representing themselves (Upton 1992: 53). Essentially this cultural landscape is ‘a motley repertoire of disparate, concretised metaphors rather than a coherent system.’ In his work he explored several metaphors that characterised the encounter between Americans and their commercial cities in the early Republican era.

The primary metaphor was the urban grid. The grid structured additions to old cities such as New York, and provided the framework for new cities such as Washington, in the early Republican period (Upton 1992: 53). Use of the grid was accompanied by a drive to conquer and equalise space, carried out by activities such as ground levelling and the widespread installation of public works. Properly regulated space was considered essential to functional human society. The grid and its associated activities sought to make every property equally useful, and set the individual within a particular set of relationships with their surroundings. This reflected an obsession with the concepts of ‘classification’ and ‘separation’, the creation of order and unity by the organisation of individuals within a framework of flexible and rational control. These concepts were associated with the idea of liberty, the free operation of each citizen within their own sphere, that is, their private property.

‘In short, the grid was understood as a single-order spatial system that eradicated natural inequalities of topography by providing equal access to every location within it. It was nonhierarchical: the parts were clearly defined, but the connections among them were articulated and flexible, and could thus accommodate an unlimited number of separate networks of meaning and activity. The grid was conceived, therefore, as neutral among users, transparently depicting
their relationships, and transparent, as well, in making social knowledge and spatial access available to everyone.’ (Upton 1992: 56).

However, Upton also pointed out that the transparency and articulation of the grid was often subverted by the commercial enterprises it promoted. This subversion often took place on the street, as businesses spilled out over footpaths, signs were placed over buildings, and building additions protruded into the street space. The street did not often remain a neutral pathway between private cells.

2.5. *The Archaeology of Ideology*

Burke (1999) has produced a definition of ideology that is particularly relevant to the archaeology of 19th century capitalism in a British colony. Her work examined the relationship between capitalism in Armidale, New South Wales, and the expression of ideology through architectural style. This was explored archaeologically through material objects, these being aspects of style evident in Armidale architecture. Of particular interest was the way in which these objects were used to encode meaning, how this was related to capitalism as a medium for the expression of identity, and how this relationship was associated with the construction of ideology (Burke 1999: ix).

Burke cited Eagleton (1991) in distinguishing between two mainstream traditions in the interpretation of the term ‘ideology’ (Burke 1999: 11). The epistemological tradition is rooted in Marx’s definition of ideology, in which ideology is interpreted as an illusion or mask. Ideology facilitates the concealment of social and economic contradiction inherent within capitalism, prevents transformation through this concealment, and therefore facilitates the reproduction of social and economic order (Burke 1999: 7). In this tradition the deception is enacted by the dominant social group and is therefore inherently subjective, based in no external reality. In contrast, the sociological tradition interprets ideology as rooted in actual material practices, experiences and institutions, and therefore can actively shape and constitute its subjects (Burke 1999: 11).

Burke proposed that ideology can contain aspects of both traditions:

‘Ideology may well be misrepresentation, but it is not pure illusion. It is inextricably linked to the fabric of society and to the general reproduction of that society through the process of concealing antagonistic contradictions. This allows ideology to be understood as something that still makes some minimal sense of people’s actual day-to-day life experiences. This suppleness is what gives ideology its power.’ (Burke 1999: 13).
Burke herself interpreted ideology as containing an element of contradiction, which serves to prevent conflict and is central to social reproduction. However, this role is interpreted as a dynamic and ongoing process that changes in response to its engagement with the world and the patterning between social groups (Burke 1999: 14).

Burke (1999: 15) pointed out that ideology is difficult to define because it is subject to change depending on context. It has no invariable characteristics, and therefore her definition is subject to specific historical roots. She ultimately defined ideology thus:

‘...false or deceptive beliefs and presuppositions implicit in ordinary ways of thinking, speaking, or behaving in the world, which arise from the structure of society as a whole and the relations of a group to that structure, and which serve to reproduce that world by concealing contradiction and by perpetuating an unequal pattern of existing material relationships between and among groups. Because it is concerned with concealment, ideology necessarily serves particular interests and thus refers to specific ways in which signs, meanings, and values help to incorporate and reproduce dominance as a social power and to manufacture consensus, while at the same time concealing the antagonisms resident at this point. Ideology may exist at more than one scale within the same society, or within the same individual. It may exist as unsophisticated ideology or implicit ‘common sense,’ which is shared most widely and as a sophisticated ideology; or as a more or less coherent system of explicit beliefs about the world that favors the interests or expresses the feelings of a more specific group in society, without the members necessarily being conscious of their belonging to that group.’

In summation, Burke emphasised that ‘Whatever particular attributes ideology may have then, it must be shared by a group of people, it must concern matters important to the group, and it must serve to hold the group together or to justify the activities and attitudes characteristic of its members.’ (Burke 1999: 15).

Burke studied ideology archaeologically through an analysis of material artefacts. She argued that it is the process of signification that validates an interpretation of meaning from material objects (Burke 1999: 23-24). Signification is the production of meaning through signs, and when sequences of such signs become embedded in social relationships they can be used to express ideological values. Therefore, interpreting ideology through the semiotics of material culture essentially assesses interaction between the producers and the recipients of such signs, as well as their relationships with the material itself (Burke 1999: 30).
One of the most well known archaeological explorations of ideology within historical archaeology is Leone’s examination of William Paca’s garden and the ideology of Georgian Order (Leone 1984; 2010). This project used archaeological excavation and documentary research to explore Paca’s expression of ideology in the spatial manipulation of his garden.

Leone cited Althusser’s (1977) interpretation of ideology, itself based on Marx’s discussion of ideology. Althusser described ideology as a set of masks, illusions that take the operations of exploitative capitalism and reproduce these operations as norms. This is achieved by assumptions that appear to be ‘obviousnesses’ of daily life, acting through material things such as space, measures of time, and manifestations of individual personhood. Leone pointed out that if ideology is reproduced by the givens of daily life acting through things, then artefacts ‘not only reflect society, they also shape it actively, even casually.’ (Leone 2010: 65). Leone asked whether cultural practice is represented in the manipulated space of the garden, placed within nature so that it would seem inevitable, that is, an ‘obviousness of daily life’ (Leone 2010: 76). He questioned whether there was an example of unequal human relationship naturalised in the garden, if ideology was interpreted as a misrepresentation of the realities and conditions of human existence.

Leone interpreted Paca’s gardening as a way of naturalising a specific attitude to past and present circumstances (Leone 2010: 72). Paca’s social position was interpreted as fixed when it appeared to be served by the optical, astronomical and geometrical phenomena displayed in the garden. These phenomena seemed to validate as universal and natural the order of social hierarchy in which Paca participated. This is best understood within the context of the ‘Georgian Order’, a prominent philosophy in the early Republican period and most famously analysed archaeologically by Deetz (1977). Georgian Order prioritised the idea of the person as an individual, and generally emphasised segregation, whether it was of daily activities by measures of time, or of family members by spatial organisation within the household (Leone 2010: 72).

Leone argued that Paca sought fixed natural order in his garden, an attempt, either conscious or unconscious, to mask the major contradiction within his society. The revolution won by white Americans freed them from what they perceived as slavery at the hands of Great Britain. But this freedom was not extended to the black population who were essential in preserving the racial and economic hierarchy of the Republican era. These were the conditions the garden was designed to mask and therefore the garden, and by extension the
Georgian Order, are expressions of ideology. Leone pointed out that not only was the garden shaped by ideology, it also played an active role in reproducing and reinforcing this ideology.

‘The formal garden was not an adornment, the product of spare time; it was not for food and still less for idle fashion…It was not passive; it was very active. For by walking in it, building it, looking at it, admiring and discussing it, and using it in any way, its contemporaries could take themselves and their positions as granted and convince others that the way things are is the way they always had been and shall remain. For the order was natural and had always been so.’ (Leone 2010: 83).

Leone’s analysis was groundbreaking in the exploration of ideology in historical archaeology. However, his work has been criticised for too readily interpreting ideology to mean the beliefs and values of the ‘dominant’, thus ignoring the existence and responses of the ‘ruled’ (Burke 1999: 3). This attitude has been termed the ‘dominant ideology thesis’ (Abercrombie, Hill and Turner 1980), and assumes that the values and ideas of the dominant social group can automatically be interpreted as those of the subordinate group also. This assumption therefore suggests that ideology arises solely from the dominant group.

Leone’s study was criticised for neglecting how those who viewed Paca’s garden interpreted it and how these interpretations differed according to differences such as race and class (Burke 1999: 3). This criticism was rooted in the opinion that material culture holds different meanings for different groups, that distinct ideologies can coexist, and that what appears to be a dominant ideology has the potential to be subverted by other points of view. Subsequently, discussions of ‘ideologies of resistance’ grew more common in the archaeological literature. These sought an understanding of how subordinate groups responded to attempts at incorporation by the dominant ideology. However, Burke (1999: 3) pointed out that this attitude risks ‘merely inverting the perceived hierarchy, rather than closely examining it.’

Thompson (1986) summarised the dominant ideology thesis, stating that ‘careful mapping of the complex discourses that articulate together to produce ideological effects’ is needed to offset the tendency to look for a single dominant ideology associated with a particular class (Thompson 1986: 81-82). Burke reinforces this in her argument that ideology isn’t patronising - one dominant group ‘duping’ a subordinate group - but ‘a set of beliefs that allows all groups to live lives within the social order, albeit an order that may be unequal.’ (Burke 1999: 14). This set of beliefs is not necessarily systematic or coherently articulated, but is related to practice and experience and is often interpreted as ‘common sense’.
Leone furthered his study of the relationship between ideology and materiality, and the causative effect of material things, in a study of a 19th century Mormon settlement at Little Colorado River, Utah (Leone 2010). Leone argued that the settlement plan was a ‘conscious product of religion’ and played an active role in determining Mormon relations within the settlement. Leone focused on the use of the technologies of spatial organisation in the creation of a social and religious system that facilitated the community’s survival in the harsh desert climate. He stated that ‘the way in which Mormons set up villages, farm sites, and house plans is closely tied to what they knew their social and religious systems would accomplish.’ (Leone 2010: 110).

The settlement plan was based on the Plat of the City of Zion, a blueprint for Mormon settlement designed by Prophet Joseph in 1833 (Leone 2010: 112). This reflected the Mormon ambition of equality in all earthly things. One of the prominent features was the equal size of the city plots. Settlers were also guaranteed equal access to irrigation water and land was distributed by ballot. Access to land and water is crucial to farming in the desert environment and an ideology that equalised access to both resulted in a reality of economic equality. The management of the physical environment therefore had causative effects on social behaviour, and the technology of spatial organisation facilitated social and religious goals (Leone 2010: 113).

Leone stressed that mental processes were as much the product of technology as technology was of mental processes (Leone 2010: 121). Using fencing as an example, he argued that the use of fencing was not random but influenced by ideology (Leone 2010: 116). Every garden, lawn, pasture or field was fenced in some way. These fences distinguished individual property holdings, both in the town and the field. This distinction reinforced privacy and reduced friction within a settlement design that deliberately placed people in close proximity to allow neighbourhood surveillance an active role in maintaining order (Leone 2010: 117). Fence building was also important in the fulfillment of his religious duty. In facilitating the cultivation of desert, the fence helped the Mormon ‘redeem the earth’.

‘By managing, manipulating and grooming the earth, he has imitated God and proven that he is worthy: he is a Saint. A Mormon who creates something green has shown his inner state. In this context, fences are valuable for what they preserve behind them. What they preserve in addition to a subsistence base is the right to a place in the Kingdom of God.’ (Leone 2010: 119).

Leone demonstrated that Mormon ideology not only influenced the use of the technologies and artefacts of spatial organisation in settlement planning, but that these fed back into that
ideology. In short, Mormonism was reinforced by the spatial representations and technological devices that allowed their lifestyle to function (Leone 2010: 121).

Praetzellis and Praetzellis (1992) provided another example of the way ideology influenced the manifestation of an urban environment. They examined the way in which the ideology of Victorianism influenced the design of Sacramento, and deliberately contrasted this with the material manifestations of the previous gold rush ethos. Victorianism was defined as the rejection of an antiquated aristocratic attitude in favour of a new set of values based on commercialism and relevant to the expanding middle class (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1992: 75). The new attitude emphasised order and economy, duty, industry, domesticity and morality (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1992: 76). Associated with these values was the idea that beautiful surroundings created good people - that good design educated, and bad design fostered immorality (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1992: 77).

Victorianism, as it was manifested in Sacramento, was in direct conflict with the previously dominant gold rush ethos. Inspired by the perceived connection between beauty and morality, proponents of Victorianism tried to create ‘order’ from the ‘chaos’ of the city streets (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1992: 76). Sacramento was an instant city that sprung from the 1848 gold rush, and suffered from a ‘Western town’ image in which law and order were poorly established and fire, flood and disease were constant risks (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1992: 78). The authors argued that the sense of impermanence of the gold rush era was reflected in the streetscape of Sacramento’s Chinatown. This streetscape displayed the expedient, idiosyncratic solutions to material problems indicative of the gold rush era. These included the use of a range of building materials, such as wood, iron, brick and canvas, plank walkways, and the violation of signage regulations.

The Sacramento authorities and those involved in the city’s commercial interests responded to this ‘chaos’ by applying Victorian values in material form. These values required the government to promote an orderly society and a stable environment for commercialism, including land practices that conflicted with the individualism of the gold rush ethos (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1992: 81). A design plan was initiated that was the antithesis of I Street. Streets were raised, a brick only building code was established, and street numbers were applied as were ordinances governing commercial signs (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1992: 84). This ‘landscape of prosperity’ was epitomised in J Street. The intensity of activity in this main commercial drag was a direct result of the planned landscape. City lots were
designed to be only 20 ft wide but 160 ft deep so that a single block could be flanked by at least 32 businesses.

This design, while rooted in an ideology of beauty and morality, instigated a new phenomenon - the ‘sunken lot’ (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1992: 84). This was the backlot commonly used for waste disposal. These were often unhealthy and were thought to contribute to the cholera epidemic that broke out in Sacramento. Archaeology was used to assess individual commitment to the tenets of Victorianism manifested so obviously in the public sphere. Excavation of several back lots was undertaken to examine how individual citizens responded to pressure to conform and create personal ‘landscapes of prosperity’.

‘Public works and building facades were overt messages through which a city and individual property owners could show their endorsement of appropriate values to the world and their neighbours. The condition of their backlots, however showed their individual commitment to civic values.’ (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1992: 85).

2.6.  Archaeology and the Ideology of Capitalism

Capitalism is commonly understood as a term to describe a particular system of productive relations and its social effects. The Marxist interpretation of capitalism views this system as entirely dominant in Western economic and social systems and assumes specific political and economic problems within it as well as an inherent social inequality. Thus capitalism has also come to mean a specific type of unequal social relations (Burke 1999: 5).

World systems theory (Wallerstein 1974) views capitalism as a reified system particular to the modern epoch and key to forming relationships between the core, periphery and semi-periphery. Croucher and Weiss (2009) challenged this view, arguing that under this interpretation capitalism becomes a thing, ‘an analytical solidity which has come into being in a historically specific time.’ (Croucher and Weiss 2011: 9). Instead they stressed that capitalism is not singular, but a system that is continually emerging and being reinterpreted, never complete. Burke supported this interpretation, encouraging an approach to capitalism that examines its evolution in society through the production of physical and social landscapes (Burke 1999: 4).

Orser’s interpretation of capitalism is possibly the most widely acknowledged within historical archaeology. While he admitted that capitalism is difficult to define in general Orser also relied on the Marxist emphasis on productive relations. He cited Curtin (1990: 47) in describing capitalism as ‘an economic system in which those who provide the capital control
the production of goods’, and acknowledged the development of wage labour, where labour is sold as a commodity, as part of this system (Orser 1996: 72).

In discussing capitalism and its social effects, Orser highlighted the contrasting interpretations of capitalism by Adam Smith in his *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* penned in 1776, and by Marx in *Capital* written almost a century later. Smith emphasised the power of the economy and free market system and maintained that success of society depended on the success of a well-run economy kept separate from governmental interference. Marx, in comparison, argued that capitalism contained injustices inherent in its nature and predicted these injustices would fuel a revolt of the exploited workers and the creation of a communist society.

It is the social effects of capitalism, stressed in the Marxist interpretation, that are often the focus of historical archaeological analysis. Orser emphasised the concept of ‘mode of production’ as key to the relationship between theoretical interpretations of capitalism and interpretations of the relationship between capitalism and archaeology (Orser 1996: 74). Orser defined capitalism as a mode of production, a ‘union between the forces and the relations of production’ (Orser 1996: 74). The ‘relations of production’ are the social relations through which labour is organised in order to use the ‘forces of production’, skills, tools, knowledge etc., in order to gain energy from natural resources (after Wolf 1982: 75). Orser suggested that production is not limited to the creation of material objects, but can also include the abstract, such as ideas, attitudes and beliefs (Orser 1996: 74). These intangible products have a powerful role in social relations and must be considered as important a product of capitalist production as material objects.

Orser stated that Marx used the concept of ‘mode of production’ to analyse the same societies that are typically the focus of historical archaeological analysis – literate, modern and capitalist (Orser 1996: 76). This illustrates the relationship historical archaeology has with the system of capitalism, which Orser termed ‘inseparable’ (1996: 71). He argued that the two aspects of capitalism most relevant to historical archaeology were the beginnings of capitalism and the method by which agents of capitalism established the economic system throughout the non-capitalist world. This second element was viewed as particularly important in that it is often implicit in definitions of historical archaeology, including Orser’s own, and particularly those that stress the European diaspora (Orser 1996: 79).
Croucher and Weiss (2011: 8), writing from a post-colonial perspective, objected to the eurocentric ring of such descriptions of the relationship between capitalism and historical archaeology. They argued that too much analysis focused on the industrial and consumer revolutions that took place in the USA, England and Western Europe. This implied that analysis has been primarily concerned with periods and subjects that were, by default, part of the capitalist world system rather than exploring broader and more varied questions of capitalism and its relationship with archaeology. They described several archaeological projects that, in their opinion, have attempted to engage with capitalism as it was manifested outside the North Atlantic, and with theoretical approaches that offered a interpretation of capitalism that encompassed both global and local relations (Croucher and Weiss 2011: 9).

Burke (1999) distinguished between an interpretation of capitalism that is defined only as a set of economic relations, and a wider interpretation that acknowledges the reified system of social relations with which capitalism is associated (Burke 1999: 6). She argued that capitalism becomes inextricably linked with ideology through the contention that the unequal distribution of resources associated with capitalist economies produces contradictions within social relations. The principal contradiction was identified as that between capital and wage labour and the unequal social relations this system produces. In order to reproduce capital it is necessary to reproduce its material means, and therefore also necessary to reproduce this contradiction and its social conditions.

Ideology acts to conceal contradiction. It is therefore the ‘field through which the essential contradictions within capitalist society are mystified’ (Burke 1999: 7). Contradictions are disguised, and their reproduction is ensured, by a process identified by Marx as ‘alienation’ (Marx 1976: 716). In this process human products escape from human control and assume a seemingly autonomous existence. They then exert a power over the population as though they were an alien force. The population submits to this power despite the fact that it created the products. As Orser pointed out, the ‘products’ of capitalism can be abstract, and therefore ideology can be interpreted as a product of the contradiction inherent in the capitalist system between capital and labour. The population that takes part in its creation also submits to its power once it is alienated and seemingly autonomous. This submission is a necessary condition in the reproduction of the contradiction at the heart of the capitalist system, and so ideology holds a powerful role in this process.

In her study of ideology in Armidale, Burke identified three types of capitalism – pastoral,
mercantile and industrial (Burke 1999: 37, after Connell and Irving 1992). It is mercantile capitalism that is most relevant to this research due to its association with the urban environment. Burke defined mercantile capitalism as that in which surplus value is produced through control over the circulation of commodities, i.e. purchase and sale, rather than over their production. The growth of urban centres such as Armidale in the 19th century was a great opportunity for primary investment and such investment contributed much to continued urban growth (Burke 1999: 48). Burke related the expansion of urban mercantile capitalism to the construction of the Armidale working class and a consequent emphasis on the idea of ‘respectability’ in relation to this hegemonic construction, including a stress on rules and rituals and the regimentation of recreation and activities (Burke 1999: 54).

The urban environment of Armidale began evolving in the late 1840s when several service providers were constructed in close proximity (Burke 1999: 55). These included several inns and stores, a blacksmith, two churches and a school. The capitalists tended to reside in the same location as their workplace, with a scattering of workers around the edges of the centre and amongst the service providers. In 1849 the centre was surveyed in order to establish the perimeters of the town proper and regulate the layout of future development. This layout took the form of a grid, a spatial system typical of new colonial towns in the 19th century. Burke associated the use of this layout with the growing emphasis on respectability that occurred in tandem with the differentiation of class along the lines of capital and labour. She pointed out that the grid may have been interpreted as having a regular and businesslike appearance that was seen to promote public order. The evolution in the ‘orderly appearance’ of Armidale became entwined with the development of trade in commerce in the urban centre, and soon the former began to be interpreted as a direct result of the latter.

Burke (1999: 70) also associated the ideology of capitalism in Armidale with its colonial context. She suggested that capitalist colonial societies shared certain features, most importantly in that they embodied the social relations of production characteristic of capitalism. She also pointed out that they largely depended on the transfer of capital and labour from Europe, that they participated in international trade immediately after colonisation, and that large quantities of land were made available cheaply to the transferred settlers.

‘Such colonialism appears to be an intrinsic element of capitalist expansion, reflecting the acquisitiveness and competitive nature of the capitalist experience and the ideology of appropriation that accompanied this. Although non-capitalist societies also colonized, it was not
2.7. *An Ideology of Capitalism: Systematic Colonisation*

Systematic colonisation set new rules for British overseas expansion and formed the basis of settlement in South Australia and New Zealand in the 1830s through to the 1850s. It arose from Edward Gibbon Wakefield’s dissatisfaction with the inadequacies of British colonisation in North America, the West Indies and Australia (Bunker 1988: 59), which he described as a ‘long experience without a system, immense results without a plan, vast doings but no principles’ (Wakefield 1849: 779).

There was no specific manifesto for the systematic colonisation of New Zealand. Instead, the basic precepts were outlined and developed over two decades of writing regarding Wakefield’s experience and opinions of British colonisation in North America and Australasia. The primary works developing systematic colonisation theory were *A Letter From Sydney* (1829; particularly the appendix ‘Outline of a System of Colonisation’), *Plan of a Company to be Established for the Purpose of Founding a Colony in Southern Australia Purchasing Land Therein and Preparing the Land so Purchased for the Reception of Immigrants* (1832), *England and America: A Comparison of the Social and Political States of Both Nations* (1833, particularly the appendix ‘The Art of Colonisation’), and *A View of the Art of Colonisation* (1849). The last is an extended re-statement of the ideas proffered in the appendix to *England and America* and was written after a decade of colonial experimentation in Wellington.

Wakefield was intellectually influenced by the classical economists, particularly Adam Smith whose *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* had developed on terra nullius ideology the previous century. However, he found fault in several of Smith’s primary contentions, particularly regarding the division of labour. One of his other major influences was Robert Gourlay’s *A Statistical Account of Upper Canada*, published in 1817, which challenged colonial administration in that colony (Lloyd Prichard 1969: 14). Despite such divergences, Wakefield’s theory remained capitalistic at its core and he was criticised by Karl Marx himself as an apologist for capitalism (Marx 1976: 932-940).

The formulation of systematic colonisation theory was motivated by what Wakefield described as the ‘misery of the bulk of the people’ (Wakefield 1833: 337) and the ‘uneasiness of the middle class’ (Wakefield 1833: 354). He attributed these conditions to want of room,
which, while he expressed particular concern for the rural poor in this regard, affected all classes of British society:

‘...the labourers, the small and great capitalists, the professional classes, and even the landed and monied aristocracy, who are yet more puzzled than other people to know what to do with their landed sons and daughters. – By a want of room, I mean a want of the means of a comfortable subsistence according to the respective standards of living established amongst the classes and obviously arising from the competition of members of each class with one another.’ (Wakefield 1849: 793).

The common people, Wakefield considered, were too cheaply valued to be happy. In particular reference to urban industry, their high mortality rate was inconsequential when they were continuously replaced (Wakefield 1833: 351-353). The middle classes suffered from more abstract ailments, such as their expenditure on social respectability out-distancing their profit (Wakefield 1833: 355).

Wakefield’s remedy for this situation was the extension of British territory (Wakefield 1829: 163). The new colonies would relieve the want of room in Britain, while providing raw materials and creating trade with Britain for manufactured goods. Thus employment and capital would be generated on both sides (Lloyd Prichard 1969: 21). However, the old system of colonising new territories with convict labour had grown outmoded and distasteful and policies for the development of land by free settlers were confusing and unregulated (Bunker 1988: 60). Wakefield disliked the excessive pragmatism exercised in such colonisation to the detriment of a system of settlement undertaken along firm principles. He believed such pragmatism was displayed in the ‘ad hoc and corrupt’ procedures of the sale and granting of colonial land by the authorities (Bunker 1988: 60). Therefore, he proposed a new system of colonisation. This system was grounded on a correctly proportioned combination of land, labour and capital. The four central tenets of this system were as follows:

a) disposal of waste lands

Colonial territory is constantly referred to as ‘waste land’ in Wakefield’s writing, demonstrating that Wakefield shared in understanding the *terra nullius* interpretation of land. Consequently there is very little in his writings regarding indigenous populations and alternative cultural landscapes. Waste land and emigration were considered critical to successful colonisation:

‘For the existence of a colony two things are indispensable; first, waste land, that is land not yet the property of individuals, but liable to become so through the intervention of government; and secondly, the migration of people; the removal of people to settle in a new place. Further, it will be
seen at once, that this migration must be of two kinds; first, the removal of people from an old to a new country; secondly, the removal of people from a settled part to a waste part of the colony.’ (Wakefield 1833: 504).

While Adam Smith had interpreted unlimited waste land resources as key to prosperity, Wakefield disagreed in part, arguing instead that prosperity in a new colony relied on correctly proportioning land to labour (Wakefield 1833: 500; Lloyd Prichard 1969: 16). Such a practice would effectively limit the availability of waste land and regulate future disposal. Wakefield considered the primary cause of failure in settlements such as Swan River in West Australia to be the rapid dispersal of labour. The labourer, starved for space in Britain, enthusiastically took up the extensive tracts of free land offered by the government, tracts that he could not hope to cultivate productively. This led to system of squatting, not settling, preventing the combination of labour for successful production (Wakefield 1829: 282). As such the land was eventually abandoned and the colonial population spiritually enfeebled (Lloyd Prichard 1969: 16).

b) combination and constancy of labour

Wakefield criticised labour dispersal through hyperactive land disposal as a fragmentation of energy. He claimed it was detrimental to the improvement of land and the production and sale of commodities, which in turn retarded the development of support infrastructure. Instead, Wakefield adapted Adam Smith’s division of labour principle, which endorsed labour specialisation by individuals. This enabled Wakefield to advocate division of employment but within a general combination of labour as a deliberate means of increasing production (Wakefield 1833: 323-326, Lloyd Prichard 1969: 17). This sustained concentration of activity in concert with adequate capital, would in theory stimulate wealth and growth. The surplus derived from this process would facilitate further settlement and systemic reproduction.

c) sufficient price

In order to ensure combination and constancy of labour, an accurate survey of colonial land was needed before its disposal (Bunker 1988: 60). Land disposal itself was to be regulated by appropriate pricing, sufficient but uniform, so that the process was neither too fast nor too slow (Lloyd Prichard 1969: 18). The price of land was to be high enough to ensure that the average British labourer could not immediately afford it and would be forced to work for wages for several years before purchasing land. However it was to be low enough to encourage those with capital to purchase land and initiate the production of commodities. Surplus profit from land purchase was to be used to fund further emigration so that by the
time the labourer became the proprietor there was labour available to take his place (Wakefield 1829: 178 and 1832: 276). Wakefield was never specific about the ‘sufficient price’, an omission for which he was often criticised (Wakefield 1849: 935-943), but he insisted it depended on many variables such as the rate of immigration (Lloyd Prichard 1969: 19).

d) responsible government

Wakefield was a proponent of self-government for British colonies. According to his system the government was to take on a very responsible role in the process of colonisation, maintaining different aspects and ensuring their application. This included presiding over the regulated appropriation of land and the selection of appropriate immigrants (Lloyd Prichard 1969: 20). Wakefield was insistent on the merits of young married couples for emigration arguing that these were the most likely to properly contribute to the success of the new colony in production and future population (Wakefield 1829: 178; 1832: 276 and 1833: 562-568). The selection of correct classes of emigrants was also encouraged (Lloyd Prichard 25-26).

Wakefield recommended three classes – the gentleman class, the capitalists (i.e. members of the middle class engaged in commercial activity) and the labourers. Justification for the inclusion of the latter two classes is evident in Wakefield’s reasons for colonisation and his insistence on the concentration of labour and capital. The gentry, consisting of landowners and professionals, would provide capital along with ‘invaluable and indispensable’ social guidance. These were ‘respectable people in the sense of being honourable, of cultivated mind, and gifted with the right sort, and the right proportion, of self-respect.’ (Wakefield 1849: 830). They would set a standard in morals and manners for the new colony and the example they set in emigrating would encourage others in the same action.

It is evident that Wakefield’s system of colonisation intended to influence social as well as economic aspects of British colonialism. His early writing disparages the ‘new society’ in Australia, which he identified as a result of overly large land-holdings and convict labour that bordered on slavery (Wakefield 1829: 165). The concentration of the criminal class and the corruption of the free settler settlement were seen as promoting insecurity of life and property and the degeneration of civilisation (Lloyd Prichard 1969: 15). He had similar criticisms of American society that he related to the evils of labour dispersion. The ‘semi-barbarism’ of the American backwoodsmen was criticised to illustrate the evil consequences of population dispersion, being the subsequent lifestyle of loneliness and degradation of civilised society (Wakefield 1833: 463-466). The inhabitants of east coast seaport cities were noted as
exceptions in that their populations were sufficiently concentrated to foster successful production.

Wakefield drew direct correlations between ‘rudeness’ and dispersion, and civilisation and concentration, stating that ‘In the history of the world, there is no example of a society at once dispersed and highly civilised…’ (Wakefield 1833: 468). Dispersion bred ignorance by dividing the individual’s capacity for labour and obstructed social interaction and the cultivation of knowledge. Accordingly he made the following recommendation:

‘In any colony where this perfect rule for treating the chief elements of colonisation should be adopted, colonisation would proceed, not as everywhere hitherto, more or less, by the scattering of people over a wilderness, and placing them for ages in a state between civilisation and barbarism, but by the extension to new places of all that is good in old society; by the removal to new places of people, civilised, and experienced in all the arts of production; willing and able to assist each other; excited by the most skilful application of capital and labour by ready markets for disposing of surplus produce; producing, by means of the most skilful industry in the richest field, more than colonial industry has ever produced; obtaining the highest profits of capital and the highest wages of labour; offering the strongest attraction for the immigration of capital and people; increasing rapidly; enjoying the advantages of an old society without its evils; without any call for slavery, or restrictions on foreign trade; an old society in every thing except for the uneasiness of capitalists and the misery of the bulk of the people.’ (Wakefield 1833: 549).

Systematic colonisation can be understood as a sophisticated ideology of capitalism and colonialism according to Burke’s definition (Burke 1999: 15). While Wakefield criticised the means by which capitalism had been undertaken in some colonial contexts his theory tweaked the existing process of applying capitalism to colonialism, rather than proposing a new process altogether. His system insisted on a division of immigrants into capitalist and labouring classes typical of a capitalist economic and social system. The system assumed an improvement in the lifestyle of the labouring class after emigration despite the fact that the system encouraged the reproduction of a capitalist system and thus the perpetuation of both an unequal distribution of wealth and the British social class system.

Wakefield was dismissive of the fledgling chartist and socialist movements in Britain at the time, although he did believe that they could pose significant problems for the future (Wakefield 1849: 794). In turn Marx derided Wakefield’s work stating ‘It is the great merit of E. G. Wakefield to have discovered nothing new about the Colonies, but to have discovered in the Colonies the truth as to the condition of capitalist production in the mother-country.’ (Marx 1976: 932)). He accused Wakefield of attempting the manufacture of wage-workers,
and working against the combination of labour and the centralisation of capital by parceling out the means of production, that is, land. Other British left wing critics objected to the reproduction of the class divisions of British society they deemed inevitable in such a system (Prichard 1969: 25).

2.8. Urbanism and Experiments in Systematic Colonisation

Mumford (1961: 447) argued that the 19th century obsession with ‘industrial power and pecuniary success’ was instrumental in the evolution of ‘the most degraded form of urban environment the world has yet seen’. The industrial ‘coketown’ was accompanied by an ideological shift towards a type of capitalism rooted in the Georgian concept of the atomic individual whose freedom and rights it was the government’s duty to protect. This new ideological focus contradicted the new forms of administration that evolved along with the technological advances of the industrial revolution. These were based in co-operative political technique and were actualised by forms such as the joint stock company. This also affected colonialism and associated urban form - ‘Every man was for himself; and the Devil, if he did not take the hindmost, at least reserved for himself the privilege of building cities.’ (Mumford 1961: 449).

In the explosion of western expansion of the 19th century, colonialism ceased to be the undertaking of the community and became the domain of the private individual. So too did urban design:

‘The location of factories, the building of quarters for the workers, even the supply of water and the collection of garbage, should be done exclusively by private enterprise seeking for private profit. Free competition was supposed to choose the correct location, provide the correct time-sequence in development, and create out of a thousand un-coordinated efforts a coherent social pattern. Or rather, none of these needs was regarded as worthy of rational appraisal and deliberate achievement.’ (Mumford 1961: 454).

Wakefield reacted against this attitude, particularly in regard to waste land disposal and the role of the government in colonial settlement. Systematic colonisation attempted to reintegrate system and design with the capitalist framework.

Despite this, and his lengthy denunciation of population dispersal, Wakefield never articulated specific views concerning urban development (Bunker 1988: 63). However, he did stipulate the process of settlement, providing indications of what kind of urban system would be appropriate (Bunker 1988: 59). His insistence on the combination of labour suggested that from the outset the colony should have both urban and rural populations (Mill and Nathanson
2004: 49). These populations would be complementary, the large-scale industry centered within the urban environment being supported by surrounding agricultural production and providing a market for agricultural surplus (Bunker 1988: 63).

Adelaide was the first settlement developed using the theory of systematic colonisation as its founding principals, after Wakefield and the South Australian Association successfully lobbied for a Crown Colony to be established by an Act of Parliament in 1834 (Bunker 1988: 62). Systematic colonisation was touted as a solution to the problems of previous Australian settlement, namely the need to bring the vast rural areas into successful production (Bunker 1993: 244).

Bunker (1988; 1993) analysed the development of the Adelaide urban plan by the Surveyor-General of South Australia, William Light, and the influence of systematic colonisation on urban development. Bunker noted that there was no clear precedent for the plan of Adelaide and neither Wakefield nor the South Australia Company seem to have paid little attention to the practicalities of applying theory to landscape (Bunker 1993: 245-247). Instead, it fell to the surveyors to interpret instructions and articulate them with the foreign landscape in which they found themselves. They were provided with a notional plan formulated by the South Australian Association. This emphasised accurate survey of land, proper procedures of selection and sale, and concentration of settlement. But advice on the city plan proper was vague:

‘You will make the streets of ample width, and arrange them with reference to the convenience of the inhabitants, and the beauty and salubrity of the town; and you will make the necessary reserves for squares, public works and quays.’ (Colonisation Commissioners for South Australia 1836, in Bunker 1993: 247).

Bunker’s study of Adelaide stressed that systematic colonisation heavily influenced the development principals and processes of settlement in South Australia. But it was the surveyors who practically applied these principals to the colonial environment, transforming their instructions into the boundaries of the urban environment.

Wakefield lost interest in the South Australian experiment when he became irritated by fluctuations in price per acre (Bunker 1988: 63). He turned his attention to New Zealand, the annexation of which was considered inevitable in the late 1830s (Bunker 1988: 67). The New Zealand Association was established in 1837. However, when its application for a Royal Charter to govern the proposed colony was rejected the association was dissolved and reconstituted as a joint stock company in 1839 - the New Zealand Company (Bunker 1988;
Therefore, from its very inauguration, the systematic European colonisation of New Zealand was organised within a capitalistic economic framework.

Wellington was selected as the Company’s first settlement in the new colony due to its deep harbour. Terms of sale were published in June 1839. Attention was again focused on the process of settlement rather than its practicalities. The region was to be selected where land values would benefit the most from colonisation and subsequent ‘improvement’ and the principal town was to be developed within that region (Bunker 1988: 68). Some details were stipulated in the ratio of urban (1,100 acres) to rural (110,000 acres) sections and the quantity of land to be reserved for Māori as payment (110 acres). However, a plan was needed for land sale. Accordingly one was drawn up by Samuel Cobham of London without any knowledge of the location beyond the presence of the Hutt River (Figure 2). The town was laid out in a perfect grid across the river, with certain blocks relegated for specific purposes such as government offices. It is extraordinarily symmetrical.

On arrival Colonel William Wakefield, Edward Gibbon’s brother, was dispatched with surveyors and the first group of colonists to select the settlement site and negotiate its purchase from the local iwi. The surveyors were then to mark out the boundaries of the urban settlement, with the instructions that ‘ample reserves should be made for all public purposes such as a cemetery, a market place, wharfage and probable public buildings, a botanical garden, a park and extensive boulevards - that a broad belt of public land should be left for public use between the town and country sections.’ (Directors of the New Zealand Company, Reports 1840-1844, in Bunker 1988: 69). The chief surveyor, Captain William Mein Smith, was tasked with selecting a flat site for the town amongst the hilly environs. His first choice, the area of Petone at the mouth of the Hutt River, was flooded continuously. Mein Smith was forced to pull pegs and the settlement was moved to Lambton Harbour, an area with a small amount of flat land at the water’s edge surrounded by ravines and steep slopes. It was for this environment that Mein Smith platted the plan upon which the city of Wellington was built.

The governance of the New Zealand colony was initially rather confused. At the time that Colonel Wakefield arrived in Wellington with the first colonists New Zealand was not yet under British sovereignty. The colonists bound themselves to settle matters according to British law and to be governed by an elected committee headed by Colonel Wakefield, who effectively became the colony’s political leader (Bunker 1988: 68). Colonel Wakefield
purchased, according to his own understanding, land from local Māori on which to settle the colonists. However in 1840 the Treaty of Waitangi was signed, according the Crown right of pre-emption over land previously alienated from Māori. The New Zealand Company’s purchases had to be reviewed by government commissioners. While Governor Hobson refused to endorse the Wellington settlement, choosing to establish his capital in Auckland, the British Colonial Office chose to use the Company as an instrument of colonisation, and granted them a Charter of Incorporation in 1841 (Bunker 1988: 68).

The scramble to establish the town of Wellington resulted in a dearth of adequate farmland within the town’s immediate vicinity (Bunker 1988: 68). The majority of rural sections were therefore laid out in the Hutt Valley. Over the next few years New Zealand Company settlements proliferated through central New Zealand with the establishment of New Plymouth, Whanganui and Nelson. The Company also influenced the settlement of Christchurch and Dunedin, in association with the Church of England and the Free Church of Scotland respectively. Within the first decade of European colonisation in New Zealand the Company had established six settlements founded along the principals of systematic colonisation.

Bunker (1988: 69) argued that systematic colonisation was largely successful in New Zealand when compared to Australia despite the fact that Wakefield himself called the South Australian attempt a failure and the New Zealand one ‘a mess’ (Wakefield 1849: 788). He attributes this to the strongly corporate nature of the experiment in New Zealand as opposed to motivation and implementation by official government policy. However Bunker also emphasised the similarity in process with which both the South Australian and the New Zealand settlement was carried out. This process, formulated along the principals of systematic colonisation, was a major influence on urban settlement in New Zealand. However, it was left to the surveyors to interpret the ideology within the new environment and transform it into physical reality. Once this reality was established the colonists themselves were confronted with the ideology it translated and interacted with it on their own terms.
3. Materials and Methodologies

In the interest of transparency it is necessary to provide a description of the materials that informed this interpretation of the urban environment of colonial Wellington as an artefact of the ideology of capitalism. This chapter will present the details of all data sources consulted and outline the reasons why these sources were considered appropriate to use in such an investigation. This chapter will also discuss the methods by which this data was collected, organised, and interpreted. This discussion considers both practical methodologies, that is, the way the data was identified, organised and presented, and more abstract methodologies, that is the theoretical threads along which the data was analysed and interpreted.

Difficulties with both materials and methodologies that were encountered during this process are identified here, along with a discussion of the ways in which these were negotiated or mitigated. Acknowledgement of perceived fallibilities is important when undertaking research and the identification and elimination of methodological problems play an important role in the progress of archaeological thought and practice. However, any and all investigative approaches have potential for weakness and bias, and it is easy to fixate on attempting to neutralise them. If a researcher fails to accept the potential for weakness and continue to work past it, the focus on their elimination inevitably obstructs the expression of new and meaningful information. Critical evaluation is a necessary constant in academic research and it is the discourse regarding such evaluation that is important, not the presentation of flawless but meaningless data.

3.1. Materials

Historical archaeology is commonly defined by its use of both archaeological and documentary material. This research adheres to this approach in that the data sources used here consist of historical cartographic material and information published in cultural heritage management reports regarding archaeological features. The following identifies the sources used in this research and contextualises them within the circumstances of their production.

Cartographic Material

The cartographic sources used for this research consisted of all material associated with the urban environment of Wellington before 1865 that could be identified and made available.

The inclusion of other types of documentary sources, namely pictorial, photographic and written sources, would have been preferable in that they provide further detail regarding the
urban environment of Wellington during that period. Unfortunately, the scope of this research simply could not manage the plethora of information that exists, even for the relatively short time period selected. The material used in this research had to be limited so that investigation could be undertaken systematically. Use of all the available documentary sources, given the limitations placed on this research, would have compromised the transparency of data organisation and therefore the integrity of the interpretation. It was considered preferable to constrain data source type, provided that the exclusion of other sources was identified and justified within the research.

Cartographic material was considered the best data source to use in this research due to its relevance to an exploration of the spatial expression of ideology. It was for this reason that it was selected before written or pictorial sources. The cartographic material consisted of survey plans created by colonial surveyors during the first years of the Wellington colony. A total of 89 survey plans were used as sources of data.

These plans were obtained from Quickmap\(^1\), a property information programme produced by Custom Software Ltd. The University of Otago held a license for the Quickmap Enterprise package (QControl version 7.4.165) at the time research was undertaken. Quickmap Enterprise uses a Geographic Information System (GIS) through which the user can explore a range of land and property information relevant to New Zealand. This includes topographical information, parcel titles, geodetic survey marks, legal boundaries and transport routes. Most importantly, in relation to this research, it provides access to original title and survey plans. This includes access to plans of Wellington created between 1840 and 1865 by both the New Zealand Company and the government survey office. These plans were digitally captured as part of a larger project undertaken by Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) in a transition from a paper-based to a digital system (Alasdair Nicoll, LINZ Hamilton Office, pers. comm.). This resulted in the Digital Cadastral Data Base, which brought together digitised versions of all cadastral records held by the agency. This information is publicly available for a fee and therefore can be collected and distributed in software programmes such as Quickmap.

The plans used in this research were all produced between 1840 and 1865. However the circumstances of their production vary. Before European colonisation, New Zealand had not

---

\(^1\) All plans were obtained from Quickmap with the exception of William Mein Smith’s 1840 plan of Wellington, which was used as the base layer in the GIS project for this research. This plan was obtained from the Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, New Zealand (Ref: MapColl 832.4799gbbd 1840 316-8).
been subjected to the Anglo system of land definition, a system built up over the previous centuries in Britain and its earlier colonies (Byrnes 2001: 20). The colonisation of a ‘blank’ environment by large numbers of people in a short period of time required a system of registered land title based on a system of cadastral surveys. This did eventually occur in New Zealand but the process was far from straightforward.

In deliberately concentrating its colonising efforts in a part of New Zealand not yet under the control of the British Crown, the New Zealand Company shouldered the responsibility of administering a system of land survey and distribution independent of the Crown’s resources. The surveying of land was an essential part of the Company’s system of land purchase and distribution. It therefore employed its own surveyors to facilitate this process in the Wellington colony. However, from the start the system of survey in Wellington was plagued with difficulties, as described by Surveyor General J. T. Thomson in 1877:

‘The New Zealand Company's surveyors at the outset of the settlement (1841 to 1852) laid out about 268,000 acres in sections, nearly all being in the chess-board fashion termed here "paper survey" that is, they did not exist on the ground. When sections were sold on these surveys it was the custom for surveyors then to be sent to mark out the purchases. This being inconsistently done, the work was inaccurate.’ (Thomson 1877).

Paper survey, also known as spotting or gridiron survey, was typical of New Zealand Company settlements where land selection was made by purchasers before the land was surveyed. This system caused a number of problems in Wellington due to the irregular topography and dense bush:

‘Thus, however easily their front corners in the valleys may be apportioned, their back corners fall upon all possible positions; seldom on the tops of the ridges, where they would be useful, but either in a gully or on the face of a precipice - ninety-nine times in the hundred in places least desirable and often quite inaccessible hence the inaccuracies and complications that have arisen, and which affect so large a portion of the work done in the colony.’ (Thomson 1877).

The Treaty of Waitangi of 1840 gave the British Crown first right of land purchase, and tension between the Crown and the Company over land policies grew (Byrnes 2001: 21). The following year the Deeds Registration Ordinance was passed, which provided for the registration of land transactions at the land office (McFadgen n.d.). These were indexed and copied into record books. Unfortunately, registration was not compulsory and even those transactions registered were not reviewed.

The New Zealand Government Act 1846 confirmed Crown control of land survey and disposal under the Land Purchase Department but excluded land previously purchased by the New
Zealand Company (Byrnes 2001: 32). Therefore at this time two systems of land definition operated in New Zealand, one under the Crown and one under the Company. It was not until 1853, when the Company went into voluntary liquidation, that its assets were passed over to the Crown and placed under its administration. That same year the Government Land Office was established in Auckland. Under the Office’s aegis, surveying staff became generally employed by the Provincial Councils. Survey plans produced after this date were therefore the work of these council surveyors.

Each provincial surveyor followed his own system of survey, with no regard to systems followed in other provinces. In Wellington a triangulation system was established across what had become the Wellington Survey District (McFadgen n.d.). While the system of survey was thus improved the system of deeds registration with the Wellington Land Office remained dysfunctional until 1870 when the Land Transfer Act was passed. This Act introduced the Torrens System, a process of land registration that guaranteed the area, description and ownership of land purchased under the Act. Land ownership was validated by registration and issue of two certificates – one to the owner and one to the register office. Unfortunately, this system was not compulsory and operated simultaneously with the older system.

In 1876 the Provincial Councils were abolished by act of government, and the following year the Land Act was passed (McFadgen n.d.). This resulted in the formation of the Lands and General Survey Department. Under the control of the Surveyor General some attempt was made to streamline the country’s land survey system. Ten land districts were formed for administrative purposes. These were each divided into six survey districts, which were in turn divided into survey blocks. Subdivision of private land, authorised by both the owner and the registry office, was recorded on land transfer plans, known today as deposited plans. Subdivision of Crown land, authorised by the Head Office Committee on the recommendation of the Commissioner for Crown Lands, was recorded on survey office plans (SO plans).

Thomson conducted an inspection of all ten land district survey offices as part of the inauguration of the new administration. His subsequent report to the Government provides an indication of the condition of the Wellington survey plans.

‘The office maps were in a most confused state. The surveys were on different meridians, and the operations most loosely and carelessly performed. There was no attempt whatever at triangulation, nor was there any determination of latitude, longitude, and true meridian.’

(Thomson 1877).
Thomson also states that the plans were kept in rolls on the walls of the office, which, being of wood, was at great risk of fire. While the newer maps seemed in good repair, the older were dilapidated, and all were beginning to shred due to rolling. Under Thomson an effort was made to organise over three decades’ worth of surveys and bring them under the new system.

The result was the Wellington survey register, an extraordinarily valuable resource for this research. The register is currently held by the LINZ Hamilton office. All plans held by the Wellington survey office were allocated an SO series number and entered into this register. Information concerning its geographical position, date of survey, description and surveyor was also entered. The register therefore provides a comprehensive list of all survey plans created between 1840 and 1865 and present at the survey office in 1877. Quickmap, while it allows for a search of plans by location, does not allow for searches by date. The register was used to confirm that all plans pertaining to the temporal parameters of this research were identified and included.

The absence of absolute dates for many of the plans made available by Quickmap was initially considered a severe limitation of the cartographic material. The eligibility of plans for use in this research was identified by their position within the spatial and temporal parameters selected (see 3.2.1 Data Collection below). Temporal eligibility could be identified by dates printed upon the plan itself certifying the survey date. However, many plans had the appearance of being contemporary with dated plans but unfortunately had been left undated on their face. The Wellington survey register nullified this limitation by providing dates for many of the undated plans. It also organised the plans within the survey office series. Wellington District survey plans made between 1840 and 1865 were organised within SO series numbers 10301 and 10750. Many of these plans were not relevant to the spatial parameters of this research but, due to the location information provided by the register, these were easily weeded out. The SO series numbers applied by the employees of the Wellington survey office in 1877 are still used today and consequently the list of plans provided by the Wellington survey register were easily collected within Quickmap.

Finally, the inherent subjectivity of the survey plans used in this research should be acknowledged. Maps are commonly understood as a representation of part of the earth’s surface. To a certain extent this can be considered valid, but only if one also accepts their potential for conveying the perspective of the author and maintaining particular social
relations (Wood 2010: 19). Wood (2010) places the origin of the map within the rise of the modern state, and emphasises its use by the state in maintaining its social relations. Clearly the survey plans undertaken according to a capitalist system of land distribution during the European colonisation of New Zealand could be interpreted as tools in the naturalisation of an imperialist worldview within a new environment. Maps are artefacts in themselves, artefacts of the social system that requires them and, more directly, of the individual who creates them. A collection of maps such as that used in this research can be considered an artefactual assemblage. However, this research does not seek to distinguish the empirical from the subjective. This is a study of the colonial perspective, and therefore a study of the creation of one modern state by agents of another. The subjectivity inherent in the survey plans used in this research should therefore be considered more of a matter of interest than a weakness in the data.

Archaeological Material

Information regarding the archaeology of the Wellington urban environment was primarily derived from unpublished reports held by the NZHPT. These reports concern archaeological investigation motivated by development projects within the city. The majority were produced as part of the conditions stipulated in archaeological authorities issued by the Trust, which were required under the Historic Places Act 1993 in order for development to proceed. Prior to the current Act reports were produced under the authority of the Historic Places Act 1980 and the Historic Places Act 1954. Over 3000 of these reports, dating from the early 1970s, are held by the NZHPT and made available through the Archaeological Reports Digital Library. All reports pertaining to the spatial parameters of this research submitted to the NZHPT before July 2012 were assessed for this research, a total of 61 reports. \(^2\) A list of these reports is available in Appendix 1.

This research uses archaeological information derived from secondary sources for several reasons. As discussed in \(1. \textit{Introduction}\), archaeological investigation of an urban context undertaken solely for research purposes is very difficult to carry out due to dense occupation. Therefore, an academic investigation of the archaeology of an historic urban environment with few resources requires information more easily attainable than that obtained through with excavation alone. Furthermore, use of secondary sources is arguably more appropriate

---

\(^2\) It should noted that all reports used in this research have been submitted to the New Zealand Historic Places Trust, with the exception of Watson (n.d.) which is still in draft. This report concerned the Wellington Inner City Bypass project, a major archaeological investigation in central Wellington, and was therefore considered too important to this research to be omitted.
than excavation in such an investigation as they essentially facilitate the examination of a much wider spatial area. The resources required in undertaking an archaeological excavation render such investigation, over a similar spatial extent entirely untenable. Archaeological survey of an area of similar size is plausible within a context with highly visible archaeological remains. However this is not the case in a highly developed urban context. Finally, it is one of the intentions of this research to provide an example of the way in which the plethora of grey literature regarding New Zealand’s archaeological record can be used outside of the cultural heritage management sphere to produce meaningful interpretations of the country’s past.

While literature from the Archaeological Reports Digital Library was the primary source of archaeological material for this research, ArchSite was also consulted. ArchSite is an online database administered by the New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA). It uses a geographic information system to manage information from the Association’s Site Recording Scheme and Upgrade Project. Essentially it stores information on all known archaeological sites in New Zealand and is organised by location. The quantity and quality of information for each site varies. But when the database was launched in 2009 it represented a significant development in the organisation and publication of New Zealand’s archaeological information. Information within ArchSite is organised by site record form, a document that includes as much relevant information as possible regarding each recorded site. A total of 68 site record forms were assessed for this research, consisting of sites relevant to the spatial parameters entered before July 2012.

Information from ArchSite was used to corroborate the archaeological sites for which reports were available. This process highlighted any archaeological context for which a report had not been submitted to the NZHPT. An example of such is the remains of the Inconstant, a ship-turned-store, which was excavated and preserved in 1997 (Keyes 1998). Supplementary information was collected for such sites when available. This primarily consisted of information collected on the NZAA site record form accessed through ArchSite. In more high-profile cases, such as the Inconstant, interpretation panels situated at the site itself was also accessed.

It has been noted above that the absence of dates for much of the cartographic material proved to be a difficulty that was fortunately nullified by consultation of the Wellington survey register. The absence of absolute dates also posed a problem when consulting the
archaeological material. It is very difficult to date archaeological features. Radiocarbon dating cannot be used for historical contexts in New Zealand due to the youth of the country’s colonial context.

Therefore, in order to obtain dates for historical features archaeologists must rely on information gleaned from their context or contents. Features are generally dated if they can be firmly connected to structures such as houses, or landscape changes such as reclamation, using the law of superposition, and the axioms of *terminus post quem* (date after which) and *terminus ante quem* (date before which). If a feature is identified beneath a reclamation layer, it can be dated before this event. Similarly, if a securely dated artefact is recovered from a feature, that feature cannot have been deposited before the identified manufacture of that object. Unfortunately not all archaeological features are blessed with such helpful contexts and the date of many features can only be guessed at. The way in which these circumstances are mitigated in this thesis is described in section 3.2. Methodologies: Data Collection.

As discussed in 1. Introduction, archaeological investigations undertaken within a cultural heritage management context do possess certain drawbacks. One of the primary drawbacks is a general disregard to specific research strategy. This can result in an absence in archaeological interpretation. Fortunately, a lack of interpretation did not negatively impact this research as it was the raw data that was vital. One of the fundamental functions of these reports is to record for posterity the archaeological data recovered during an investigation, be it excavation or survey, before this data is damaged or destroyed. Of course, the reports are secondary observations of primary archaeological information. The recording of this information is subject to bias in the same way that the cartographic material was when it was produced, in that the records essentially represent the authors’ understanding of the archaeological material recovered. Again, the identification of subjectivity within a source material is interesting but negligible and cannot be considered to impact drastically on the quality of information the reports provide. These documents archive primary investigations of archaeological contexts and therefore are ideal building blocks in a synthesis of spatial archaeology over a large and well-developed area.

3.2. Methodologies

Data Collection

A wealth of information exists concerning the colonial history of Wellington. European colonisation of New Zealand occurred in an era when record keeping was next to godliness,
technologies such as photography were developing, and scientific and anthropological curiosity was fashionable. The youth of New Zealand’s colonial experience has also ensured the preservation of an abundance of historical documents. Therefore, even when this information is restricted to Wellington city in the 19th century, the amount of information available is untenable for use in research of this scope. As stated above, the use of documentary evidence has been constrained to solely cartographic material in order to retain transparency and order within the data collection and analysis process.

However, 19th century cartographic depictions of Wellington are still too numerous to be handled well by research of this scope. It was therefore necessary to define spatial and temporal parameters for this research in order to further refine the material. This process had the added benefit of ensuring that the material eventually used remained relevant to the research themes and enhanced understanding of these themes. This was particularly applicable to the archaeological material which, while abundant, was not as abundant as the documentary evidence. It was necessary to weed out information that was irrelevant to the research focus, that is, the early urban environment of Wellington, so that it did not obfuscate the data. For example, information regarding the archaeology of a residence constructed in the suburb of Island Bay in 1886 would have been excluded. Island Bay, while considered a part of Wellington city today, was farmland until the 1880s (Maclean 2009a), so the location is not relevant to a study of urban character. Similarly, by 1886 Wellington’s urban environment had developed considerably, so the timeframe is not relevant to a study of Wellington’s initial manifestation.

The temporal parameter, applied to both cartographic and archaeological material used in this research, extended from European settlement of Wellington in 1840 until Wellington was appointed the nation’s capital in 1865. This research investigates the Wellington colony’s initial urban manifestation. Ideally information would have been restricted to the first five years, or the first decade. However, a balance had to be reached between ideals and practical considerations. While parameters were necessarily applied to refine both documentary and archaeological evidence, the opposite dilemma also had to be taken into account. While some very interesting information regarding the very first years of settlement is available, there was simply too little of it for a comprehensive analysis. Therefore, the temporal parameter had to provide a time span that allowed for sufficient information that still remained relevant to the research aims. The first 25 years of settlement was considered appropriate, in that it allowed for information relevant to most of the area included within the spatial parameter.
Of course Wellington’s urban environment wasn’t static during this time, and change and development did occur. This included two major earthquakes in 1848 and 1855, and various reclamations of the shoreline. However, during this period of growth the spatial organisation systems initiated at the beginning of colonisation remained powerful, and both population and development had not reached a point that significantly impacted those systems. This began to change in 1865 when the capital of New Zealand was moved to Wellington from Auckland. The location of the national government in Wellington made the city the administrative centre of New Zealand, and with the waning of the Otago gold rush some years later it also became the country’s financial capital. Wellington’s population exploded from 7,460 residents in the mid 1860s to 49,344 at the end of the century (Maclean 2009b). The city’s new function precipitated major demographic change, providing a catalyst for change in the city’s physical development. The city transformed from a relatively insular colonial experiment to the centre of national government administration, exposed to new geographical areas and political influences. The function of the city was no longer solely concerned with the governance of Wellington but also with providing a governmental and bureaucratic service to the entire country.

It could be argued that the temporal parameter applied in this research is somewhat arbitrary, 25 years being a solid number with aesthetic appeal. However, the parameter is more rationally grounded than this, tying together historical context with scope for sufficient data sources from which to draw a meaningful interpretation. While change did occur during this time, the nature of settlement and governance during this period is considered homogenous when compared to major changes after 1865. *Te Ara: The Encyclopedia of New Zealand*, a major government-run history project, also uses this parameter to separate early Wellington history from changes that occurred after it became the nation’s capital.

The spatial parameter used in this research is based on William Mein Smith’s plan of Wellington platted in 1840 (Figure 3). Mein Smith was the New Zealand Company’s chief surveyor, employed to design the physical layout of the Company’s first settlement. Initially Mein Smith had considered the mouth of the Hutt River as the most propitious location for the settlement due to the amount of flat land available. However, the location was soon revealed to be severely prone to flooding and the settlement site was hastily relocated to Lambton Harbour. Unfortunately, the topography of this location was less amenable, the areas of flat land being restricted to the beachfront between Thorndon and Te Aro flats. This influenced Mein Smith’s plan, which hugs the harbour between Thorndon and Oriental Bay.
and extends southwest through Newtown Valley.

Mein Smith’s plan was the first platting of Wellington’s urban environment, providing a physical layout that has influenced the city’s development to the present day. The plan presented the future population of Wellington with the spaces and boundaries within which they were to create a community. It is the only available representation of pure intention, a plan by which settlement was intended to occur. It is therefore the first representation of a motivating ideology, as expressed through urban planning, relevant to urban Wellington. It is, in effect, also the Company’s first attempt to apply ideology to the physical landscape in this location. All later cartographic records are representations of the way in which the spaces and boundaries, and thus the ideology, were negotiated by those who administered them and operated within them.

Mein Smith’s plan includes all or part of the following areas of modern Wellington: Thorndon, the central business district (Lambton Harbour), Oriental Bay, Mt Victoria, Te Aro, Aro Valley, Mount Cook, Newtown and Berhampore. In the early years of the colony land outside the urban boundaries was sometimes sparsely settled or used for activities that required large tracts, such as cattle and sheep farming. Over time, as population increased, the urban boundaries extended. Smaller settlements in the surrounding hills and valleys eventually became suburbs and absorbed into the urban environment. However, these extensions and developments, although virtually inseparable from the definition of Wellington today, were not part of the city in the first years of colonisation. As emphasised above, this research is concerned with Wellington city’s first manifestation, and it is for this reason that Mein Smith’s plan provides an appropriate spatial parameter for this research.

The defined temporal and spatial parameters were applied to both the documentary and archaeological data to produce groups of appropriate information sources. These were then reviewed and relevant information identified and catalogued. Both the cartographic and archaeological data sources used in this research contained a range of information only some of which was considered relevant and useful. For example, cartographic documents provide geographic and abstract information concerning the area surveyed such as location, natural and cultural features, geodetic references, land ownership and place names. They can also contain information concerning the document itself, such as surveyor, commissioner, publisher and date of survey. Similarly, archaeological reports and site record forms contain just as much, and usually much more, information concerning the location, history and
It was therefore necessary to identify exactly what information could contribute to an interpretation of the spatial organisation of the colonial city. Within the cartographic assemblage these were essentially all spatial features that were depicted in the plan. These included property boundaries, natural features such as streams, and cultural features such as buildings, roads and paths. Abstract information was also collected, in order to contextualise these features within the research database. These included SO series number, date, surveyor, and associated street names and town acre numbers. These last data groups provide the features with a geographic location within the spatial parameter. Such data, while abstract, are part of the land designation and appellation system still in use today.

All subsurface archaeological features that could be firmly placed within the temporal parameters were identified in the archaeological reports. Common examples of these features are rubbish pits and structural remains. It should be noted that only subsurface archaeological features were of interest for this research. Buildings archaeology is an important subdiscipline of archaeology and significantly enhances our understanding of New Zealand’s historic structures. However, buildings archaeology data was considered irrelevant to this research. Extant standing structures relevant to the spatial and temporal parameters of this research are extremely rare. Furthermore, much of the information obtained from buildings archaeology recording, such as construction techniques and phasing, is not useful in assessing inter-structural spatial organisation.

Many archaeological studies that have explored the relationship between ideology and urban space have included an analysis of artefacts recovered during excavation of urban contexts (e.g. Beaudry 1986; Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1999; Burke 1999; Beaudry and Mrozowski 2001). Most of these studies concern a restricted spatial area, such as a single section or group of sections, and excavation and artefact analysis provided another layer of interpretation concerning the inhabitants of this space. The current research involves a much larger spatial parameter compared to most of these projects and undertakes macro-analysis of urban spatial features. Material culture theory is explored and applied here, but through an unorthodox approach which examines urban spatial features as details of a single artefact. As such, consideration of material culture from archaeological excavations within the city would
unnecessarily complicate the analysis of the urban artefact without significantly contributing to a meaningful interpretation.

*Data Organisation and Presentation*

Every effort was made to collect data systematically, and this system was structured in a way that defined and enhanced the research themes and objectives. The organisation of the abundance of information collected, and its presentation in an accessible and meaningful format was the next requisite.

Initially, as relevant data was identified in the archaeological reports, it was entered into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet according to the following criteria: the report’s date and author, the location of the site and the modern legal description of the site, the number allocated to the site by the NZAA site recording scheme\(^3\), the original town acre(s) affected by the archaeological investigation, a brief description of the site's history and context (including section owners and occupiers, and known structures), dates relevant to the site (usually inferred from the site’s known history), the type of investigation undertaken (test pitting, mechanical site stripping, trenching etc.), archaeological feature and feature description. The nature of any artefacts associated with the feature was noted but artefactual analysis undertaken after investigation was not included.

This spreadsheet provided a comprehensive compilation of those aspects relevant to this research. Features such as report name and author were also recorded so that the original document could be subsequently referenced. The accessibility and functionality of the eventual data presentation format was an objective of this research. While details such as report name and author are not directly relevant to an interpretation of Wellington’s urban environment, they are necessary for contextualising the archaeological data and providing basic information about the data source for future users.

It was not necessary to deconstruct data from the cartographic material and enter it into spreadsheet format as the survey plans were transferred directly into the GIS project by georeferencing. This process is discussed below.

---

\(^3\) The majority of archaeological sites used in this research possessed associated site numbers according to ArchSite. However there were exceptions – sites associated with the Wellington Inner City Bypass Project (Furey 2010; Watson n.d.) and the Chews Lane site (McFadgen and Clough 2009).
It was decided that the final organisation and presentation of the data would best be facilitated through a geographic information system (GIS). Such a system produces a single, visually appealing representation of the data and facilitates the integration of a large amount of varied spatial information. Both the archaeological and cartographic data sets were large and fragmented. The use of GIS allowed amalgamation both within and between data sets while simultaneously retaining the ability to distinguish single plans or features. GIS was considered preferable to the use of simpler graphics software such as Adobe Illustrator. Such programmes do allow the overlaying of various spatial data to produce a single presentation. However, GIS allows for both the integration and annotation of data and possesses the potential for the future expansion of the project along both spatial and temporal lines by the addition of further data. GIS projects are ‘alive’ in their interactivity and potential to evolve. Because they are digital they have no restrictions regarding physical space or scale, unlike paperbound representations, and the potential for error is reduced.

The GIS project created for this research is available on the disk included in Appendix 2 at the back of this thesis. It must be emphasised that GIS was used in this research is purely a tool for providing a sophisticated visual representation of the spatial relationships within and between data sets. It was not used for its analytical capabilities. This research focuses on the relationship between spatial features and ideology, the complexity of which cannot be reduced to algorithms. The benefits of GIS analysis in interpreting the relationship between aspects of historic cultural landscape and past natural environment, for example, cannot be denied. However, they are less apparent when exploring the relationship between the historic cultural landscape and the ideology that produced it. Forcing something as complex as ideology through computing processes is overly simplistic and reductive. GIS cannot be expected to ingest spatial data and disgorge an informed analysis of ideologically motivated human behaviour. For a meaningful interpretation of the data theoretical discourse must be considered and imagination applied, and this is beyond the scope of a computer programme. Even when such ephemera are considered we can only aspire to propose one interpretation of aspects of ideology and its spatial consequences from amongst a plethora of possibilities.

Witcher (1999) examined the tension between abstraction and quantification in GIS and the post-processual emphasis on the qualitative and subjective in archaeology. He applauded the use of GIS in describing and contextualising data, but also the danger in confusing description with interpretation which, he believed, promoted environmental determinism (Witcher 1999: 14). However, description is integral to the interpretive process and Witcher identified a need
to move GIS analyses of archaeological landscapes towards a more hermeneutic approach emphasising the landscape as social as well as economic. GIS has its roots in traditional cartography which, as discussed above, often perpetrates space as neutral (Witcher 1999: 15). Witcher identified this same ‘pretension of neutrality’ in early archaeological uses of GIS which tended to succumb to the novelty of GIS and neglect theoretical frameworks (Witcher 1999: 16). Such neglect appeared to encourage emphasis on economic rationality. However Witcher contended that with firm theoretical grounding, and movement towards a social focus, archaeological research was ‘beginning to humanize GIS.’ (Witcher 1999: 17).

Other disciplines within the humanities have acknowledged the same difficulties in carrying out research using GIS. Gregory (2003: 4) noted a preference for quantitative approaches in GIS analysis as opposed to qualitative. The latter are often far more relevant to researchers in humanities disciplines. He referenced an older debate questioning whether GIS offered a cohesive scientific framework or merely fostered ‘naively positivist agenda’. With specific reference to GIS use in the historical discipline, Gregory propagated critical use of the GIS technology to complement more traditional ideas and approaches to research (Gregory 2003: 5). Such approaches are developing, but definition of a theoretical framework makes for slow progress. Gregory provided several examples of GIS use in the historical discipline. These examples strongly emphasise the use of the data cataloguing and visualisation capabilities of GIS. In essence, use of GIS in these examples is strongly descriptive, illustrating the weakness in GIS analytical tools in interpreting qualitative data. However, they also stress the importance of the system’s ability to spatially reference and integrate large amounts of disparate data and explore it geographically.

Within the archaeological discipline GIS and its analytical capabilities seem to have been predominantly utilised by prehistoric archaeologists. It may be that the much-criticised reliance on descriptive research within historical archaeology has retarded the utilisation of this system in comparison. However use of GIS within historical archaeology seems to be growing. It is particularly prevalent in discussions of historic landscapes and there is an increasing body of literature regarding the integration of archaeological and documentary evidence within GIS (e.g. Madry 2006). Such integration is particular to historical archaeology. Use of GIS within historical archaeology has tended to be descriptive with emphasis given to the data organisation and visualisation capabilities of the system (e.g. Smith, Ohm Clement and Wise 2003). Such use conveniently avoids issues of environmental determinism associated with the integration of qualitative research with a positivist
framework, but that should not preclude exploration of more analytical uses of GIS within historical archaeology. Indeed, some research is beginning to do just that (e.g. González-Tennant 2009).

It seems evident that using GIS in archaeological research requires a qualitative approach with a firm theoretical framework and a subjective focus. The current research sits far more comfortably within such an approach with regard to the acknowledged subjectivity of the source material and the inherent complexity of any analysis of ideology. It should be emphasised that this research explores the relationship between two manifestations of cultural landscape – that of the applied spatial boundaries and delineations expressed cartographically, and the archaeological landscape created by the inhabitants of this constructed landscape. Most archaeological uses of GIS explore the relationship between an archaeological landscape and the natural environment. By choosing to focus on relatively abstract contexts this research avoids major issues inherent in GIS use such as environmental determinism. However, this also precludes the use of the more complex analytical tools GIS offers.

An approach to temporality is an issue that almost all historical research using GIS must consider. Temporal functionality is not a strength of GIS programmes, and it falls to the user to create a way in which data that varies on both spatial and temporal scales can be presented and analysed. Diachronic analysis is often fundamental to archaeological research and, if the onus falls on the researcher to decide how to handle the temporal scale, at least this allows for creative solutions sensitive to both the data and the research aims. However, Gregory (2003: 36) warns that the complexity of such analysis can result in the simplification of space to preserve temporal detail, or vice versa.

There are options for dealing with time in GIS. It can be treated as an attribute attached to spatial data. The ‘key dates’ or ‘time slices’ approach is also commonly used, consisting of discrete map layers for different time phases. This is particularly suitable to spatial data derived from several different source maps (Gregory 2003: 38). However, this solution is only really appropriate for a limited number of dates or when periods of change can be clearly distinguished from periods of stability. Such an approach also assumes time and space are linear, independent constants, an idea that has roots in the same scientific positivism of the western renaissance that generated cartography and ultimately GIS (Witcher 1999: 16). Concepts of space and time as non-linear and indivisible are becoming more widely acknowledged (e.g. Gosden 1994), but these present an even bigger challenge to a system
such as GIS that is effectively atemporal.

Quantum GIS (QGIS) Version 1.8 (Lisboa) was selected for use in this research. QGIS is an open source GIS licensed under the GNU General Public License, and an official project of Open Source Geospatial Foundation, which supports the collaborative development of open source geospatial software. QGIS was selected in preference to ArcGIS, access to which was offered without cost by the University of Otago. This was an informed decision. QGIS is relatively easily negotiated by the novice, and is capable of running on various operating systems including Windows, MacOSX and Linux. ArcGIS only runs on Windows. Admittedly, QGIS is not as sophisticated as ArcGIS in its analytical capabilities but sophisticated computer analysis was not required for this research. The organisation and visualisation capabilities of QGIS were ideal for this research. These points justify the selection of QGIS. The difference between the programmes is negligible. The determinative factor was the free and public availability of QGIS from its website qgis.org. In contrast, ArcGIS is only available at a high cost outside of academic institutions. This research aims to produce an accessible and comprehensive tool for the use of archaeologists outside the academic field in a format that can be independently explored and expanded. Moreover, this research is hugely reliant on publicly accessible data and it is considered appropriate that the information gained from this data be returned to the public domain. QGIS is the only GIS programme with the ability to facilitate these aims.

In discussing spatial analysis in archaeology, Barceló and Pallarès (1998: 69) stated that ‘the main objective of spatial analysis is the spatial correlation of different social actions: how the spatial distribution of an action has an influence over the spatial distribution of other(s) actions(s).’ They argued that GIS was especially useful in achieving this objective due to its capacity to overlay different arrangements of georeferenced points. This ability proved crucial in the organisation of data in the GIS created for this research. The initial task in the development of this system was the selection of a base layer to which all subsequent data could be applied. The logical choice was the original plan of Wellington created by William Mein Smith in 1840 as this provided the spatial parameters by which all spatial data was subsequently collected. A digital copy in raster format was obtained from the Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, and permission granted by the same institution for its use in this research. This plan also depicted the numbered town acres of the original Wellington settlement. These provided an extremely useful reference system for the location of subsequent survey office plans, for which relevant town acre numbers were always provided.
on the plan itself or in the Wellington survey register.

The Mein Smith plan was imported in its entirety and unchanged into the GIS project as a base layer. However, the survey office plans obtained from Quickmap had to be prepared by several processes before they became part of the GIS project. In 1877 the General Surveyor J. T. Thompson deplored the state of the maps in the Wellington survey office in a government report. Neglect of the cartographic material was translated during the digitising process more than a century later, resulting in considerable amount of visual ‘noise’ on the consequent rasters. Therefore, all survey plans were ‘cleaned up’ by processing through Adobe Photoshop where extraneous marks were erased where they did not interfere with the cartographic information, and superfluous space was cropped from the image. This had the added advantage of reducing the file size of the raster.

Several plans contained multiple maps on the one sheet that were applicable to the one SO series number. These were sliced and a separate file was created for each plan. The multiple plans were organised alphabetically within the same SO series number (e.g. SO10329a, SO10329b etc). Many survey office plans covered large sections of the area delineated by the spatial parameters. Unfortunately, the larger the section imported into the GIS project via the georeferencing process (see below) the more susceptible the section was to warping. This was due to the inevitable variation between the details of the base layer and the details of the survey office plan. In plans representing smaller areas variation was negligible to non-existent, but the larger the represented area grew the higher the potential was for deviation from the base plan. Therefore, some large survey office plans were sliced into smaller sections in Adobe Photoshop and saved as separate files (using alphabetised versions of the same SO series number, as above). Each section was imported and georeferenced individually and then grouped as the same layer once within the GIS project.

Georeferencing, the process by which survey plan rasters were overlaid in the correct location in relation to the GIS project’s base layer, was undertaken using the Georeferencer plugin available for QGIS 1.8 (Lisboa). The plan was imported into Georeferencer and easily identifiable points, such as section boundaries or street corners, were cross-referenced with the same location on the GIS project’s base layer using ground control points (GCPs). Georeferencer uses real-world coordinates to tie the associated GCPs together. In this research the New Zealand Transverse Mercator (NZTM) projection system was used. Once several locations in the survey plan were cross-referenced with the base layer, georeferencing
was initiated and the survey plan was imported into the GIS project and reprojected to overlay the base layer according to the GCPs provided. The export transformation settings applied to this process were thin plate spline (type) and nearest neighbour (resampling method). Once georeferenced, the survey plan’s visual properties were set within the GIS project. Black and white rasters were set so that only the black details of the plan were visible across the base layer, while the white background was made transparent. The opacity of colour plans was reduced to 50%, so that features of both the base layer and the overlay were visible and comparable.

Once all survey office plans within the spatial and temporal parameters of this research were imported into the GIS project and their properties set they were grouped in order to provide some order to the visualisation process. An arbitrary ‘time slice’ approach was used to construct these groupings. Plans with known dates were grouped by decade (i.e. 1840-49, 1850-59, 1860-65). Plans without a precise date, but known to be within the temporal parameters due to the Wellington survey register, were grouped together (i.e. 1840-1865). This meant that the survey office plans could be viewed against the base layer individually, together, or by group.

All survey plans were included in the GIS project as separate raster layers, but the archaeological data were all included in one vector layer labeled ‘Archaeological Features’. This layer displays the location of archaeological features relevant to the spatial and temporal parameters of this research in relation to the spatial information represented in the cartographic raster layers. The vector layer was created manually in QGIS for this project and each archaeological feature is visualised by a point. These points are located in relation to the town acre with which the archaeological feature was associated. This layer also facilitates the inclusion of detailed information concerning each archaeological feature. These details are made available in an attribute table connected with the vector points. This table provides the report author, report date, NZAA site number, site location, town acre number, site context, feature description, feature date, and any notes associated with that feature. Due to difference in the way in which archaeological information and cartographic information was visualised in the GIS project and the inclusion of dates in the attribute table, it was not considered necessary to distribute the vector points into temporal groupings.

4 Several sites in this table are associated with reclamation activity along the coastline. These re­clamations are identified according to SO 14413 (dated to 1899), which depicts the sequence of reclamation in Wellington harbour. This plan is included as Appendix 3.
Another vector layer was included in the GIS project, labelled ‘Reserves and Reclamations’. This depicts the different reserves and coastal reclamations identified in the cartographic material. These features are discussed in detail in 4. Results, and a depiction of their spatial organisation integrated in a single layer was considered a pertinent and useful inclusion. Again, this vector layer was created manually in QGIS for this project. The features are represented as polygons, and each is labelled as a coastal reclamation or a type of reserve. The reserve types relate to those categories discussed in 4. Results. Further details relating to each feature are included in an attribute table. This table lists feature type and name (if stipulated in the cartographic material) and the number and date of the earliest plan in which it can be identified.

A user guide for the operation of the GIS project is included on disk with the project (Appendix 2), and as Appendix 4 in this thesis.

Interpretation of Data
This chapter has discussed the systematic approach to data collection, organisation and presentation adopted in this research. Such an approach is also necessary for the analysis and interpretation of data. However, it is important to temper this with the arguments regarding the tension between the empirical and the subjective. GIS offers new tools and techniques, but these must be used critically to complement more traditional ideas and approaches (Gregory 2003: 5). A purely empirical approach to the data is too rigid a system to adhere to during an exploration of ideology and its effect on cultural landscapes. Instead theoretical touchstones must be established that shape the threads along which the data is interpreted. It is important that this theoretical framework is well grounded in the data, but it cannot be replaced by the data itself. To dismiss archaeological theory in research such as this is to marginalise the opportunity for a more meaningful and imaginative interpretation of the past. The theoretical framework for this research was constructed from evolving discourses in archaeology and other disciplines including urban planning, sociology and history. These discourses concern the three primary aspects of this research – ideology (centred on concepts of colonialism and capitalism) and urbanism.

As discussed in 2. Archaeology, Urbanism and Ideology, archaeological theory regarding the spatial organisation of settlements grew from the emergence of settlement archaeology in the 1960s. This development emphasised an analysis of social relationships using archaeological evidence, as opposed to the traditional focus on discrete cultures based on artefactual
evolution. Trigger (1967) outlined what he considered the principle tenets for settlement analysis in a three-levelled model. These levels represented the basic analytical units of settlement patterns with potential for providing information regarding social structure and relations. They consisted of the individual structure, the settlement, and the settlement distribution. It is the second unit that is most relevant to this research. Trigger hypothesised that investigation of the settlement could reveal the type of social and economic activities undertaken in the past through the investigation of artefact distribution patterns, the relationship between residential structures, and the location and nature of individual buildings with specific social or economic importance.

Settlement archaeology was somewhat superceded by landscape archaeology over the following decades. This had the same emphasis on the social and economic activities of past human settlement. However through the era of processualism that followed emphasis was overwhelmingly placed on the relationship between human settlement and the past environment, with a particular focus on the economic effect of the environment on settlement. Such a focus tended to override intra-settlement analysis and the interpretation of past social relations advocated by Trigger in the 1960s. The more recent post-processual movement has seen a development in alternative theoretical frameworks that attempt to temper such economic focus with a social emphasis. Examples of this discourse are discussed above in 3.2. Methodologies: Data Organisation and Presentation. Landscape archaeology research has also developed the concepts of space and place, which are particularly important to this research.

Landscape archaeology theory must be extended by, and amalgamated with, aspects from other disciplines if it is to be appropriate and useful in the construction of a theoretical framework for this research. The most important of these is another traditional archaeological focus - material culture theory. This is one of the fundamentals of archaeological practice and involves the identification, analysis and interpretation of artefacts recovered from archaeological contexts. In historical archaeology material culture analysis tends to explore issues of consumption, domesticity, culture contact, gender, class and ethnic identity, and wider issues such as industrialisation, mass-production and global trade. These areas of interest are indicative of the contextual themes approached by historical archaeology - capitalism, colonialism and the development of globalisation, among others.

Deetz’s *In Small Things Forgotten* (1977) has essentially reified material culture analysis and
interpretation in historical archaeology. However, this is not as restrictive as it sounds. Deetz was visionary in creating potential for the definition of ‘material’ to be extended and redefined, something Upton (1992) discusses in relation to the city artefact (see 2. Archaeology, Urbanism and Ideology). This research is concerned with exploring several contexts that have not traditionally been classed as ‘material’ using an approach rooted in material culture analysis. The artefactual characteristics of maps and reports have been discussed previously in this chapter with regard to their potential subjectivity. This research applies such an approach to land and landscape, arguing that a worldview rooted in imperialism and capitalism underscored the colonial perspective of land as material to be distributed, possessed and improved. Land can be analysed as artefact because the colonists articulated it as chattel. Land was subsequently shaped through the human manipulation and use of the physical environment. We are able to analyse such material precisely because the owners/users understood it as such. Post-colonial deconstructions of this colonial perspective may take issue with such a perception, and with good reason. But this does not detract from our ability to interpret meaning from land. The land was imbued with meaning by the colonists and can therefore be analysed in the same way other material possessions are analysed.

Such an approach requires an amalgamation of landscape archaeology and material culture theory, taking aspects from both discourses to explore historical aspects specific to this research. Human settlement in an alien environment and the spatial organisation of their settlement would traditionally be the fodder of landscape archaeology. However, this research explores the ideological motivation of settlement with regard to an ideology that is specifically colonial and capitalist in nature. Therefore, the colonial perspective of land as possession must be accounted for and the inclusion of a material culture approach in the theoretical framework of this research made necessary. However, it is important to extend this amalgamation a step further to account for the broader context of this research – the urban centre.

This research contends that the colonial Wellington urban environment can be analysed as material, because its settlement was planned, intentional, and organised along the clear ideological lines of a controlling minority. To do this we must borrow the concept of the city artefact from the historical discipline and add it to the theoretical framework. Historical archaeology is defined by the use of both historical and archaeological material to produce a distinct methodology for the investigation of the recent past. There is no reason why
theoretical aspects of both disciplines should not also be amalgamated to produce distinct interpretations of that material.

Urban history literature specifically assessing the New Zealand urban environment in the 19th century is refreshing in its distinction of such from the Australian equivalent. Pownall (1956) categorised New Zealand’s settlements into prevalent types and distinguishes ‘colonial settlements’ (i.e. planned settlements) amongst these. However, his assessment is preliminary and entirely descriptive. Hamer (1995), in distinguishing New Zealand urbanism from Australian, connects urban development with the political and economical contexts of the time. He also touches on Wakefieldian principles and the capitalist land distribution system. But his assessment is uncritical in that it does not question the neutrality of such systems. It is only in a brief discussion of the Māori relationship with urbanism that Hamer alludes to an ideological relationship between colonists and urban property.

It is therefore apparent that critical assessments of urbanism are needed to contribute to this research’s theoretical framework and these can be found in broader examinations of urbanism in history. As discussed in 2. Literature Review, the concept of the city as an artefact was introduced by Summerson in the 1960s. Summerson maintained that in order to understand a city’s nature it must be conceptualised as a single organism. Analysis of the city’s whole physical mass must be undertaken much in the same way archaeological artefacts are analysed according to material culture methodologies. Garvin (1963) demonstrated how this could be carried out within a particular historical context using the planning and settlement of Philadelphia as his example. Later Upton (1992) explored these ideas within an archaeological framework and emphasised the concept of ‘cultural landscape’ in merging the physical aspects of the urban environment with the imaginative structures of its residents. This concept is integral to the current research because it examines different representations of cultural landscape rather than the more typical landscape archaeology approach of comparing cultural to physical landscape.

This research uses analysis of spatial organisation rooted in settlement and landscape archaeology and understands them as the details of artefact design following the framework espoused by material culture studies. The merging of these two theoretical approaches is particularly apt when considering the colonial context of the settlement under scrutiny and the capitalist ideology espoused by its founders which viewed land as material. This provides an over-arching theoretical framework for the archaeological analysis of colonial Wellington’s
urban environment. But how is the importance of spatial features related to this type of urbanism to be recognised? Urban planning literature makes a considerable contribution towards solving this problem, particularly that which concerns British colonial towns and Wakefieldian settlement.

Although literature regarding the urban planning of Wakefieldian settlements is not plentiful, it does exist, even if much of it focuses on South Australia (e.g. Williams 1966; Bunker 1988; 1993; Brand 2007). Williams (1966) and Bunker (1988; 1993) provide detailed assessments of the urban design process for Adelaide, and to a lesser extent the New Zealand Company settlements, within the context of the principles of systematic colonisation. These assessments tend to focus on the origin of specific physical features of the design. Bunker in particular emphasises the direct causal relationship between passages from Wakefieldian literature, such as publications and charters, and the physical realities of settlement. It is precisely this focus on the physical qualities of urbanism that makes urban planning literature useful in this research in that it aids in the identification and contextualisation of major spatial features.

Subsequent papers have touched on more theoretical issues around colonial urban design. Miller (1998) considered the relationship between urbanism and New Zealand’s national mythology, and Brand (2007) alluded to the Victorian obsession with scientific empiricism and related post-colonial deconstructions. However, once again these papers focus on the direct relationship between historical fact and the physical reality of settlement. Such literature tends to be narrow in focus, excluding broader contextual issues. Therefore, while examples of settlement development are abundant they are not related to anything more meaningful and the proffered argument is weakened. The theoretical framework used in this research, forged from the archaeological and historical disciplines, adopts the information provided in the urban planning literature and extends it by questioning the neutrality of identified features and examining their potential as metaphors of ideology.

The identification, contextualisation and critical analysis of urban features provide for an exploration of the relationship between urban spatial organisation and the ideology that influenced it. Study of the Wellington settlement requires acknowledgement of both its immediate ideological association, that of systematic colonisation, and the broader ideological context, that of British imperialism and capitalism. It is one of the tenets of this research that such ideology was expressed spatially through the creation, use and negotiation of urban features. When considering the relationship between the ideology and its spatial expression it
is apparent that the one could not produce the other without human agency. It is also apparent
that the ways in which people engaged with the ideology and its urban manifestation were
diverse. Distinctions can be made between these different levels of agency.

For this research three agency groups were identified. Each group was defined by the way in
which they were understood to interact with ideology to shape the urban environment of
Wellington. Each group could also be related to the different ‘artefacts’ used in this research.
The first group, the ‘directors’, consisted of Wakefield, the New Zealand Company, and the
New Zealand Company’s primary agents in Wellington who controlled the governance of the
settlement. This was primarily Colonel Wakefield, Edward Gibbon’s brother. The ‘directors’
actively created a system of principals for colonialism rooted deeply in the capitalistic
economic system dominant in Western society. They were responsible for the ‘master plan’ of
the Wellington settlement – its genesis, location, nomenclature, population, land distribution
system, major structural and landscape features, and the distinction of urban from rural. This
perspective can be related to the GIS project produced in this research. The project is a
macro-representation of the intentions of the directing group. It facilitates the ‘big picture’ of
the colonial urban environment of Wellington extending across the spatial limits and
including the activities of the following two agency groups within it.

The second group, the ‘implementers’, consists of the planners, designers and surveyors who
were charged with the task of implementing broad directives, applying them to the
Wellington landscape to produce a functioning urban centre. They therefore took instructions
that were heavily ideologically charged, but rather sparse in detail, and interpreted them in
their own way during the creative process. The ‘implementers’ tempered the ideology of the
‘directors’ with aspects of importance to themselves, which generally consisted of a dose of
practicality. This group primarily consisted of the Company’s chief surveyor, William Mein
Smith, and the surveyors that followed him in the early years of the Wellington settlement.
The ‘implementers’ are strongly associated with the assemblage of survey plans which they
themselves authored. These plans were used in the creation of the GIS project for this
research. As discussed, these plans have potential not only to reflect the spatial organisation
of colonial urban environment but also the ideological framework of their authors.

The third group, the ‘negotiators’, consists of the settlers who emigrated from Britain to
inhabit the new colony. The majority of these settlers were workers who were tempted by the
New Zealand Company’s booster literature to try their luck in New Zealand. Many
participated in the ideological system shaped by the New Zealand Company before they left home by pre-purchasing land sections in the new colony. Upon arrival these settlers were presented with, from their perspective, an inhospitable physical landscape and asked to participate in a cultural landscape of ideological boundaries that were barely physically inscribed. The ‘negotiators’ had no part in the initial design of this cultural landscape. However, their negotiation of these ideological boundaries and the way they manipulated their physical surroundings within the urban landscape provides fodder for a microanalysis of the relationship between ideology and urban spatial organisation. The activities of the ‘negotiators’ are reactive to the ideology they were presented with. But they were active in their reaction. The archaeological remnants of these activities, those that have been excavated and recorded, form the third ‘artefact assemblage’ used to create the GIS project for this research.

Identification of these agency groups helps systematise the analysis and interpretation of ideology’s influence on the colonial urban environment of Wellington. It is therefore necessary to identify those features that characterise this environment and consider their role in these relationships between ideology and the colonists. These features may be identified due to their size, their location, their function, or simply because they are repeated within the landscape. Some features are easily dismissed due to their seeming neutrality to an observer indoctrinated in the New Zealand urban landscape. These include the geometry of land blocks and subdivided sections, which are inevitably quadrilateral, the surrounding thoroughfares and the grid pattern that they form. These features tend to be related to the work of the first two agency groups. Other, less prominent features can be identified from both the cartographic and the archaeological material used in creating the GIS project. These features include structures, infrastructure such as drains and paths, rubbish dumps and other activity areas. Relationships between the features were also questioned. For example, what does the arrangement of structures in relation to features such as roads tell us about attitudes to the public and the private in the urban environment? Does the arrangement between rubbish deposition and section boundaries support or contradict the conclusion regarding these attitudes? Is this significant regarding what is known of the ideological foundation of this settlement?

The theoretical framework of this thesis is constructed from aspects of archaeological and historical theory. When these threads are pulled together this framework provides theoretical justification and support for the analytical and interpretive approach taken in this research.
They help identify and interrogate features with potential importance to the research questions and contextualise them within the themes of colonialism and capitalism that formed the basis of the ideology that motivated the city’s settlement.

Finally, it is important to emphasise that this research deliberately employs a wider perspective that many archaeological studies, particularly those concerned with landscape archaeology and use of GIS. Often these studies focus on questions asking ‘how close?’ or ‘how far?’, ‘how did this environment effect that social system?’ and ‘how did this economy effect that environment?’. Instead, the most important question that this research asks is ‘what is present?’. This may initially seem simplistic. However the observation and consideration of features provokes the much more complex questions ‘why is it present?’ and ‘why was it organised thus?’. This approach creates potential for criticism in neglecting to acknowledge the variability in micro-details. But such criticism may also demonstrate a certain pretension towards data in which higher intricacy is uncritically regarded as more meaningful. In reality a microanalysis of this context would inevitably implode under the weight of infinite variation. A macroanalysis is far more practical and, in the end, more meaningful.

Repudiating the ‘what?’ and the ‘why?’ as too obvious can also reflect a naïve acceptance of a particular landscape as the ‘natural state’. Suggesting that there is nothing to be gained in questioning it is to dismiss the ideology that influenced it as neutral and universal. By asking ‘why?’ this research is challenging the perception of a particular cultural landscape, that of the planned urban settlement, that has remained relatively stable in postcolonial New Zealand society since its conception. Exploring this landscape as a product of a particular ideological agenda opens New Zealand’s urban contexts to different interpretations and post-colonial critiques.
4. Results

The aim of this chapter is to identify and contextualise the major features of urbanism in colonial Wellington. These features were identified through the integration and assessment of Wellington survey office plans and archaeological information in a geographic information system project. The identification process, the results of which are outlined below, targeted major urban features. These features were either evident in the data sources or were general conclusions regarding the nature of specific actions evidenced by several smaller instances in the data sources. As previously discussed, the methodology employed in this research in examining the relationship between ideology and Wellington’s urban environment deliberately neglects the discussion of features in detail, whether common or ephemeral, choosing instead to draw general conclusions about their nature and function. This was done to avoid an increase in data variation, a process that could potentially produce variation to an extent that would have been unmanageable in this context. Proliferation of variation in data associated with such a large spatial area and broad thematic context would likely lead to misdirection in focus and loss of meaningful interpretation.

This chapter follows the urban planning tradition of identification of physical features and relating them to historical fact. Features are identified, described, and contextualised within contemporary circumstances. When applicable, information from the Wakefield texts relating to particular features of the urban environment is also noted. This was done to further contextualise the results directly within the sophisticated ideology with which they are associated. Discussion of these features is not extended beyond this. Instead the purpose of this chapter is to define and clarify the results of the data collection and organisation processes. This is a necessary part of articulating the relationship between identified features and ideology, specifically the ideology of systematic colonisation, which is undertaken in 5. Discussion.

The simple framework constructed around three identified agency groups has been discussed in 3. Materials and Methods. This framework is used here as a means of organising and streamlining the observations made in this chapter. The framework also provides a structure through which urban features can be related to ideology. The nature of the engagement between ideology and urban feature through the agency of specific groups is discussed in 5. Discussion. It is important to note that urban features are not strictly associated with one particular agency group to the exclusion of others. All aspects of the urban environment were
experienced and interpreted differently by different people. Instead, in this chapter the framework serves to loosely associate features with the group that had a major influence over their genesis, and thus streamline the descriptive process.

All data accumulated and assessed during this research to produce the following results are presented in the GIS project included as Appendix 2 on the DVD insert at the back of this thesis. This tool was used specifically to avoid the necessity of reproducing numerous plans in paper format. Some plans are provided here as illustrations, and all others can be viewed in the GIS project. Similarly, details of the archaeological sites and of the reserves and reclamations mentioned in this chapter are available in the GIS project.

4.1. The Directors

The Urban Centre

In keeping with this research’s objective to challenge the neutrality of features of the urban environment, it should not be assumed that the urban centre itself is neutral. Urbanism wasn’t necessarily an automatic requirement of colonialism. Indeed, Wakefield was motivated by previous colonial examples of settlement dispersal, in North America especially, where practices such as homesteading were often preferred to the population density and provision of services characteristic of urbanism.

It would appear that the decision to create an urban environment in Wellington was, at least partially, a conscious one by the New Zealand Company in the sense that they were committed to the combination of labour principle. This required a particular level of population density. Whether this principle was consciously translated into an urban environment, or whether it was simply assumed that the manifestation of this principle was to be an urban landscape is less clear. Wakefield wrote a lot about the combination of labour but less about the distinction between urban and rural, and seems to jump between both rural and urban contexts and examples when discussing the principle. It is therefore ambiguous as to whether an urban environment in Wellington was a conscious choice or an ‘obviousness’ of colonial experimentation (Leone 2010: 76).

When Wakefield did discuss urban contexts it was often to provide examples of good colonial practice. The town of Guelph, in Canada, was reviewed as an example of good practice in relation to other settlements where large tracts in the town centres were reserved for clergy and governor and never improved (Wakefield 1832: 299-304). The swathe of neglected waste
land in the centre of the urban landscape was detrimental both to the value of urban sections and the productivity of the settlement. In contrast, all of Guelph’s urban lots had been sold at £20/acre, thus ensuring their value from the outset.

Even if the New Zealand Company was not conscious of the choice in creating an urban environment, they did recognise its distinction from the rural in the designation of different land parcel types, that is, town acres and rural sections (Figure 4). Thus the colony was imagined and manifested as both urban and rural, in contrast to the homesteading process of North America. The Company also recognised the value of the urban environment in the most basic sense. In his plan for Adelaide Wakefield proposed that no land should be given away or withheld (Wakefield 1832: 299). Rather everyone, including the Company, should be obliged to purchase land. The purchase of urban lots would be the Company’s greatest expenditure but would also see the greatest increase in value and return the most profit. Wellington’s urban environment was similarly controlled to ensure urban sections retained value. This was primarily done by restricting the size of the settlement. The city would consist of a certain number of units, 1,100 town acres, that would make up the urban centre. These could not be too numerous or too large and they were to be kept compact to prevent rapid expansion. Features such as the town belt provided a means of restricting this expansion, thus increasing internal development and competition and ensuring the value of urban property.

**Location**

A deep harbour and flat land appear to have been critical to the location of a settlement based on the principles of systematic colonisation. This attitude is gleaned from sources regarding the South Australia colony (see Bunker 1993 for citations from the *Colonisation Commissioners for South Australia 1836*) and from Wakefield’s writings. The requirement for flat land is never specifically stipulated and justified, indicating that it was considered an ‘obviousness’ of colonial settlement. However, the importance of flat land is evident in the actions taken by William Mein Smith and his surveyors upon reaching Wellington. The confluence of the Hutt River with the harbour at Petone was selected in part for its regular topography. When floodwaters were deemed too threatening to the fledgling settlement the surveyors were forced to reapply their plan to the hastily selected site between the Thorndon and Aro flats across the harbour. These areas were the only alternative flat land around the harbour, and the 1840 plan of Wellington by Mein Smith shows how the town acres were distributed to take advantage of every available flat space. In order to do this symmetry was sacrificed and the town acres stretched along the beach with concentrations at Thorndon and
Te Aro at each end, and south through the Newtown and Aro valleys. However, the number, size and shape of town acres required for the settlement forced the placement of further sections onto the ridge behind Lambton Beach and onto the hill slopes of Mt Victoria and Mt Cook. This caused problems for subsequent surveying (see 3. Materials and Methods) and suburban development of the later 19th century was characterised by the hills and ridges.

Justification for a deep harbour is found in Wakefield’s discussion of the benefits colonialism would have for Britain. He suggested that Britain’s merchant navy would be increased by colonialism because colonialism promoted the use of England’s ships and supported port cities (Prichard 1969: 22). Colonies would also become markets for manufactured goods, creating employment in Britain, and be a source of raw material for those industries. Therefore maritime trade and communication were crucial to both Britain and Wellington and a harbour was necessary to facilitate this (Wakefield 1849: 811-812). The value of this access to trade would also improve the value of the land associated with the harbour. Wakefield pointed out that, in his opinion, the Canadian settlement of Guelph, the planning of which he generally applauded, would have been improved if it was situated on a river, lake or sea and possessed a good harbour, It would then be well placed for trade and the value of the settlement valued accordingly (Wakefield 1832: 280).

Town Acres
The town acre was the primary land unit of the colonial urban environment in New Zealand (Figure 5). It was closely associated with the land purchase and distribution system designed for the Wellington experiment within the principals of systematic colonisation. It is therefore a direct product of a capitalist economic system and the primary means by which the urban landscape of the colony was materialised. These units were arranged by the town surveyors to form a geometric pattern across Wellington’s topography and so provided definition for the urban settlement. The town acre was the urban unit of systematic colonisation, and was in direct opposition to the rural section. The latter was larger and distinct from the urban section in function and location. While rural sections were intended for large-scale agricultural production and the like, and were spread around the outskirts of the city, town acres were closely grouped to form the urban commercial hub that was to provide a market and similar services for rural produce and populace. While these spatial units were to be distinct in meaning and location Wakefield also suggested that they be closely associated and complementary so as to support combination of labour (Lloyd Prichard 1969: 17). This fine balance was difficult to achieve, especially within the rough Wellington geography, and rural
sections were subsequently located far from the city in places such as the Hutt Valley.

**Town Belt**

The concept of a town belt was conceived in Britain in the early 19th century. But it was in the colonies of Australia and New Zealand that the idea was first applied (Pollock 2012). Wellington’s town belt was made up of 625 hectares of green space that encircled the original colony. It served to frame the urban environment of town acres destined for improvement with space for recreation and resource exploitation. It therefore served to define the urban from the rural or the wilderness beyond and was also intended to protect the value of the urban landscape within by preventing rapid expansion and population dispersal (Pollock 2012). This feature was applied to the other Wakefieldian settlements of Adelaide and Dunedin. They were also reserved for the cities of Christchurch and New Plymouth but the land was considered too valuable and subsequently developed (Pollock 2012).

**Native Reserves**

At the time of European colonisation the Wellington area was inhabited by Māori associated with Taranaki iwis Te Āti Awa, Ngāti Tama and Ngāti Mutunga (Maclean 2012a). The New Zealand Company arranged purchase of the land from chiefs Te Puni and Wharepōuri, although Te Rauparaha, whose Waikato iwi Ngāti Toa occupied the Kapiti area, objected to this transaction (Maclean 2012b).
Certain sections distributed throughout the colonial urban landscape of Wellington were designated ‘Native Reserves’. These sections were reserved for the occupation of Māori inhabiting the Wellington Area at the time of settlement. Some of these sections were associated with locations that were already the place of Māori habitation, such as those situated in Thorndon around Pipitea Point, the location of Pipitea pā occupied by the Te Āti Awa hapu of Te Matehou (Love 2012). A few reserves were also located in the vicinity of Te Aro pā on the shore of the harbour. However, much of this area was divided into town acres for settlers. While some reserves were situated in association with established Māori occupation and use, settler acres were distributed across much of the area used by Māori for cultivation. The space remaining to them subsequently declined in value for Wellington Māori.

Native Reserves are shown tinted green on the Mein Smith plan of 1840. It is interesting that later plans show many of the native reserves originally situated within the urban parameters changing in function. For example, reserves at Pipitea pā are described collectively as a market reserve in SO 10569 (dated to 1857). Similarly, an obvious relocation of native reserves becomes apparent in later plans with smaller inner-city reserves being replaced by larger tracts of land on the outskirts of urban settlement. However, some smaller reserves remained – Wi Tako, a Te Āti Awa leader, had retained a reserve on Lambton Beach by 1862 (SO 10632).

The native reserves theoretically relocated Māori to space that was considered less valuable to the colonists, often at the peripheries of the urban environment. However, despite a steady decline in population due to colonial pressure and consequent migration, both Pipitea and Te Aro pā continued to be occupied until the 1890s (Love 2012). The reserves established the boundaries of Māori spatial use within the colonial urban framework and provided the colonists a means of controlling the Māori cultural landscape by relegating it to increasingly smaller or more peripheral spaces.

Church Reserves
In the Mein Smith plan of 1840, sections tinted grey were reserved for ‘church missionary stations’. It is unlikely that these sections were reserved for the Anglican Church Missionary society, who actively opposed the New Zealand Company’s principles and practices regarding land appropriation and treatment of Māori (Lineham 2012). Instead, it is more likely that they were reserved generally for the use of religious institutions. However, the function of these
reserved sections quickly changed to private ownership and occupation, as demonstrated in SO 10478 (c. 1850). Later plans show the dominance of the Wesleyan denomination in Wellington city, particularly through a large reserve above Wellington Terrace. The Wesleyan-Methodist Missionary Society, established in New Zealand in the 1820s, extended its influence through the lower North Island and the South Island in the 1840s while the Church Missionary Society retained its influence in the upper North Island (Lineham 2012).

It is interesting to note that Wakefield’s view of the relationship between religion and systematic colonisation appears to have developed from the time of the South Australia settlement to the publishing of his A View of the Art of Colonisation in 1849. In his plans for the South Australian settlement Wakefield emphasised that the controlling company should not interfere with the colonists’ religious beliefs or any practices or institutions they should establish for religious practice and instruction (Wakefield 1832: 278). It is not so much that his later work contradicts this sentiment, but rather the emphasis differs. Wakefield argued that religion benefited the colony’s attempts at improvement:

‘In many parts of some colonies, there is, I may say, no religion at all; and wherever this happens the people fall into a state of barbarism. If you were asked for a summary definition of the contrast between barbarism and civilisation, you would not err in saying that civilised men differ from savages in having their natural inclinations restrained by law, honour, and religion.’ (Wakefield 1832: 839).

He therefore encouraged the provision of religious institutions in colonies and for all colonists, regardless of religious choice.

Public Building Reserves
Sections tinted grey on the Mein Smith plan of 1840 were reserved for public buildings. The buildings intended to occupy these reserves were those considered necessary for urban administration, such as government and land offices, law courts, and also public markets (Rice 2012). The reserving of land for such buildings emphasises the importance placed on the physical presence of, and the role served by, specific institutions within the urban centre. However in his plan for Adelaide Wakefield was very critical of past colonial practice of the reserving of large swathes of urban land by the government that remained unimproved and so emphasised that the government of a colony should purchase land needed for these institutions like every other colonist (Wakefield 1832: 276-277). However, he did suggest that the controlling company should have first choice of land (Wakefield 1832: 277).

Emigration Reserve
In his first discussion of systematic colonisation Wakefield suggested that each new colony
should have an ‘Agent of Emigration’ (Wakefield 1829: 180). This agent would facilitate the distribution of labour in the settlement so that the capitalist did not suffer shortages and the labourer lack of employment. He would regulate the flow of labour through reports to the home government while providing emigrants with ‘moderate provision’ until they were employed. An emigration reserve is shown on Hobson Street occupied by barracks in 1860 (SO 10632) and this was later moved to Mount Cook (Walton 2006). The barracks served the purposes Wakefield had envisioned, accommodating new arrivals until they departed to new employment.

*Hospital Reserve*
A hospital reserve is shown on Hobson Street (SO 10478; c. 1850). This reserve is indicative of the type of institution considered necessary for the urban environment, enough to warrant the annexation of valuable urban sections.

*Orphanage Reserve*
An orphanage reserve was identified beneath the Wesleyan college reserve. Assuming the orphanage was a public establishment this feature, like the hospital reserve, is evidence for the social institutions the colonists felt were necessary for their urban environment. Its proximity to the Wesleyan college reserve may indicate that it was associated with this religious institution. Either way, the presence of this feature is indicative of a sentiment of concern and responsibility for underprivileged urban inhabitants. Its presence also demonstrates the need for such an establishment in the colony, confirming the presence of those who would benefit from it.

*Military Reserve*
The association between Mt Cook and the colonial military is demonstrated by both cartographic and archaeological evidence. Mt Cook had previously functioned as a defensive pa, Puakehu, but it had been abandoned by the time of European colonisation (Walton 2006). Mein Smith recognised its advantages as a military post and approximately five years later the area had been designated as a Grant to the Ordinance Department (SO 10458, c. 1845). An adjacent section was reserved for the Secretary of State for War across Town Acres 84 and 85. Imperial troops were stationed at Mt Cook in 1843 as a result of the Wairau affray which had occurred earlier that year (Walton 2006). The site was leveled and palisades erected to protect from potential attack by Maori. Barracks and a jail were constructed on the site. The jail was destroyed by the 1848 earthquake but the barracks are still visible in SO 10632 dating to 1860. Mount Cook and its military association was intended to protect the new city from
outside threat, and possibly also provide a means of maintaining order within the city itself.

Education Areas
Several reserves for education purposes are apparent in the cartographic material. These include a land grant for a Wesleyan College above Wellington Terrace (SO 10478 and 10480, both dated to 1850), a college reserve cut into the original town belt where Wellington College is still situated today (SO 10631, dated to 1860), and smaller sites proposed for schools on Sydney Street (SO 10362, dated to 1861) and Vivian Street (SO 10569, dated to 1857). Therefore, these education areas are associated with both religious and non-religious schooling institutions. It is interesting that the non-religious college reserve appears to have been delineated from public land, whereas the Wesleyan College reserve is associated with the private Wesleyan land grant.

Education was important to Wakefield’s instructions for settlement. In planning for Adelaide Wakefield suggested that the company ‘provide a sufficient number of teachers not merely to instruct the infant and adult inhabitants to read and write, but to spread among them as far as possible, knowledge which will be useful in their new state…’ (Wakefield 1832: 278). Therefore, education was initially important to propagate methods of sustenance and production so that the colony could successfully participate in the market system intended for it. The general principles of trade and commerce were also to be important aspects of colonial education, as were the foundations of western moral and political thought (Wakefield 1832: 278).

Cemeteries
It is evident that several reserves for cemeteries were delineated in the very first years of the colony. Separate cemeteries were delineated for the interment of followers of different religions and Christian denominations. Jewish, Public, Church of England and Catholic cemeteries are evident in the cartographic material. These were all delineated from public land. These examples provide an indication of the scale of ethnic and religious diversity present in Wellington in the first years of colonisation. It is interesting to note that while these cemeteries were situated in a group the distinctions between them were considered necessary. Cemeteries provide another example of the type of institution considered necessary to the colonial urban landscape. They highlight the cultural importance of burial to colonial culture and its association with religious institutions. These features are therefore loosely associated with the church reserve features identified above and also features relating to urban health.
Botanical Gardens

The botanical gardens are another example of the importance of green space in plans for the colonial urban environment. The gardens, like the town belt, served as a resource although in a slightly different way. While the town belt provided space and raw materials to the city’s inhabitants, the botanical gardens provided a means of natural acculturation, a way to introduce familiar species of flora from home into the new environment. They also emphasise the importance of the scientific process of collection, categorisation and display. Like the town belt, the botanical gardens can be construed as a space of tamed nature acting as a buffer between the urban environment and the wilderness outside the city boundaries.

4.2. The Implementers

Location

The surveyors of Wellington placed the city on the coast of Wellington Harbour due to the location of the Thorndon and Te Aro flats. This contrasts with the location of Adelaide selected by William Light, who placed the city several miles inland from the harbour. This was due to the existence of a broad, flat river plain which Light considered congenial for urban development despite the Governor’s objections that it was too far from the harbour (Bunker 1993: 247). The haphazard circumstances surrounding the location of Wellington forced the future city onto the harbour shore where at least some flat land was available. As discussed above, the subsequent shape of the city was influenced by the valleys meandering through the surrounding hills. This plan contrasted with both the South Australian example, a symmetrical grid across the Torrens River, and the plan for the Britannia settlement, an almost identical settlement proposed for Petone and the Hutt River. The location of the city on the harbour shore was to characterise the new urban settlement through the development of ‘The Beach’, the centre of commerce and public life along the Lambton shore. This feature has become key to Wellington’s mythology and the area serves the same purpose today.

Grid Street Pattern

The gridded street plan found in so many western colonial towns was also implemented in Wellington (Figure 6). It was a staple of British colonial town planning, a hangover from colonialism by conquest and the spatial structure of military settlements (Garvin 1963: 191). The streets were laid out in a grid in as much as the irregular topography and coastline would permit. This meant that, particularly through the Newtown valley, the quadrilateral grid became triangular. Also, while streets were platted to a grid pattern the overall street plan itself was not square in the same way that it had been planned for the Britannia settlement.
The grid street pattern essentially structured and framed the distribution of sections within the urban landscape. This feature is also closely associated with traffic flow and transport. The delineated streets provided traffic routes that were sanctioned for public use. In doing this they also distinguished the space enclosed by the gridded streets as private or possessed and so not open to public thoroughfare. In this way Wellington’s grid street pattern simultaneously separated space and knitted together the urban landscape.

*Lack of Public Reserves*

Land reserved for the purpose of establishing specific institutions or providing space for specific functions appears to have been an important aspect of the intended urban landscape in the new colony. However, the change in location from Petone to Lambton and the limited flat land at this location meant that the surveyors struggled to fit the promised 1,100 town acres into the town plan. This was accomplished by sacrificing space for public reserves intended for public recreation and amenities (Ward 1929: 367).

*Subdivision*

Both the cartographic and archaeological evidence amply demonstrate the practice of subdivision occurring in the first 25 years of Wellington’s settlement. The process of subdivision was, in theory, undertaken by cooperation between private buyers and sellers and the public land office, although the confused state of land survey and registration at the time
raises questions as to how effective the land office actually was. However, subdivision appears to have occurred along the same geometric spatial patterning as the surrounding urban landscape, mirroring the gridded street pattern and section distribution. This suggests that the process was somewhat regulated. Not only did the spatial patterning mimic the wider pattern but the process did also, subdivision being a continuation of the capitalist land distribution system instituted by colonisation.

The cartographic evidence from the early years of settlement indicates that some town acres were quickly divided among occupants (Figure 7) and the archaeology of the upper Te Aro area provides further evidence of the proliferation of subdivision within a relatively small space (Furey 2010; Watson n.d.). Subdivision demonstrates that, in reality, town acres were owned and occupied by many more people than the original purchaser. Lanes and right of ways appeared where the process obstructed subdivided sections from contact with the public thoroughfares, reshaping the appearance of the urban landscape at street-level and influencing the negotiation of space off the street.

Figure 7. Detail of SO 10311 (1847) showing lots subdivided from town acres 169 and 171. Image: Quickmap.
Canal and Basin

In 1840 a small lagoon connected to the harbour by small stream was situated at the southwestern base of Mt Victoria. This feature was to be developed into a canal and basin by the colonists, as demonstrated in the original 1840 town plan and several subsequent plans. However work does not appear to have started on this development before the 1855 earthquake raised the Te Aro flat by two meters, draining the lagoon. The land was subsequently designated a public park, perhaps to relieve the lack of public space discussed above.

The canal and basin features would have provided a sheltered inland anchorage for vessels while remaining connected with the harbour. It is likely that the canal and basin were fortuitous inclusions inspired by the presence of the lagoon and stream, rather than features required by the colonial urban landscape. By transforming the natural features into something that could be useful to the important maritime connection, nature was rendered productive.

Mt Cook

The military reserve at Mt Cook has already been discussed in relation to the expected role of a military force in the colonial urban environment (Walton 2006). However, it was the surveyors who selected the abandoned pa and were responsible for the placement of the military reserve there. It is likely that the height of the ground, combined with its location at the heart of the new city, recommended the site for defensive purposes.

Coastal Reclamation

The importance of flat land in the new colony, enhanced by the lack of it in the Wellington area, has already been established. Throughout the 19th century the colonists supplied this need by leveling irregular topography and by reclaiming the coast around Lambton harbour (Figure 8). The first systematic reclamation was undertaken in 1852 (Reclamation A SO 14413). Then in 1855 the earthquake uplifted the coast providing further incentive to reclaim the coastal area for urban occupation. The earthquake also provided plenty of rubble for use in the reclamation process, as archaeological evidence from the Chew’s Lane site demonstrated (McFadgen and Clough 2009; Reclamation B SO 14413). Further work on this particular reclamation is illustrated by a harbour wall identified at the intersection of Customhouse Quay and Hunter Street (Sheppard 1987). These were official reclamation activities, in contrast to the unofficial filling of Lambton Beach with rubbish disposed over the bulwark, as demonstrated by the archaeology of the Lambton Quay and Whitmore Street corner (Grouden 2009). Reclamations C, D, E and F are also depicted in the cartographic material used in this
Once completed, the early reclamations appear to have provided space for both public and commercial use. This designation was likely influenced by the developing character of the Lambton area as the public and commercial hub of the new settlement. SO 10630 (c. 1860) demonstrates that the grid street system was extended onto Reclamations B and C which also facilitated the construction of the attached Queen’s wharf. The reclamation was named ‘Customhouse Quay’, providing an indication of the feature’s primary function. SO 10315 (n.d.) details Reclamations B and F, showing a designated reserve for a custom house and post office, a section for the Society of Oddfellows, the ‘New Wharf’ (Queens), and Plimmer’s Wharf. The latter feature is labeled Noah’s Ark, as it was colloquially referred to (McLintock 2009). Therefore, the reclamations facilitated the growing need for space in the expanding civic centre and further facilitated the connection to maritime communication and trade that fostered the commercial interests of the settlement.

_Tension with Natural Environment_

Articulating their instructions for a colonial settlement within the natural environment they
were presented with in Wellington initiated a unique relationship between the colonial surveyors and the Wellington urban landscape. The tension of this relationship is perhaps the most important component of this agency group’s association with the urban environment. Many of the features discussed here relate to the way in which the implementers negotiated this tension. The location of the city, the application of the grid street plan, the designation of Mount Cook as a military reserve, the development of the canal and basin and the reclamations are all features at the interface of the structure of urban planning and the irregularity of the physical landscape. Some natural features were incorporated into the urban landscape, such as the intended basin and canal, while others, such as streams, ridges and swamps, were simply platted over. Mumford (1961: 450) wrote of philosophical development in the 19th century rooted in contemporary changes in science and technology. The tension in the relationship between colonial town planting and the natural environment can be understood in the context of these developments which emphasised a ‘rigorous concept of mathematical order’ derived from astronomical study and the ‘physical process of breaking up and destruction which had become part of routine scientific investigation’ (Mumford 1961: 450).

4.3. The Negotiators

Tension with Natural Environment

It was not only the implementers that struggled with the obstacles they saw in the natural environment. This tension also affected the settlers for whom the implementers had platted the urban landscape. The settlers directly engaged with the natural environment on a smaller scale, grappling with the physical reality of their purchased town acres. The implementers had supplied a blueprint of abstract boundaries and the negotiators had the task of physically manifesting what this blueprint dictated. Like the implementers, the negotiators’ relationship with their patch of earth was characterised by a combination of destruction and acceptance. For example, the bedrock at Windy Point was benched to fill and flatten the ground before residences were constructed. This was identified during an archaeological investigation on Willis Street (Jones 2011). Ground leveling was also identified during the archaeological investigation of 3 Pipitea Street (Campbell 2009; Figure 9). However at the same site native timber had been used in the construction of house piles, demonstrating the exploitation of local resources. At the Willis-Boulcott Street site residents took advantage of the natural stream and gully as both a water source and for rubbish deposition, reflecting replacement of a natural feature by a structure that was considered both technologically and culturally superior (O’Keeffe 2011).
Figure 9. Foundations of the house at 3 Pipitea Street. The difference in ground level between the main room of the house and the addition on its left suggests that ground levelling occurred before construction. Image: Campbell 2009.

Roads and Tracks

There are several roads and tracks evident in the cartographic material that were not originally platted. These thoroughfares tend to be irregular in shape, in contrast to the gridded street system. For example, SO 10631 (1860) shows several tracks extending between the urban centre and the surrounding town belt (Figure 10). It is possible that these were forged by those urban inhabitants frequently accessing these areas for raw materials such as timber. It is also possible that they were created to access occupation areas outside the urban centre, such as developing suburbs or locations of rural activity such as mills and dairy farms.

Examples of this feature type were also located within the town belt (Pollock 2012). A temporary road is identified in SO 10632 (1860). Other irregular routes are also shown in this

Figure 10. Detail of SO 10631 (1860) showing an alternative track running through several town acres in south Wellington. Image: Quickmap.
plan. One appears to extend outside the urban plan through the town belt while the others run through seemingly unoccupied town acres. The latter were probably improvised thoroughfares created according to the transport needs of the urban inhabitants that used them rather than adhering to planned boundaries. They would have been forged by frequent and repeated transit along the most expedient route. These tracks therefore represent ‘as the crow flies’ routes, contrasting to the geometry of planned traffic routes. Large tracks through apparently empty town acres are shown in SO 10344 (n.d.) extending through the south of the colony in what is now Berhampore. This end of the city remained largely unoccupied until the 1870s and was used for rural purposes such as stock grazing. It is therefore possible that the tracks shown on this plan are stock routes related to cattle grazing and dairy farming around the south coast.

Private Sections
Ample cartographic and archaeological evidence indicate the way privately owned sections were used and spatially organised in the early years of colonisation. It is clear that these sections were places of primarily residential, commercial and industrial function. Sections possessing residential structures were often supplemented by gardens, buildings related to animal husbandry and other structural features. For example, SO 10338 (n.d.) shows a dwelling house on town acre 170, together with sheds, a stable, a well, a courtyard, and a large planned garden (Figure 11). Variety is evident in the manner in which private sections were arranged as well as in the residences within them. SO 10342 (n.d.) shows several small cottages and a range of commercial buildings densely packed into one town acre, town acre 147 (Figure 12). In contrast, SO 10355 (n.d.) shows large houses with extensive ornamental gardens occupying entire half acres on the Wellington Terrace (Figure 13).

Private sections also provided space for commercial and industrial premises. One of the earliest instances identified in the archaeological material was the series of frames associated with butchery at 3 and 9 Pipitea Street (Campbell 2009). A slightly later example is the extensive brickworks present at Tonks Avenue in the 1850s (Furey 2010). This was downsized less than a decade later when part of the property was redeveloped into housing, presumably due to increasing urban land value. However, commercial or industrial contexts were not necessarily exclusive of residential contexts. For example, town acre 147 was occupied by several cottages, gardens, a brewery and a butchery. In this example it is not clear whether residential and commercial structures were associated with the same owners were present in the same property. One example is the small brickworks and dwelling
Figure 11. Detail of SO 10338 (n.d.) providing an example of private section use on town acre 170. Image: Quickmap.

Figure 12. Detail of SO 10342 (n.d.) providing an alternative example of private section use on town acre 147. Image: Quickmap.

Figure 13. Detail of SO 10355 (n.d.) providing an alternative example of private section use on the Wellington terrace. Image: Quickmap.
occupying 14 Tonks Avenue (Furey 2010).

Public and Private
Examination of the cartographic and archaeological material identified a distinct difference in attitude between what was considered appropriate for public view and what was not. The gridded street system arranged the town acres so that each section was accessible from a public thoroughfare. Therefore, spatial organisation of features developed on private sections determined what was visible from the street by the public. Often structural features situated along the street front concealed other features situated behind them. Even if features were not completely obscured from public view the physical delineation of a boundary by a feature such as fencing reinforced an abstract barrier associated with private possession.

The archaeological investigation of the Wellington Hotel on Lambton Quay demonstrated that the actual hotel building fronted the street across the width of the section, reinforcing its function as a service provider (Chester 1988). Behind the building at the rear of the section features such as open drains and a privy were identified. These utilitarian features were kept private by the hotel’s public façade. Similarly, features associated with the process of burning rubbish were identified behind both the Wellington Hotel and the adjacent pub. The location of these features suggests that such an activity was considered inappropriate for public demonstration. This division between public and private was evident in residential as well as commercial contexts suggesting that the public-private division was a cultural more that extended beyond a desire to attract custom. Private dwellings were often situated on the street front thus relegating the rest of the section behind it as private. This was observed in the archeology of 174-276 Willis Street (Watson n.d.).

Furthermore, archaeology of early colonial Wellington suggests that before organised rubbish collection, rubbish was commonly disposed of behind the house or at least distanced from publicly accessed space. For example, the archaeology of the Nairn Street residence (Chester 1990), and those excavated on Vivian Street (Watson n.d.), demonstrated that rubbish was disposed of at the rear of the property. At 272 Willis Street rubbish deposition was also distanced from the right-of-way that developed due to increased subdivision (Watson n.d.). It is likely that continual subdivision over the years influenced the spatial patterning of rubbish disposal in the urban environment. The private disposal of waste associated with residential contexts contrasts with the evidence for public rubbish disposal at the Chews Lane (McFadgen and Clough 2009) and the Lambton Quay-Whitmore Street (Grouden 2009;
Figure 14) sites. Here rubbish was disposed over the sea wall onto the beach and later covered by reclamation activity. It is possible that the beach was perceived as ‘common land’ in the same way that the town belt may have been perceived as a public resource and so public disposal of waste in this space was sanctioned.

![Image of rubbish disposal onto the original seabed at the Lambton Quay-Whitmore Street site](image).

**Figure 14. Evidence of rubbish disposal onto the original seabed at the Lambton Quay-Whitmore Street site. Image: Grouden 2009.**

**Hygiene**

Mumford (1961: 474) stated that the greatest contribution of the industrial town was the push towards sanitation and public hygiene it induced as a reaction to its own flaws. This developed into a ‘cult of cleanliness’ associated with moral and aesthetic discipline (Mumford 1961: 475). Several features were identified in this research, particularly in the archaeological evidence, which attest to a concern for hygiene in early colonial Wellington. These features primarily consisted of drains, privies and wells. Early drains seem to have been installed to take advantage of natural features to prevent the accumulation of stagnant water on private sections. For example, drains identified at the Wellington Hotel site on Lambton Quay collected water from the section and drained it into the sea nearby (Chester 1988; Figure 15). Drains also may have been used to clear public thoroughfares; for example, the gradient of one of the drains identified at 26 Arthur Street suggests it drained stormwater off the road (Furey 2010).

Privies and wells both appear to have functioned as private resources associated with single households. For example, during the archaeological investigation of 214 Vivian Street the
Figure 15. A stormwater drain uncovered at the Wellington Hotel site on Lambton Quay. This drain would have directed excess water off the site into the sea opposite. Image: Chester 1988.

well was identified at the back of the dwelling and was not accessible from the surrounding sections (Watson n.d.). Several of the privies identified in archaeological investigations appeared to have been capped in an effort to contain waste and smell (Jones 2011; Watson n.d.), and the privy at the Wellington Hotel site also appeared to have been lined to prevent pollution of the nearby well (Chester 1988). However, drains do not seem to have been treated as strictly. Many of those identified were left open and often filled with refuse (Chester 1988; Furey 2010; Watson n.d.). Furthermore, at the Willis-Boulcott Streets site rubbish was disposed of in a stream gully that had originally been a water source (O’Keeffe 2011). This gully was located directly adjacent to the well, the water source that replaced it. This echoes the public disposal of rubbish along the waterfront (Groudén 2009) which was popularly frequented.

Boundaries
Both the cartographic and archaeological material provide evidence for adherence to abstract spatial boundaries, primarily legal section delineations, by Wellington’s early settlers. However there is also evidence for the dismissal of these abstract boundaries. This is most obvious in examples of physical boundaries truncating the abstract. Both SO 10342 (n.d.) and SO 10490 (1851) provide examples of fencing crossing section boundaries. In SO 10490 it is obvious that the fencing is associated with one dwelling but extends across sections belonging to different owners (Figure 16). These provide an illustration of an atypical type of settler
engagement with the colonial purchase system highlighting the reality of absentee ownership of parts of the urban landscape and the consequent system of squatting. Such an instance was described by settler Thomas Bevan in 1841 who discovered a squatter on land purchased by his local vicar in Wales:

‘He has made himself a small house on it, and fenced for his own use, a little garden. … He has let the remainder of the acre to five others, who have built temporary huts upon it.’ (Bevan 1841?: 15).

In the archaeological evidence disconnection between abstract and physical boundaries is demonstrated by the disposal of rubbish across section boundaries or in different sections altogether. For example, at 3 and 9 Pipitea Street rubbish deposition was identified extending across the boundary of the occupied section into the unoccupied section, and 9 Pipitea Street was also used for rubbish deposition by nearby businesses (Campbell 2009). These examples suggest that abstract boundaries were ignored if the space that was to be utilised was empty or unoccupied. No examples of encroachment on occupied space have been identified.

![Figure 16. Detail of SO 10490 (n.d.) showing fencing associated with one structure extending across several lots. The fence line has been highlighted in red. Image: Quickmap.](image)

Gardens

Wakefield (1849: 827) equated cultivation with health and pleasure, suggesting that those who undertook cultivation found joy in a visible and perpetual sequence of production. There are several examples in the cartographic and archaeological evidence of urban sections being used for gardening. These gardens vary in size and are often associated with a dwelling. It is
likely that gardens provided a means of subsistence as well as surplus that could be sold at market. SO 10358 (1850) depicts a garden large enough to have functioned as a market garden, in which produce was grown specifically for sale (Figure 17). The archaeological investigation of early colonial residences at Windy Point on Willis Street demonstrated that gardening was attempted even in this inhospitable location, the gardens being in the lee of the point during a northwest wind (Jones 2011).

![Figure 17. Detail of SO 10358 (1850) showing a possible market garden. Two of the plant beds have been labelled ‘asparagus’. Image: Quickmap.](image)

The cultivation of gardens in the early urban environment of Wellington echoes a process that Wakefield appears to have intended for systematic colonisation – a combination of self-sufficiency through improvement of the land and commercialism through providing services or produce in a market system. However it is agriculture, rather than horticulture, that Wakefield commonly referred to in discussion of colonial economic and social systems. As such his discussions of combination labour tend to emphasise the role of agricultural cultivation. Nevertheless, his approval of cultivation in general, and the limited extent of urban horticulture in comparison to rural agriculture, makes it likely that gardening by colonists would have been considered appropriate for the urban environment. Gardening allowed settlers to be somewhat self-sufficient but not to the extent that they were independent of the services that the urban environment provided.

**Buildings**

The cartographic and archaeological evidence demonstrates variation in the built environment...
of early colonial Wellington. Wakefield (1849: 827) used what he saw as the colonist’s delight in the creativity of construction to argue for the benefits of colonialism for emigrants, stating that it was a pleasure for both ‘the loftiest and the meanest minds’. This joy in building was also used to justifying why housing was not provided by the colonial government but was rather the role of private enterprise (Wakefield 1849: 827).

Variety in the built environment of Wellington is evident in all sorts of aspects, from materials used to architectural style, but it is the function and role of buildings that is of most interest to this research. The structures of Wellington’s early urban landscape primarily served residential, industrial, commercial, public and social functions. Examples from the cartographic material alone include the brewery on Wellington Terrace (SO 10632 dated to 1860); a theatre, a pub, a billiard room, several stores, private dwellings, a Freemason’s tavern, a bakery, an exchange, a counting house, and even an alms house on Lambton Beach (SO 10321 (n.d.); 10336 (n.d.); 10314 (n.d.)); the Thistle Inn on Mulgrave Street, still extant today (SO10363 (n.d.)); a club house on Thorndon Quay (SO 10363 (n.d.)); the Independents’ chapel on Woodward Street (SO 10370 (n.d.)); and a ‘Scotch kirk’ on the Customhouse reclamation (SO 10315 (n.d.)).

Clustering of construction can also be identified in the cartographic material, with dense construction along Lambton Beach from Thorndon to Te Aro, and south through the centre of the Te Aro flat. Construction is more disparate towards the south coast and east around Oriental Bay. This clustering, and the function of buildings in the area, demonstrates that Lambton and Thorndon were the commercial and public hub of the urban landscape. The buildings in this area appear to have functioned as service providers, whether this was the sale of goods or the provision of accommodation or entertainment. As a result public buildings such as the exchange and the post office were developed in this area (SO 10315 (n.d.)).

The archaeological evidence supplements the cartographic material with further detail including an abundance of features associated with the proliferation of construction in the early years of the city. These consist of collections of postholes and piles (Campbell 2009; Chester 1988; Furey 2010; Watson n.d.), foundations (Campbell 2009; Furey 2010; McFadgen and Clough 2009; Watson n.d.), and occasional brick structural features (Chester 1988; Furey 2010; Grouden 2011; Jones 2011; O’Keeffe 2011; Watson n.d.; Figure 18). It was often difficult to associate these features with known structures, suggesting that the built environment consisted of more than what is represented in the cartographic material. One
archaeological context that attests to the early colonial construction boom is the brickworks at 1, 3 and 5 Tonks Ave (Furey 2010). While extensive, this factory was short-lived, being downsized less than a decade after it was established. It is likely that the bricks produced by this factory serviced the early construction industry, and it was partially replaced by housing when such development became more profitable than brick production.

Figure 18. A brick cellar excavated at the Wellington Hotel site on Lambton Quay. Image: Chester 1988.

**Commercialism and Maritime Trade**

The location of Wellington on a harbour facilitated a strong connection between city and sea and therefore a connection with the maritime trade and communication network. While the opportunity to take advantage of this network was a result of the city’s location and that location is attributed to the directing and implementing agency groups, the negotiators also actively participated. Wellington’s early settlers helped to develop the colony’s connection with maritime trade through private enterprise. Their activity occurred on a smaller scale than other features associated with this theme, such as the coastal reclamations, but was just as important. It is represented by structural features identified in the archaeological evidence, for example, the early jetty identified in Reclamation A at the Chews’ Lane site (McFadgen and Clough 2009), and the remains of the iron store on lower Cuba Street (Grouden 2011). Both features represented small links in the connection between the harbour and the inner city.

The *Inconstant* is probably the most famous, and most eccentric, of these features (Figure 19). The barque was built in Canada in 1848 but the following year it foundered on Pencarrow
Heads (McLintock 2009; Keyes 1998). It was beached at Te Aro and subsequently purchased by John Plimmer, a colonist and businessman, in 1850. Plimmer established the barque on Lambton Beach and transformed it into a wharf, business offices, and a warehouse. This unusual structure became known as ‘Noah’s Ark’, and was accessed via a bridge built from the street. When the Reclamation B (Customhouse Quay) was undertaken the Ark became landlocked but continued to function. SO 10315 (n.d.) depicts the Ark within the reclamation with a long jetty along one side. It was not demolished until 1893. ‘Noah’s Ark’ was a unique feature of early Wellington commercialism and illustrates the ingenuity of colonial capitalists.


Ruralism

It is evident that settlement density throughout the urban landscape was patchy. Some areas were very built up while others remained unoccupied. The lack of connection between the colony’s urban and rural sections, due to the irregular geography of the Wellington region, has also been previously alluded to.

The cartographic material examined indicates that activity typically understood as rural was undertaken in close proximity to, if not even within, the urban boundaries of Wellington. For example, in SO 10631 (c. 1860) stockyards are depicted in large sections adjacent to the urban boundaries (Figure 20). This possibly demonstrates the use of the immediate vicinity for large-scale cattle grazing or dairying. It is also possible that these were used as sale yards where stock was purchased for the urban meat supply. Similarly, SO 10633 (1860) depicts ‘Upland Farm’ directly adjacent to the urban settlement. In examination of the negotiation of
boundaries by settlers it became evident that unoccupied land was quickly taken advantage of despite legal rights of title. This appears to have occurred on a larger scale around the southern edge of the city where farming was being undertaken despite the location of rural sections in the Hutt Valley.

While demarcation of urban and rural sections was direct, suggesting a clear functional difference, it is possible that in reality the delineation wasn’t such a strict expectation. Even Wakefield (1832: 276) suggested that, while land should not be cultivated without purchase, cattle could be grazed on free land. Therefore large tracts of unoccupied land within the city and in its immediate vicinity may have been perceived as an economic resource similar to the old English commons system. The town belt was apparently used for the same activities. Throughout the 19th and 20th century the town belt was known as the ‘dairy belt’ due to the presence of several private dairy farms within its boundaries that provided milk for urban residents (Pollock 2012).

Figure 20. Detail of SO 10631 (c. 1860) showing stock yards near the urban boundary in south Wellington. The stockyards are highlighted in red. Image: Quickmap.
5. Discussion

This chapter extends and explores the information regarding the major urban features of colonial Wellington that was collated in 4. Results by applying the theoretical framework discussed in 2. Archaeology, Urbanism and Ideology and 3. Materials and Methods. The goal of this chapter is to examine the contention that ideology, specifically the ideology of capitalism, has a causal relationship with urban form, specifically western colonial urbanism. The case study used in this research is the colony of Wellington, New Zealand, during the first 25 years of European settlement. This is a relatively recent example when viewed within a global context, but it is an example with an abundance of associated historical and archaeological material for collection and analysis. An unmistakable relationship between the colonisers (the New Zealand Company and associated British colonists) and the ideology of capitalism (specifically systematic colonisation theory) is also apparent in this context. These circumstances render the European colonisation of Wellington, and much of early European settlement in New Zealand generally, unique within a global context. This uniqueness demonstrates the potential contribution the study of New Zealand’s historical archaeology can make to the study of recent history, particularly the history of colonisation and westernisation, despite the nation’s relative ‘youth’ as it is commonly perceived.

The previous chapter, 4. Results, identified and contextualised major features of the urban environment of colonial Wellington. However, the intention of this research is to seek a broader understanding of the historical and archaeological evidence beyond an immediate context. A distinction exists between historical contextualisation and interpretation. While the former is unquestionably important the information it provides is limited, being based on historical description, and information derived from historical description inevitably remains descriptive. The necessity and value of historical contextualisation to the archaeological discipline cannot be denied, but for a meaningful interpretation of the evidence to be extrapolated this information must be extended. This is done through the examination of the relationship between the evidence and the historical context through the application of a theoretical framework. This process does not necessarily provide some kind of absolute or definitive answer. Rather, it results in a means of understanding the complexity of past human action and experience. As previously alluded to, the importance of research does not lie in being right but in contributing to an ongoing and ever-evolving discourse.

The first step towards an interpretation of the relationship between ideology and urban form
in colonial Wellington was the careful construction of a theoretical argument. This chapter will discuss the meaning of results as examined through a lens informed by specific theoretical tenets drawn from relevant disciplinary discourses. A review of this theory and the important aspects of the methodology through which it was applied are outlined. This is followed by a discussion of the way in which ideology and urbanism can be seen as engaged through the integration of evidence and theory.

5.1. Constructing the Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework used to examine evidence in this research was constructed using a series of basic suppositions that are related to each other through the context of the present research. These suppositions are summarised here and articulated in such a way as to make evident the process through which archaeological and historical material are connected to abstract concepts of ideology and urbanism.

This process of supposition is as follows:

The ideology of systematic colonisation is essentially an ideology of capitalism applied to a colonial context.

The definition of ideology adopted in this research is that developed by Burke (1999) which in turn is strongly influenced by that articulated by Karl Marx. Principal within this definition is the concept of ideology’s function in masking contradictions and antagonisms inherent in the economic and social system that is capitalism. This function is crucial to the perpetuation and reproduction of this system. This research has accepted the contention that the capitalist system possesses a strong ideological component and has identified systematic colonisation as a strongly reified version of capitalist ideology, what Burke would term a ‘sophisticated ideology’ (Burke 1999: 15). Systematic colonisation theory was firmly rooted in the capitalist system of the British Empire, as was the methodology used to facilitate the emigration of thousands of British settlers into a new environment. As such, the system was primarily concerned not only with the contemporary capitalist ideology, but with the reproduction and development of this ideology in new physical environments through the transplantation and reorganisation of human society in that environment. Therefore, it was an ideology of capitalism specific to the context of colonialism which had reached its height in the British Empire of the 19th century.

Systematic colonisation advocated systemised settlement of new colonies according to specific principles. These principles were based on the capitalist ideological framework. Land
sales had to be facilitated at the ‘right price’, colonial society was to be formed from the appropriate classes of people, and the colonial economy was to depend on the establishment of the appropriate industries organised within the system outlined by the theory. This was all intended to successfully reproduce the capitalist social and economic system of Britain, albeit along highly idealised lines. Systematic colonisation was therefore a sophisticated ideology deeply entrenched in a wider ideological tradition of imperial capitalism. It was used to convince prospective immigrants and investors of the wisdom in perpetuating these ideological traditions while masking with idealism the antagonism inherent in the reproduction of the capitalist system. The colonial context was crucial to the success of this reproduction. Experimentation with colonialism had been occurring and developing in the 200 years prior to the large-scale European colonisation of New Zealand and was reaching a crescendo in the American west at the same time as the initiation of systematised colonisation of New Zealand. This American frontier, along with those in Australia and New Zealand, provided the opportunity for the application of this ideological process.

Central to both capitalism and colonialism at the time was the perception of land as material. The relationship between land and concepts of materialism and possession was rooted in Lockean ideas of improvement facilitating ownership within an environment where traditional concepts of land ownership were difficult to apply, or found to be irrelevant. These ideas were developed during the early stages of the colonisation of North America and are therefore rooted in the colonial context and the associated challenges of reproducing old world systems in the new world. Locke’s thesis had a powerful influence back in Britain during the culmination of the enclosure process at home and the extension and development of the empire and its colonial processes overseas. It was during this time, and through these processes, that modern capitalism was formed. Land as personal possession became fully entrenched in the capitalistic system and this concept in turn functioned to motivate and justify further colonial undertakings. This perception was solidified under the legal term terra nullius, which distinguished colonisation from invasion in that the former described the occupation of unimproved land which, as such, could be possessed. Conversely, invasion was the occupation of improved land that was understood as owned. Gosden (2004) used the term terra nullius to define the type of colonisation that was typical of 19th century British expansion. This was an inflexible and often brutal system which adhered closely to contemporary scientific and legal empiricism. Such rigid categorisation did not often engage well with the inevitable ambiguity of circumstances inherent in the colonial process.
The strength of materialism in this context encourages the application of material culture theory in the study of ideology’s physical manifestation.

Typically an archaeological study of spatial environment that extends beyond the single site would be approached with a theoretical framework derived from landscape archaeology. This approach is often used when the subject matter is spatially extensive and varied, as opposed to self-contained and transportable material. Landscape archaeology does contribute to the theoretical framework constructed here in that this research is an examination of the spatial organisation of a colonial settlement. This research also considers the potential meanings imbued in specific spatial features and the way in which they are arranged. These meanings become part of a space by the relationship developed with that space through human activity or event. The concept of place, a socially meaningful space, is the most important contribution that landscape archaeology theory makes to the framework constructed for this research because it articulates the means by which space takes on social and cultural importance.

The connection between land and material as propogated by the terra nullius concept in the context of 19th century British colonialism suggests that material culture theory can also contribute to a meaningful understanding of colonial spatial organisation and land use. Under the colonial tenure system land was divided up into units of personal possession. Small material units, i.e. town acres, were the building blocks of the urban environment and all of them were purchased and possessed either publicly or privately. The entity formed through the conglomeration of these units, the city, can therefore also be considered a single material unit. The example of such an entity used in this research, colonial Wellington, was designed and located with intention according to the direction of a specific creative group. This differs from the romanticised and often unchallenged perception of urban development in New Zealand, which tends towards organic urban growth through the toil of intrepid pioneers and the entrepreneurial genius of roguish impresarios. In reality, Wellington was designed specifically to function as an urban centre and was therefore a city from its genesis. The intention of its design and the immediacy of that design’s application supports the concept of the city as a material entity shaped by its creators and possessors.

The integration of theoretical tenets precipitates the application of the city artefact concept to this context.

The notion of the city artefact was developed in the urban history discipline in reaction to what was perceived as an overly descriptive discourse focusing on the physicality and
architecture of the city. Only light exploration of this exact concept is evident in the archaeological literature, although there are some examples of similar use of theory (e.g. Bedford 2001). This concept advocated for an increased focus on the cultural features of the urban environment. This has similarities to the study of place in the landscape archaeology discourse in that it emphasises the process of people imbuing space with cultural meaning through engagement. Thus it becomes a place or feature of culture. Together these features form a ‘cultural landscape’ which is just as important (and arguably more so) as the physical landscape in understanding examples of urbanism.

The city artefact concept allows the urban environment to be understood as single cultural unit, a landscape of interconnected features with associated social meaning due to human agency in its creation and ongoing use. Like a typical archaeological artefact, evidence of its initial design, production and use over time can tell us much about the way in which its human creators and users engaged with the artefact, and what possible meanings they associated with its creation and function. In turn, such derived information can produce pertinent questions and possible interpretations regarding the nature of the human society with which the artefact is associated.

The city artefact concept provides a means of examining the causal relationship between ideology and the urban environment.

The notion of land as material is central to the ideology of systematic colonisation as an ideology of capitalism. According to Lockean philosophy the process of materialisation is undertaken through the process of improvement. Within the terra nullius precept, colonists can be argued to have perceived a new environment as a blank canvas, or raw material, and so urban design was theoretically free of restrictions. In the creation of the city artefact from this material the colonists undertook different roles in its design, production and use. Once the basic geometry of the urban environment was produced, this landscape was negotiated by those within it and thus continued to be shaped through this activity.

The concept of urbanism plays an important role in the neo-utopian order that was closely associated with concepts of colonialism and cultural imperialism in the 19th century and specifically instilled in systematic colonisation theory. Urbanism held connotations of improved lifestyle and civilised culture as opposed to the wilderness and the savagery of unimproved nature. It was also an important concept in Wakefieldian theory in that it was distinguished from rural. The urban centre was a centre of social improvement, an
administration centre for outlying rural areas undertaking physical improvement through industry and agricultural productivity. As such, parallels can be identified in the role of the city and the role of ideology from the colonial perspective. Both served to motivate a process of improvement, whether it be social, agricultural or industrial, and reproduce this process further afield.

The urban environment differs significantly from other types of human habitation landscapes in both physical and cultural features. This research is particularly concerned with the relationship between this ideology and urban form which logically requires a focus on urbanism. Use of the city artefact framework defines the spatial context under investigation as urban, a context that is often clearly delineated by physical boundaries such as walls or reserves. Such delineation correlates well with the representation of the city as a single material unit. The artefact analogy reinforces the notion of materialism in the study of an ideology in which materialism is a crucial tenet. The theory associated with the city artefact also reinforces the importance of the urban cultural landscape. Mumford (1961) argued that urbanism was defined by cultural features and that examination of the urban cultural landscape has the greatest potential to aid in understanding the nature of urbanism. If social and cultural meaning was expressed through this cultural landscape by those who engaged with it, it is logical that this landscape will reflect the way in which those same people engaged with the social and cultural phenomenon of ideology. In short, the city artefact concept presents the integration of urbanism and cultural expression in a format that lends itself well to analysis and interpretation using archaeological method and theory. Moreover, this format correlates well with an investigation of ideology, in its focus on cultural and social meaning, and specifically with the ideology of capitalism, in its association with materialism.

5.2. Review of the Methodological Framework

As discussed, the theoretical framework constructed for this research focuses on the city artefact concept and its unique combination of cultural landscape and materialism. Such a framework encourages a macro-analytical approach to the data available in historical and archaeological sources. This involved an assessment of major features and trends evident in the source material and examination of their contribution to the urban environment as a single artefactual unit. This approach focused on identification, as opposed to quantification, comparison, micro-description or detailed historical contextualisation, and so discouraged a plethora of variation that would have proved unmanageable in this research context. It would also have proved inappropriate to an approach that aims to extend understanding of the urban
cultural landscape through the application of theory beyond masses of description.

This ‘neglect’ of descriptive detail is not typical of the archaeological approach and potentially becomes vulnerable to accusations of subjectivity. Inherent subjectivity in both the materials and the methodology used in this research has already been discussed and an argument advocating a more phenomenological approach has been made. There is, perhaps, an irony in insisting that a context so closely associated with Victorian social and scientific empiricism be examined through a subjective framework. However this is also an exploration of colonial perception and what the colonists considered as neutral and universal can potentially be interpreted as an ideological projection. For example, the ideological principles expressed by the *terra nullius* concept were derived from a colonial perception of landscape as empty and neutral, a perception entirely contradictory to the reality of colonial situations.

This examination of the urban environment of colonial Wellington was made possible through the integration of various data sets within a geographic information system. The features identified were described in 4. Results and organised within a simple grouping system based on the categories of agency considered to be important to the formation of the urban environment. This system is simply a means of organising the results on the basis of primary association and is not an attempt to construct a rigid categorisation model. The urban environment was experienced by different groups in different ways and differences in agency became apparent when the nature of the identified features was examined. Three major agency groups were identified: those associated with direction, those associated with implementation, and those associated with negotiating the urban environment of colonial Wellington.

The ‘directors’ were the authors and proponents of systematic colonisation and responsible for the control (through financial capital) and facilitation of the colonisation process from the old country to the new. This group articulated ideology with the fabric of the physical landscape through the stipulation of particular spatial features, not least of which was the stipulation for an urban environment in the first place. They were the designers of the city artefact, deciding how it was to be formed, how it was to function, and what it was to mean. The ‘implementers’ articulated the directives provided by the former group with the realities of the physical environment with which they were presented. Their task was influenced by the specific ideology imbued in their directives and broader ideological influences including scientific systems and military traditions that had played important roles in the development
of the surveying and urban design disciplines. They were the craftsmen of the city artefact, materialising broad ideological instructions to form a landscape that users could understand and engage with.

The ‘negotiators’ were the vast majority of those who actually experienced the created artefact first hand. They engaged with the ideological precepts with which they were presented. Both ‘directors’ and ‘implementers’ also functioned as negotiators, but were in the minority. These people were the users of the city artefact, negotiating the space to suit and express their own needs and values. They received ideological messages through the spatial features designed by others and responded to them through means within their own control. For example, town acres previously manipulated by ‘directors’ and ‘implementers’ through their definition, delineation and location, could still be interpreted as raw material by this group. These spaces retained potential for further design and manipulation by the owner and occupier into a place imbued with relevant meaning. Byrnes (2001: 39) suggested that by engaging with the landscape created by the New Zealand Company and surveyors through the system of commodity purchase, settlers became part of the landscape. They functioned within the proffered boundaries along lines of improvement and profit as approved by the ideology that motivated the colonial process.

5.3. Colonial Wellington: Ideology and the City Artefact

The previous chapter, 4. Results, identified and described urban features evident in the historical and archaeological material. This work is extended here with a discussion of the broader meanings these features may have possessed and the ideological processes to which they may have contributed. With regard to the agency model discussed above, the features associated with the ‘director’ group have the most obvious causal relationship with the ideological precepts under discussion, as this group possessed initial creative control over the urban form of the colony. Features associated with the other groups, on the other hand, are expected to reflect how ideology, through spatial organisation, was received, interpreted, and possibly subverted. However examples of negotiation and subversion of ideology through space should not be interpreted as negating the influence of ideology on the urban cultural landscape. This research undertakes an examination of that influence in all its forms and expressions and is not an argument for the dominance of that influence in all aspects of settlement development.

In identifying the results of the data collection and organisation, several major themes became
evident. These themes were intertwined with the identified features in the same way that these features could be identified as associated with different agency group. Often aspects of the same feature contributed to the illustration of different themes. The following attempts to streamline the discussion of results and their relationship with ideology by organising the discussion thematically. The discussion considers the ways in which ideology was imbued in space and the different means by which people participated in this ideology through space, or not, as the case may be.

Improving the earth: materialisation by physical improvement.

Materialisation through improvement is a crucial aspect of the ideology identified as relevant to the colonisation of Wellington. The most obvious means of improvement, and the method that is possibly most evocative of a pioneer mythology, is the physical change and development made to the natural environment by the colonists. Wakefield articulated the details of this process for the individual settler in a rather romanticised description:

‘But, above all, the farm of the colonial settler has to be brought into being: the whole aspect of the place has to be changed by his own exertions; the forest cleared away, the drainage and irrigation instituted, the fencing originated, the house and other buildings raised from the ground after careful selection of their site, the garden planned and planted; the sheep, the cattle, the horses, event the dogs and poultry, must be introduced into the solitude…’ (Wakefield 1849: 828).

The common meaning of urban features in relation to this ideological theme is discussed here, with a focus on material land units and the perceived relationship between physical order and morality.

The primary means of physical change that the colonists employed was a system of material land units. The urban centre was the most basic and the largest of these units relevant to the urban context. The existence of an urban centre at all demonstrates its importance to, and possibly even a requisite of, terra nullius colonisation by the mid-19th century. The role of the city can be understood as a civilising influence - a centre for administration, commercialism and industry in opposition to and extending control over the rural hinterland that was to surround it. While this hinterland may be the concentration of agricultural production, the city was the centre of cultural sophistication. The importance in the perpetuation and dominance of that culture to the colonists is demonstrated in the need for an urban environment. It was this feature, more than any other, which would distil and perpetuate colonial culture.

After Petone was deemed an undesirable site due to flood risk, Wellington was eventually located on the stretch of coast between the Thorndon and Te Aro flats. Therefore the location
of the urban environment was a result of both physical and circumstantial factors. It is evident from the initial plan to settle at Petone, and the platting of Britannia, that flat land and a river as a water source were considered important features for an urban settlement. The geometry of the planned urban centre was changed drastically when it was moved over to Lambton Beach in order to take advantage of all available flat land, again demonstrating its importance. However, in doing this the river feature was yielded. This is perhaps understandable considering the trouble the Hutt River’s floodwaters had already caused. Flat terrain may have been desirable for practical reasons as it was far easier to develop an area of concentrated occupation on such terrain. However, it may have also served an ideological purpose in that it was far more easily regulated and facilitated the application of further features such as the grid system. The perceived relationship between order and morality is discussed further below.

The other major aspect of city location was the necessity for a deep harbour. Again, the need for a harbour or port may seem natural when considering the form of many cities of the modern era that still prosper today. However, it is important to emphasise the function of this feature in connecting the urban landscape with the intricate global system of maritime communication, transit and trade. This system ‘plugged in’ the city to a worldwide network of capitalist enterprise and benefited from this connection through opportunities for growth and wealth.

The entity of the urban centre was composed of a range of smaller material units. This was facilitated by the application of abstract boundaries made manifest through the strength of the land tenure system in colonial capitalist society. The grid pattern in which streets for the new city were platted, and the resulting geometry of land parcels, was the largest boundary system used in the urban landscape. This system delineated groupings of town acres and, in conjunction with the town belt, the exterior boundaries of the urban landscape. It therefore reinforced the materialisation process inherent in the settlement system, reprojecting the landscape as an ordered geometric system distinct from the variation of the natural environment and the medieval urban patterns of the old world alike. This system was strongly influenced by recent developments in military practice (see Garvin 1963), particularly that employed by the British Empire, and the ideological traditions of that culture. Early examples can be identified in the British military colonisation of Ireland in the 16th and 17th centuries. By the 19th century the system had been refined and mass-produced during British expansion. The grid system delineated geometric blocks of land which were themselves composed of the
most basic material land unit, the town acre. As indicated, these blocks of land were an acre in area, and were slotted into the urban environment side-by-side. This arrangement was sporadically sprinkled with reserve sections, often the same size and shape as the town acres so that they fitted the geometrical system or irregularly shaped ‘scaps’ resulting from the articulation of geometry within the natural terrain. The colonial city of Wellington was therefore formed from a conglomeration of material chattels – privately owned town acres and publicly owned reserves. No part of the space designated urban could be considered ‘waste’. Each segment was to function in some way beneficial to the urban landscape. Each segment was thus improved and so materialised.

The materialisation and distribution process was continued upon the advent of settlement through subdivision and sale, reducing the scale still further. More legal boundaries were applied within individual town acres according to the colonial land tenure system. This process tended to replicate the geometry dictated by the grid system. While subdivisions may have differed in size they retained the quadrilateral shape in which the town acres were originally delineated. Subdivision also demonstrated trends in the development of urban location preference. Certain town acre groupings became highly subdivided in the 25 years after colonisation while others appear to have remained undivided under single ownership. Subdivision seems to have been most common around Lambton Beach and south through the city centre. It is likely that this trend was a response to a high level of demand for land in this area, which in turn may reflect a preference for access to the shoreline and harbour and the trade and communication systems associated with these features. The combination of access to the maritime system and the accumulation of human habitation through this area would have contributed to the concentration of commercial and industrial interests that developed around the Beach and extended southwards, as is evident in both historical and archaeological sources.

The colonists intentionally included specific features of physical improvement that functioned aesthetically in the urban landscape. These features can be interpreted as playing a role in the moral maintenance of the inhabitants that engaged with them, according to a connection between order and morality in the culture’s broader ideological traditions. Praetzellis and Praetzellis (1992: 77) discussed the fostering relationship environmental beauty was understood to have with the virtue of those inhabiting that space within the edicts of Victorianism. However beauty, in this context, was understood as order and educated design as opposed to the aesthetic appeal of untamed nature.
While material land units were initially delineated by abstract boundaries, these features had a direct relationship with the natural environment. The natural landscape of the new environment must have played a part in the idealism with which the colony was advertised. Especially in comparison to the European industrial landscape so predominant at the time, the natural landscape must have held connotations of Eden compared to Gomorrah. The reaction against this grim industrialism and the social upheaval it wrought, together with contemporary scientific developments, fostered an association between nature and health, both physical and moral. Increased interaction with ‘unspoiled’ environments due to colonial expansion may have also contributed to this attitude. However, distinction can be made between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ nature. Good nature was beneficial because it was controlled. Its advantages were rung from thorough scientific investigation, and to facilitate this it needed to be tamed. In contrast bad nature, the uncontrolled wilderness, was understood as savage. If it was not tamed it could not be known scientifically and was thus rendered dark and unsafe. Such an environment was associated with ‘savage’ culture, untamed and so both unknowable and uncontrollable. This attitude was reified in colonial New Zealand by the Wastelands Act 1854 (see Schmidt 2012).

Both the town belt and the botanical gardens were important features of colonial Wellington in this respect, signifying the importance of the inclusion of green space in the urban landscape. These features, while representing the natural environment and its cultural connotations within an overwhelmingly human context, epitomised the notion of wilderness tamed. Both were associated with health, leisure and aesthetic appeal, and the botanic gardens in particular had connotations of scientific collection. They highlight a contradiction in ideals. Natural wilderness was a wholesome and appealingly romantic notion, but the reality was savage and distasteful in its potential to obstruct civilised progress. Instead it was to be subdued, and used to serve the purposes of that progression.

Lawrence and Davies (2011: 259) reference the conflicting meanings green space held for colonial users in a discussion of the Adelaide Parklands, suggesting that it held meaning as both recreational space and resource. The Wellington town belt is likely to have been similarly understood, functioning simultaneously as idealised leisure space and practical resource for timber, for example. This second function provided a means of subjugation and control and thus facilitated the intended idealised use. The botanical gardens functioned in a similar way, but the means of control was through scientific collection, dissection and classification. This reflected a broader attitude of social superiority through travel and
education. Through the inclusion of, and engagement with, such features in the urban landscape colonists could participate in cultural associations of morality and enlightenment. These features also provided a unique contribution to the general function of the urban centre as the civilised centre, and as examples of wilderness tamed.

The coastal reclamation that occurred along Lambton Beach in the early years of the colony provides a similar example of the manipulation and control of nature through science and technology. While the need for flat land around the harbour is well documented, the reclamations were also motivated by coastal uplift caused by the earthquake of 1855. The Wellington colonists manipulated the physical results of this disaster into a feature that functioned within their ideological sphere. The reclamation can be interpreted as a combination of functionalism and defiance, demonstrating that if one aspect of nature cannot be controlled the results can be used to subdue another. If the reclamations reinforced this attitude they also heightened the connection with commercialism developed in this location and its association with external maritime trade. Similarly, the canal and basin intended for construction before the 1855 earthquake demonstrate a desire to control and make productive what was likely considered wasteland. This area was very marshy and so was more difficult to materialise according to the process described above. Instead, it was to be improved by transformation into a functioning feature connected with the maritime trade and communication network.

*Urban utopia: materialisation by social improvement.*

The concept of taming the wilderness for the social and moral benefit of urban inhabitants provides a pleasing analogy for a similar process that was undertaken through social institutions. By including features of subdued nature in the initial urban plan and by demonstrating dominance over nature through the use of natural resources or the manipulation of scientific and technological systems the colonists enacted the intended effect of the urban centre as a civilising influence upon the surrounding hinterland. Wakefield, writing in the first decade of Wellington’s settlement, argued for the nurturing of the colony’s moral and social wellbeing through social institutions, following Dr. Samuel Hinds’ essay on colonisation published in 1832:

‘It contemplates a colony in short, that shall be an entire British community, and not merely one formed of British materials, - a community that shall carry away from the soil of Great Britain the manners, the institutions, the religion, the private and the public character of those whom they leave behind on it; and so carry them away as to plant them in the new soil where they settle.’

(Hinds, 1832, cited in Wakefield 1849: 817).
Physical features and improvements to the landscape can be more fully understood as social benefits. These primarily took the form of institutional features common to the ideological traditions of the colonising culture. They were physically represented in the urban landscape by buildings and specifically organised spatial formations that provided a material connection to the associated cultural meaning. In colonial Wellington this process was initiated by the delineation of designated space for the establishment of these institutions as specific reserves. The inclusion of certain institutions in the urban environment was deemed so crucial to the urban community that this was undertaken very early in the urban development process. This would imply that these institutions were considered necessary for the maintenance of colonial urban society according to general colonial values. They were a significant means of improvement to the urban environment and therefore contributed to the materialisation of the city artefact.

Among the most prominent of these institutions were religious reserves and cemeteries. Mumford (1961) regarded religion, represented by the temple, as integral to early expressions of urbanism. The physical presence of religious institutions was possibly considered just as important to the colonial city. Religious institutions reinforced the concept of the urban centre as the civilised core. Religion, particularly Christianity in this research, was important to this image of urbanism in that it was profoundly connected with an accepted system of morality and, perhaps more importantly, a system of social administration and control. Indeed, the system of Christian missions converting the cultural periphery functioned in much the same way the urban centre did, taming and improving the surrounding hinterland. Marx suggested that religion functioned as ideology (Marx 1976: 172-175) and the two concepts can be understood as intricately connected. This association may explain why religious institutions were considered important to the urban landscape in that they functioned in the perpetuation of ideological precepts.

A distinction between religions, and Christian denominations, is evident in the spatial organisation of Wellington’s urban landscape. The delineation of space for the representation of a range of sects suggests an attitude of relative tolerance and it is possible that tolerance had a role within the colonial ideology, functioning as social improvement. However, it is also possible that the variation of religious institutions represented in the urban environment was somewhat more mercenary - those institutions that could afford to invest in the urban landscape were awarded with spatial delineations. Unlike Christchurch and Dunedin, Wellington was not a New Zealand Company settlement associated with a particular religious
movement. In Wellington the actual presence of religious institutions is likely to have been more important than the faith they adhered to.

Educational, medical and general public reserves are less numerous than religious reserves in the colonial urban landscape. But they are evident nonetheless. The inclusion of these reserves is indicative of the types of social institutions considered necessary for the development and maintenance of colonial urban society. Again, these features can be associated with the civilising function of the urban centre. According to the values of colonial society it would seem that institutions for the benefit of the health, education and leisure of its inhabitants played important roles in the urban landscape. Such institutions were necessary for the definition of the urban centre as a bastion of civilised society in the wilderness, a society that cared for its inhabitants. They also served a practical purpose in rendering the urban centre attractive to potential colonists. Ready access to such institutions would represent an improved lifestyle to many colonists. To those who already enjoyed access, these institutions would be considered the basic necessities of civilised society. A new urban settlement that neglected such institutions would not have been a viable prospect.

The emulation of the institutional fabric of old world urban centres in the new colony served a broader process of social and economic reproduction. As such they functioned ideologically. These features were so crucial to the perpetuation of the system because they had come to be considered, and still are considered, the basic rights of the inhabitants of an enlightened society. Therefore, their inclusion was critical because their exclusion would have provided justification for social change.

*Opportunity for all: the appeal of personal improvement.*

The system of emigration and colonisation was touted by the New Zealand Company as beneficial to potential migrants; ‘a feast of anticipated and realised satisfaction’ (Wakefield 1849: 827). It emphasised freedom and independence for the individual, the prospect of improvement in their material circumstances through wholesome hard work or investment, and the abundant potential of the new land. Themes of individualism and material improvement were inherent to contemporary capitalism and highlight the strongly capitalistic nature of this particular colonial system. Key to this opportunity for personal improvement was access to and ownership of land. As discussed, land was crucial to concepts of colonialism because through its improvement it could be possessed, and if land was possessed then colonialism was legitimised. Possession of land was also crucial to the individual.
Through its improvement the colonist was provided with a means of production, and status as landowner. This was a benefit many had no hope of accessing in the old world. Wakefield viewed this as one of the major problems with the old world system and colonialism as the means by which to rectify it.

Aspects of spatial arrangement and use of Wellington’s urban landscape reflects the focus on land and its relationship with personal improvement within the ideology of systematic colonisation and capitalism. These features were not only the result of ideological influence, but they can be understood as functioning in the perpetuation of the ideology. If ideology is to be understood as a means of concealing contradictions in the dominant economic and social system then urban features associated with personal improvement can be understood as tools in this masking process. By representing the colonial system as beneficial to the individual they helped obscure possible antagonisms inherent in the system also.

The tradition of the grid street plan can be identified in many western colonial urban centres. Upton (1992) associated this tradition with attempts to equalise both physical and social space. The grid pattern facilitated transparency in access and neutrality in content through the division of space by regular geometry. Thus the individual was provided with space that was simultaneously personal and equal to all others. In colonial Wellington this space was constituted by the town acre. If land ownership was central to the concept of the material improvement of the individual’s material circumstances then the town acre was the principle material of this process. This unit was designed as distinctly individual and personal, intended to provide for the colonial yeoman and his nuclear family. This feature epitomised personal property.

It is evident that the personal space represented by the town acre continued to be personalised after purchase. This functioned in the materialisation process initiated by the delineation of boundaries but was also intimately connected to the person undertaking the process. By manipulating the physical environment the owner-occupier of the town acre materialised his possession in such a way that it represented himself and his values. This was done through a variety of actions. Abstract boundaries were physically manifested through fencing. Buildings were constructed, from large dwellings with ornamental gardens to small cottages with vegetable patches. Animal dwellings, commercial buildings and yards can all be identified in the historical and archaeological evidence. These features are associated with different purposes, from the functional (e.g. subsistence) to the abstract (e.g. conspicuous displays of
wealth and status). Therefore these features represent range in socio-economic status within colonial society, but all demonstrate the process of improvement, possession and personalisation.

Gardening and animal husbandry for both private and commercial purposes were identified in the evidence. However, all instances tend towards small-scale horticultural activity as opposed to large-scale agriculture common in rural contexts. These features are the urban equivalent of ‘tilling the soil’ and reinforced the image of the self-sustaining yeoman so important to the concept of individualism. Ideally, the town acre was somewhat self-sustaining. It provided the means for residence and subsistence with the potential for surplus and participation in the capitalist market system. This contrasted with the reality of British industrialism in which many were entirely disconnected from sustainable systems. The appeal of the colony, according to the ideology, lay in the idea that even urban residents were provided with the means of sustenance and improvement through land. However, while satisfaction in subsistence and small-scale capitalism was achieved, the system also attempted to ensure a more general reliance on the agricultural produce of rural industry through determining the size and distribution of town acres, thus promoting combination of labour through differentiation of employment.

The evidence indicates that many settlers functioned as expected within the boundaries delineated for them by the New Zealand Company and its surveyors. This is particularly evident when studying settler engagement with the town acre. By purchasing this unit the settler literally bought into the system, making manifest the abstract boundaries of legal land distribution through acceptance of the system and participation in the process of improvement and materialisation. This participation functioned in the reproduction of the capitalist land tenure system in the colony. The enticement of profit and an improved lifestyle through land tenure likely convinced many immigrants that participation in and adherence to the system was the best possible means of improvement of their personal circumstances and thus demonstrates the strength of the influence the ideology had on the colonists.

However, the settlers should not be understood as entirely passive in the process of receiving and perpetuating ideological messages. Instead, it would appear that they were more pragmatic, active in creating their own community and taking advantage of opportunities. For example, many settlers took advantage of the commercial appeal of Lambton Beach, literally situated at the cusp of the international maritime trade network and inland colonial expansion.
These entrepreneurs prospered by providing goods and services for the new settlement. More specifically, Plimmer’s Ark became a symbol of creative capitalism in the new colony, rendering commercial success from unlikely and unexpected sources. This narrative still resonates in Wellington today.

**Systematic regulation: features of social control.**

Some features of the urban environment can be understood as features of persuasion tempting colonists to participate in the proffered ideological system by appealing to desire for improvement in their material circumstances. Other features also served to ensure participation in ideology but by a different method. These features are more aggressive, serving to control and regulate cultural behaviour. In his plan for the South Australian colony Wakefield made several stipulations with regard to governance (Wakefield 1832: 277): that, initially, the governor’s power of legislation should be almost unlimited; but when the male population of the colony met 10, 000 a representative government should be formed; and that the whole male population aged between 16 and 60 should form a militia for the defense of the colony. Almost two decades later he reiterated the need for government control in ensuring security of property as it was the ‘indispensable foundation of wealth’ (Wakefield 1849: 801).

One of the more obvious attempts at control through spatial organisation is the delineation of native reserves. These served a similar function to nature reserves in that they identified the other within the newly constructed cultural landscape, regulating and assimilating the ‘uncivilised’ by delineating its spatial occupation. The Māori inhabitants of what became Wellington city presented the New Zealand Company with a problem regarding the ideological tenets of colonisation. Upon European arrival there was ample evidence for both occupation and improvement by Māori, such as settlements, defensive structures and horticultural cultivation. However, the New Zealand Company intended to apply the ideological approach distilled by terra nullius in order to justify colonisation and settlement of the area. This resulted in a rather confused system of ‘purchase’ and appropriation. Acknowledgement of Māori land rights was vague and vacillating, and inappropriate purchases were undertaken within the colonial ideological system of land tenure and sale. These token transactions masked far more powerful episodes of land appropriation that epitomised the terra nullius colonial process.

The delineation of native reserves in the urban environment demonstrates the colonists’
attempt to draw Māori spatial use within the same ideological system that was used to delineate European settlement. The application of abstract boundaries initiated the process of materialisation and individualisation and so land designated thus could be bought and sold from ‘individual owners’ according to the colonial system. It should be noted that Māori did not necessarily participate in this system simply because it was applied to them by the colonists. When two spatial systems operating simultaneously conflict there is likely to be friction. Survey pegs that interrupted Māori gardening were routinely pulled out and discarded and Te Aro pā on the Wellington waterfront continued to be occupied for decades while the city grew around it (Love 2012).

The way in which native reserves are expressed in the historic cartographic material, as opposed to colonial space, is indicative of the colonial attitude towards Māori space. Very little detail is expressed in any of this material to indicate how the reserves were used or occupied except for one instance of labelling (Wi Tako’s Reserve SO 10370 ). This lack of detail reinforces the attitude of marginalisation and therefore perpetuates the terra nullius perspective. The reserve boundaries were an attempt to distinguish terra nullius from occupied colonial space, which was represented by a wealth of detail reflecting the improved nature of that landscape. In creating their own cultural landscape the colonists systematically obscured another, but they were affected by the presence of the Māori cultural landscape despite attempts to marginalise it. Gosden (2005) argued that colonisers were as affected by material exchange as colonised cultures. While it is arguable whether Māori considered land as material (see Jackson & Smith 2013), the British colonisers did. By forcing the application of ideology to landscape colonisers were forced to create Māori ‘material’ and integrate it with their own cultural landscape.

In the early years of the Wellington colony the governance of the settlement was undertaken by Lieutenant Wakefield, a New Zealand Company representative. Buildings for the purposes of government administration were intended for the public reserves that were originally delineated in the city plan. While these reserves were intended for a variety of public uses they were controlled by the government. The delineation of space placed specifically under government control reinforced the influence of this body and public reserves placed throughout the urban landscape and their subsequent physical development served as symbols of that influence. One of the major symbols of central control was the delineation of a large reserve for military occupation in the heart of the city at the top of Mount Cook. This military occupation would reinforce government control, including the spatial boundaries that were
administered under the land tenure system. The delineation of the military placement took advantage of a traditionally defensive area – Mt Cook had originally been a Māori pā which was apparently abandoned at the time of colonisation. This site also possessed more abstract advantages with regard to control, being located at the centre of the colonial urban environment and higher than the civilian space. This location reinforced the military occupation as a symbol of control, providing a certain level of panopticism and differentiation from the settlement around it. This feature can be compared to the role of the citadel outlined in Mumford (1961: 28) as a distinct symbol of centralised administration and control backed by force.

Emigration barracks established by the New Zealand Company were another prominent feature of governance and system regulation observed in the evidence. These were a practical measure used to process new immigrants from the ship into settlement and employment in the new colony. This institution was designed to ease the process of colonialism but also possesses connotations of paternalism. While they did not necessarily exercise any role as extreme as indoctrination, the barracks nevertheless provided a means of regulation of the immigration process from initial contact. It is interesting that the most important function of the barracks was to transition immigrants into employment, demonstrating the emphasis placed on productivity in the new system. Waste was anathema in both the natural and the social landscape. However, it is likely that the new immigrants expected such a service of the government administration and considered such paternalism the role of the new government.

Features associated with individualism and independence, for example the grid street system and personal property, can also be interpreted as features of control. Emphasis of the individual, on separation and legal classification, discouraged settlers from seeking power in communalism. Such an emphasis connects with the connotations of scientific empiricism identified in features such as the botanical gardens in that identification and categorisation provided order and control.

*Ideology and pragmatism: designing the urban centre.*

The application of ideology to the physical landscape of the new colony proved difficult in some respects, highlighting the disconnection between legal empiricism and physical reality. This tension between the natural environment and urban design was negotiated by surveyors and settlers alike by drawing some natural features into the cultural landscape and excluding others. It is unclear how conscious those engaged in this activity were of the tension between
the cultural and physical landscape. Did they feel restricted by the ideological requirements of the design or did they consider them logical and necessary? It is likely that the more abstract connotations of features such as the grid system were not considered. Instead it would have been understood as a staple of good design due to its roots in military tradition and long use in western colonial contexts.

The ‘implementers’ had to consider the physical realities of their material and this may have precipitated a process similar to dilution. Through materialisation, that is, application to physical substance, the ideological symbol may have lost some of its intended meaning. For example, the relocation of the urban centre required major alteration to the city’s intended geometry. Surveyors were forced to use every inch of flat land available around Lambton Beach as well as the hill slopes and valleys. This contrasts to the plan of Britannia designed before Wellington had even been sighted by the New Zealand Company. This plan outlined a rectangular urban centre; a symmetrical grid spanning the Hutt River. The Adelaide settlement in South Australia was far more reminiscent of this plan than the Wellington city that eventuated. When compared to this preconception Mein Smith’s plan can be seen to be very affected by Wellington’s topography and as such is hardly an advertisement for the civilising power of colonialism against the wilderness. Subsequently, desired features such as public reserves were limited in the urban plan due to a lack of space, lessening the potential for physical reminders of centralised control.

Such instances demonstrate a disconnection between the reality of landscape and the ideological understanding of land. The physical environment of Wellington was not actually the blank canvas the colonists insisted on treating it. This disconnection is reflected in the relationship between ideology and colonial society. While many of the attempts at shaping society along ideological lines were successful, those who participated in it were not passive and as such variation occurred.

The articulation of ideological precepts within the physical environment highlights the reality of the application of ideology in this particular colonial context. That ideology can be understood by examining the resulting cultural landscape indicates that the ‘implementers’ were relatively successful despite physical restrictions. While aspects of the town plan diverged from the original precepts the subsequent effect may have reinforced other ideological aspects. For example, the location of the city along the Lambton coast resulted in reinforcing the relationship between the settlement, harbour and the international maritime
The articulation process highlighted cracks in the ideological mask. It is important to consider whether the social and economic system that made ideology necessary was perpetuated despite this, or whether such diversions amassed to effect change. It is likely neither exclusively one nor the other. Aspects of ideology may have been changed or discarded while others were perpetuated because of their perceived neutrality. As such, when the New Zealand Company finally collapsed the colony continued to be administered within the same cultural and ideological traditions.

**Participation and subversion: rejection of ideology.**

Expression of ideology has been identified in the cultural landscape of colonial Wellington. A large amount of evidence demonstrates not only expression of, but also participation in, the ideological system imbued in urban features. However, there is also evidence attesting to the subversion of this system undertaken by those who engaged with it on an everyday basis. Such evidence is not as ample as evidence for participation in ideology but it is identifiable, especially in the archaeological record. Features consist of changes made to original ideological precepts by changing the physical and cultural landscapes of the settlement. Some change was undertaken during the initial design of the settlement, motivated by necessity and the challenge of the natural environment. Further subversion is evident in the way the large settler group negotiated the cultural landscape with which they were presented.

It is likely that most instances of divergence from the ideological system imbued in the landscape were not conscious acts of subversion. Examples indicate that much of it was motivated by practical concerns and personal preferences. However, these activities occurred within a cultural environment constructed from a specific ideology. As such, the colonists were faced with the same problem encountered by the surveyors – how to apply ideology with a degree of practicality.

There are many examples of ‘appropriate’ negotiation of boundaries in the urban landscape identified in the historical and archaeological evidence. However, there are also examples of these boundaries being renegotiated. Physical delineation often truncated abstract delineation with fences being run across legal section lines. This may reflect settlers taking advantage of one of the realities of colonial occupation in Wellington, where a propensity for absentee land tenure encouraged squatting by those ‘on the ground’. Similarly, there is evidence for the
renegotiation of thoroughfares beyond those delineated in the grid street plan. These unofficial routes appear to have developed through less heavily occupied areas of the urban landscape. This suggests they were motivated by practical concerns such as providing more direct access between urban features than that provided by the gridded roads established during the platting process. However, their development demonstrates the subversion of intended traffic flow and definition between public and private space.

It is likely that the problems that plagued the land distribution and regulation system in the early years of the colony played a role in the subversion of these boundaries. In many instances it may not have been subversion so much as confusion that resulted in changes to the intended design. However, it is just as likely that many examples of subversion were intentional and if so the lack of legal enforcement by the land agency would have rendered subversion easier to carry out.

The geometric delineation of town acres and subsequent subdivision have been interpreted as a means of land materialisation and distribution. However, it is possible that excessive subdivision undermined the initial ideological intent of the delineation process. The town acre was the original single material unit with ideological connotations of individualism and self-sufficiency. By breaking this unit into increasingly smaller pieces this ideological association may have been diluted or changed. Praetzellis and Praetzellis (1992: 84-85) discussed the evolution of the ‘sunken lot’ in the urban environment of Sacramento and its potential for revealing personal negotiation of the pressure to conform to civic values. The back lot was a private context screened from public scrutiny by the physical consequences of subdivision including dense construction and narrow right-of ways. The small lots and laneways identified in Wellington’s colonial landscape are reminiscent of the urban slum landscapes that have been an important focus of historical archaeological examination and the development of archaeologies of resistance. Features recalling the old-world industrial landscapes were not congruent with the utopian aspects of the ideology that influenced the urban development of Wellington.

An example of possible subversion related to spatial function rather than delineation is the instances of ruralism within the urban landscape. The geography of the Wellington region forced the location of colonial rural sections in the Hutt Valley which were disconnected from the urban centre. The distance between urban and rural sections presented a challenge to the expected institution of land owners possessing both urban and rural holdings. As a result land
closer to the urban landscape, but outside the original urban parameters, came to be used for traditionally rural activity. An example is the running of stock around the south coast of Wellington, close to the southern extremity of the urban environment. These activities can be identified in the cartographic material associated with the urban landscape.

5.4. Systematic Colonisation and the Wellington Colony

This research demonstrates the influence ideology can have on the design of the city artefact. The influence of systematic colonisation on colonial Wellington is still recognisable in the physical and cultural landscapes of the city today. The origins of systematic colonisation can be found in the broad ideological traditions identifiable in British capitalism and imperialism of the time. While no particular manifesto of systematic colonisation exists, the central tenets of this ideology can be identified in the writings of Wakefield and the subsequent writings and actions associated with the New Zealand Company. This research has identified the ways in which ideology may have been expressed in the design and negotiation of the cultural landscape of colonial Wellington and the major ideological themes that emerged during this process. The following is a general interpretation of the role of ideology in the colonial process and the possible meaning of the ideology itself to those who engaged with it during this process.

Land has been identified as the material from which the city artefact was molded. This material was obtained through a system of purchase and appropriation. The purchase process could be interpreted as recognition of indigenous right to land, but the means of purchase was often pitiful and the transaction was often not recognised by many of those involved. Land purchase was an immediate necessity for the New Zealand Company. The ideological alternative - conquest - was unpalatable. But adhering to the ideological framework meant acknowledging evidence of materialisation in the pre-colonial landscape. The ambiguity evident in the subsequent purchase and appropriation process may have provided justification for proceeding under the terra nullius banner, in that purchases could be conveniently disregarded as placation after the fact.

Settlement development continued within the terra nullius framework, proceeding through materialisation, personalisation and possession of land. Therefore ideology functioned in perpetuating the ‘appropriate’ colonial system. The influence of capitalism allowed abstract representations of the physical landscape to be considered material and participate in the purchase process. Accordingly absentee landowners purchased sections before their
boundaries were even applied to the physical landscape. Further materialisation was undertaken through the occupation, use and negotiation of the developing cultural landscape once the abstract and physical were articulated.

The primary method of materialisation was improvement. It is necessary to consider what exactly constituted this concept. The transformation of land through agriculture was a powerful symbol of improvement in that it rendered the land productive. Agriculture provided both sustenance and surplus, nurturing both the individual and the capitalist system in which the colonist participated. However large-scale agricultural activity was inappropriate for an urban context. An examination of the relationship between ideology and the city artefact produces a more complex understanding of improvement. Improvement in the urban environment centred on civilisation and control. Subjugation of the natural environment played an important role, but within this context success in rendering space productive was also measured by the development of institutions and symbols associated with cultural dominance.

Improvement was also be understood as a personal process associated with social and moral status. Gosden (2004) highlights the importance of acknowledging the effect colonialism had on the colonists as well as the colonised, especially through engagement with material. In establishing a civilised urban centre in the wilderness complete with religious, educational, social welfare and commercial institutions, the colonists improved both the social and natural ‘wilderness’ of the new land. However, the civilisers were also improved through this process. Personal circumstances were changed through their relationship with land, that is, its possession through materialisation. Furthermore, moral virtue was achieved through participation in the civilising process. The relationship between landscape and colonial society was therefore understood as mutually beneficial. The landscape was rendered productive through materialisation and possession and society benefited from the products of that process and the effects of participation.

The emphasis on control and regulation identified in the urban cultural landscape was demonstrated both overtly, through features associated with governance and the military, and more subtly through the influence of space socialised through an ideological framework. The urban centre was considered a crystallisation of civilisation, sophistication and aesthetic appeal. However this was only made possible through a controlled process of materialisation and marginalisation. After all, civilisation could be considered synonymous with control
within this ideological framework, and labelling the process as improvement legitimised it. This contradiction suggests conditional utopianism hidden in the ideological framework. Improvement in lifestyle through the colonial process was dependent on following the rules. Applied to colonial Wellington’s urban environment this amounted to an emphasis on temperance and restriction. For example, some engagement with nature was healthy and moral, but too much was uncivilised; some engagement with the rural idyll was condoned by the colonial yeoman lifestyle, but large-scale agriculture required separation from the urban context; some acknowledgement and assimilation of indigenous culture was appropriate, but only under colonial control; some aspiration to social improvement was laudable as far as improvement of personal circumstances, but not to the degradation of the condoned social structure.

Systematic colonisation was the specific ideology associated with the European colonisation of Wellington. The theory proposed new ways of expressing an old world system in a place where the basic material of capitalism - land - had not run out. It proposed ways in which to create a successful settlement in a new environment by critiquing aspects of contemporary colonial practice and social and economic frameworks. Systematic colonisation was deeply concerned with improving contemporary processes because it was entrenched in a wider collection of cultural and ideological traditions. Aspects of these traditions can be identified in the Wellington urban landscape even if they are not specifically referenced in the rhetoric associated with systematic colonisation.

Challenging the perceived neutrality of urban form is crucial to this research. Reasons for the intentional inclusion of specific features and institutions in colonial Wellington have been thoroughly examined. Exploring culturally determined behaviour provides some possible answers, and questioning ideological motivation can extend these. Ideology attempts to ensure culture’s reproduction. Cultural features are heightened and systematised by ideology as a means of convincing people to participate and to continue to participate in the social and economic systems condoned by that culture. Marx argued that those holding social and economic control were active in the creation and dispersal of ideology to ensure the perpetuation of a system within which they were favoured (see Althusser 1977). The 19th century colonial process nurtured ideology by providing a cultural negative to colonialism’s positive. In order to perpetuate the system newly encountered environments and societies were portrayed as stereotypically savage, in need of improvement by members of a superior cultural form.
Ideology created a perception of colonial engagement that was akin to a moral obligation to perpetuate the colonial system in this new environment. Participation fostered a firm belief in the superiority of this system and the benefits it held for the colonised, or conversely, the benefits colonialism held for the colonisers. Urban features were active in the perpetuation of ideology in the Wellington colony, deflecting attention from any antagonisms inherent in the system by providing justification for participation. To not participate meant exclusion from the privileges of a civilised urban lifestyle, such as access to education and healthcare, and opportunities for personal improvement. The importation of culture by a colonising group is expected by that group and considered obvious. Therefore the intentional reproduction of aspects of British culture in the new colony can also be understood as culturally determined behaviour. However, a certain level of awareness of and reason for their reproduction probably existed. In fact, systematic colonisation actively sought to make changes to, or at least improve, aspects of the old world system in the new colony. Many colonies in other parts of the world, particularly early religious settlements, were established specifically to enact cultural change. Cultural behaviour and cultural institutions were also an important tool in the ideological process of placation by concealing this shift in emphasis with familiar cultural coating. Our understanding of these phenomena in a colonial context is enhanced by examining their relationship with ideology.

5.5. Archaeology and Ideology

Two major components of the ideological system relevant to the colonisation of Wellington have been established. These are the institutions of capitalism and colonialism, both of which functioned as ideologies in their own right. These two concepts are strongly integrated in the context under examination. Burke (1999: 15) equates ideology with a pattern of signs containing meanings and values that reproduces unequal material relationships between and among groups and conceals potential antagonisms in the interest of consensus. Capitalism is interpreted as an ideology in this way, in that resources are distributed unequally resulting in contradiction in social relations. Orser (1996: 74) chose to present capitalism as a ‘mode of production’ which defined the union of the relations and forces of production. The capitalist mode of production produced both material and abstract results, and ideology can be understood as both product of and motivation for this system. In submitting to the power of an abstract entity they were instrumental in producing, participants in capitalism reproduced the contradictions at the heart of capitalism. In turn, ideology masks the contradictions that necessitated its production.
These definitions reflect the complex, dynamic and ambiguous relationship between participants and a system that they at once create and submit to. Orser’s work has been important to historical archaeology in that it emphasised the means by which agents of capitalism established this system throughout the non-capitalist world (Orser 1996: 79). Burke (1999: 70), in turn, stated that colonialism was intrinsic to capitalist expansion, and that the acquisitiveness and competition inherent to capitalism contributed to a general ideology of appropriation associated with colonialism.

Material is a concept that connects archaeology with ideology in this research based on Gosden’s (2004) discussion of archaeology and colonialism. Materialism is intimately connected with systems of colonialism and capitalism in the context of terra nullius colonialism as defined by Gosden. Landscape also connects archaeology and ideology, particularly due to the association between land and material in this same context. The distinction between place (as socialised space) and object becomes blurred in this theoretical framework. Both materialism and landscape are major components of archaeological theory and practice. Archaeological theory and practice are then a means by which colonial cultural landscapes can be understood as influenced by ideology and a means of ideological influence. Archaeological theory provides a way of constructing questions and interpretations of the historical and archaeological material. Archaeological practice, specifically that associated with historical archaeology, provides a way of examining this evidence and organising the resulting data to which questions can be applied and interpretations extruded.

The colonial city provides an interesting opportunity for investigating the physical manifestation of an ideology of colonialism, being a specific spatial area imbued with an abundance of cultural meaning. The city artefact concept in this investigation is important in justifying an examination of the city as a single, whole unit through its major features. This is in contrast to much previous archaeological work that focuses on smaller units such as sections or even smaller artefactual units. By framing the urban centre as a city artefact one can avoid a quagmire of variation. However this could be interpreted as inattention to detail - anathema in traditional archaeological practice. The city artefact allows the application of archaeological terminology and practice to a nontraditional archaeological context. The concept has potential to be criticised for presenting the urban centre as static, disregarding urban evolution and development. However, dynamism is allowed for by the consideration on the social and cultural aspects of the urban landscape. This approach is similar to that used to understand place, as opposed to space, in the landscape archaeology discourse. Dynamism is
produced through human engagement with space, not through its basic physical development.

Justification for merging aspects of material and landscape theory lies in the way in which the city artefact and archaeological landscape concepts articulate. In this instance the landscape in question originated as a clearly defined unit, one that was an abstract cultural landscape even before it was physically manifested. This unit was applied to the natural environment, initiating the materialisation of the cultural landscape. Witcher (1999: 18) contrasted the specular landscape of cartography with the action of experiencing the landscape from within. He emphasised the importance of negotiation between empiricist objectivism (the exclusion the human subject) and cognitive idealism (the exclusion of the external reality) in any understanding of landscape. This emphasis is key to research that utilises both archaeological and cartographic information. Witcher (1999: 19) highlighted the role of perception in this mediation, this being the reception of external information and the interpretation of it through mental insight. This can also be applied to ideological processes identified in this research. For example, in the materialisation of abstract boundaries external information was translated through ideological language to produce a reality that was understood by participants in that discourse. The rules of the system were therefore enforced by perception of the physical landscape as an encoded cultural landscape.

The ideology of systematic colonisation is most obviously associated with the directing group identified in this research. However, ways in which others engaged with this ideology through both participation and subversion have also been identified. According to Marx ideology functioned as a mask by which the majority were persuaded to perpetuate the capitalist economic and social system through the obfuscation of the system’s reality (see Althusser 1977 and Leone 1984; 2010). This research has discussed the way features can be understood both as a means of enforcing ideology and as ideological masks themselves. It would appear that ideologically influenced design was in turn active in influencing those who engage with it to perpetuate the ideological message. If design is understood to influence cultural behaviour, what is the process through which this occurs? How did design and use of space in the Wellington colony influence participation in and reproduction of ideology, specifically the capitalist social and economic system?

Space was socialised in a particular way to influence those who continued to engage with it. The physical environment of urban Wellington was initially socialised by the application of abstract boundaries and the designation of specific functions to specific spaces. In this way
certain spaces were provided with social meaning relevant to those that participated in the same general cultural traditions. Space continued to be socialised by the actions that were undertaken within it by people who engaged with that space. These actions may have been associated with the originally designated function (thus demonstrating participation) or not (thus demonstrating subversion by changing or altering that function). Actions undertaken within space generate a spatial form of the action’s social meaning and repetition of that action within that space strengthens the association. Repetition of the action over time results in a perception of the space and activity as integrated. This in turn results in the perpetuation of that activity within that space. The space is therefore socialised by human activity and perception of the social meaning of that activity as integrated with the space. Space becomes place. The imbued social meaning can also result in the space actively influencing continued social activity. Therefore socialised space perpetuates both social activity and associated meaning or symbolism. If space is socialised by an activity associated with ideology the ideological meaning is perpetuated through the social influence of that space. Burke (1999: 7) argued that ideology is conditional to the reproduction of the capitalist system. Socialised space, in this case the urban cultural landscape, has been demonstrated as acting as a tool in the reproduction of capitalism and associated ideological tenets in colonial Wellington, in that it perpetuated the necessary symbolism and consequent activity.

It is important to consider the probability of this being a conscious process. It likely was conscious to an extent. The ‘directors’ selected features that they believed were important to the urban environment based on the values of their ideological system. It is possible that these features were recognised as active components of ideology, for example, as functioning in the perceived improvement and civilising processes. However, it is ambiguous whether they were recognised as tools in the perpetuation of a broader, more powerful ideology, that is, the materialisation of land to conform to the capitalist system and the consequent entrenching of this system in the new colony. It is worth remembering that those who directed the colonial process also participated in the ideology and did not merely force it upon a passive populace. It is likely that they sincerely believed the process was both necessary and beneficial, and if their own personal circumstances were improved by this process then it was condoned by the system.

It is also worth considering whether the system of ideological introduction and reproduction in the colony was generally successful. Ideology may have been perpetuated by those presented with the beginnings of socialised space, such as delineated section boundaries, but
Evidence of participation has been contrasted with examples of people ignoring or subverting the intended ideological meaning. Potential for the dilution of ideological meaning during the process of articulating cultural landscape with the physical environment has also been identified. These circumstances may present the reality of using space to imbue and express ideological meaning. The physical environment is, by definition, not abstract and therefore some compromise is necessary for its articulation with the cultural landscape. This is undertaken by the physical development of the natural environment by technology and alteration to achieve the intended expressions of social meaning.

The fact that many may not have participated in the ideological system does not mean that space remained devoid of symbolism. Subversion, intended or otherwise, of spatial meaning also resulted in the socialisation of space, just not in the way expected. The symbolism of activity outside the ideological system may also have been perpetuated. Individuals, not drones, negotiated space and meaning even if cultural conditioning may have rendered them more perceptible to particular ideological symbols. There is a possible irony in the thought that individualism was utilised as a tool to encourage participation in the ideological system but may also have fostered subversive attitudes.

Burke (1999: 13) emphasises the importance of understanding ideology as misrepresentation rather than illusion. This is due to the way in which misrepresentation presents ideology as more connected with the fabric of human lifestyles. By engaging with everyday life ideology is endowed with power in its primary functions of concealing contradictions and its own reproduction. This interpretation highlights the ambiguity of ideology. Interpreting ideology as illusion presents it as somewhat more abstract and streamlined. Ideology can be understood as possessing elements of contradiction in its definition and function. Burke (1999: 14-15) suggests that such flexibility can add power to ideology in that ambiguity facilitates its application to the variation inevitable in human society. Ambiguity has been identified in the ideological system associated with the Wellington colony, which contained half-measures and contradictions associated with an attitude of restriction.

The emphasis on the relationship between ideology and the ‘fabric’ of everyday life suggests that archaeology provides an effective means of examining ideology. One of the advantages of archaeological study is that it concerns itself with the material of human society and so offers unique insight. Ideology’s connection to everyday life renders it ambiguous and difficult to examine in a purely abstract way. By using the material filter through which
ideology was expressed archaeology is able to provide an interpretation of this expression while acknowledging its ambiguity. In the case of this research the materials examined are the features of the urban environment.

Leone (1984; 2010) presents ideology as the ‘obviousnesses of daily life’ (after Althusser 1977). This reinforces Burke’s insistence that ideology must be considered as intimately connected with the human society that both creates it and endows it with power through their submission. It also emphasises the seeming neutrality of ideology to those participating. Ideology’s ‘obviousness’ is accepted as given, without question. It is perceived as simply the best way of doing things. This is what Burke (1999: 14-15) termed unsophisticated or ‘common sense’ ideology, in contrast to sophisticated ideology, defined as a highly explicit and coherent ideological system. Both types of ideology have been identified in the urban environment of colonial Wellington. Systematic colonisation is an example of a sophisticated ideology and features of the urban landscape can be identified as direct products of the directives of this system. Features associated with the broader ideological traditions identified as influencing systematic colonisation can be understood as representing an unsophisticated ideology of ‘obviousnesses’. These features are often present in other western colonial urban contexts as they fit a broad ideological pattern that influenced British colonial episodes internationally.

One of the major consequences of Leone’s groundbreaking work on ideology in historical archaeology (Leone 1984) was the development of the dominant ideology thesis. This questioned the assumption that the ideology of the dominant group was also that of the less powerful (Abercrombie, Hill and Turner 1980). This development instigated a focus on the ‘ideology of resistance’ that particularly effected archaeological studies of colonialism. Such work argued for the coexistence of different ideologies - that material meant different things to different people and so dominant ideologies could be subverted. The importance of these theoretical developments to archaeological studies of colonialism necessitates its consideration in relation to the current research.

In this examination of ideology in colonial Wellington three general agency groups were identified that were characterised by their role in articulating ideology within urban form. While differences between the groups were identified, the groups themselves did not fall into easily defined ‘dominant’ and ‘dominated, or ‘rulers’ and ‘ruled’ categories that are commonly identified in archaeologies of resistance. In this context a controlling
administration did exist and those who chose to participate in the system submitted to this administration. However, a difference in ideology between groups is harder to identify. Elements of ideological subversion became evident during analysis but these are best understood in relation to the same ideology as that participated in by the majority. Evidence of subversion could be interpreted as both consciously and unconsciously undertaken in relation to the complex negotiation of pragmatism and idealism. While colonists may have engaged with ideology in different ways, they did not necessarily create a separate ideology of resistance.

It is important to note that resistance can be evidenced in different ways and at different levels. The way in which Māori may have responded to colonialism is more likely to fit the definition of resistance ideology developed in previous literature (e.g. Allen and Phillips 2013). Differences in the ideological traditions between the colonisers and the colonised are likely to be more distinct, particularly if they were developed in distinct cultural environments. Therefore these different ideologies are more likely to produce friction upon engagement and motivate resistance. Groups identified within the same broad colonising category may have engaged with the ideology presented to them by the urban landscape differently, but were shaped by similar ideological traditions. They can then be identified as sharing ideology but varying in their interpretation and negotiation. Such variation is not necessarily recognised as resistance.

The complexity demonstrated in the negotiation of a single ideology illustrates the flexibility inherent in such a system. Burke (1999: 14) suggests that ideology should not be considered patronising - an illusion used by one group to dupe another - but a complex system of misrepresentation that facilitates co-operation among and between groups despite an unequal social system. Similarly, Thomson (1986: 81) stressed the articulation of discourses to produce ideological effects, rather than the framing of ideology as a single, dominate influence associated with one particular group. The relationship between ideology and urban form in colonial Wellington is nuanced. Differences in the agency of ideological articulation, in the means of ideological expression, in the negotiation and interpretation of that expression, and in the major influences that formed that ideology all support an approach to ideology that acknowledges the complexity of this concept.

5.6. Ideology and Urbanism

Space is socialised through use and so gathers meaning. This meaning can proceed to
influence action associated with it. Mumford (1961: 113), when discussing the definition of ‘city’, referred to the city functioning in much the same way. The physical environment provides a medium for the storage and expression of past events and current values and Mumford stated this is one of the primary functions of the urban entity (Mumford 1961: 113). Mumford also attributed the development of social variation and subversion to the growth of the urban centre, suggesting that growing differentiation resulted in the breakdown of the city as ‘a wholly like-minded community, wholly obedient to a central control.’ (Mumford 1961: 117). Therefore, the differentiation crucial to the development of urbanism also nurtured rebellion against the institution of control it created. Mumford’s comments support the supposition central to this research that values were materialised through the physical features of urbanism and that these features functioned as tools of influence for and upon those who engaged with them. They also suggest that ambiguity and subversion are inherent in the urban context and therefore unavoidable in its study.

Features of Wellington’s urban environment have prompted discussion about the unique role played by urbanism in western ideological traditions, particularly in its function as a civilised centre, an icon of improvement. This is in direct contrast to the concept of new environments perpetuated by *terra nullius* ideology. Mumford described the concept of urban civilisation as ‘that peculiar combination of creativity and control, of expression and repression, of tension and release, whose outward manifestation has been the historic city.’ (Mumford 1961: 30). His description of the type of civilisation attached to urbanism is full of opposition. It is reminiscent of the flexibility and ambiguity Burke attributes to the concept of ideology and the tension and contradiction identified in the expression of ideology through the urban cultural landscape of colonial Wellington.

Mumford’s archetypes of urbanism - the house, shrine, spring, public way and agora (Mumford 1961: 19) - can be identified in that cultural landscape of colonial Wellington, which represents a 19th century manifestation of Mumford’s urban prototype. Mumford’s archetypes could be understood reframed as, for example, personal property, religious grants, tension with the natural environment, the grid street system, and the capitalist system of land tenure. While these examples have obviously been reinterpreted in accordance with contemporary ideology, they emphasise the same basic components of urbanism that Mumford identified in his discussion of urban evolution. If these components are to define urbanism they must also be central to an understanding of the associated concept of ‘civilisation’. As such, features that represent these aspects are key to the perpetuation of an
ideological system that emphasised civilisation and were therefore reproduced in the new colony.

As an example, the shrine or religious institution, was central to the development of urbanism in Mumford’s prototype and also a key ideological tool that functioned in system reproduction. As a developing institution religion was originally perceived to function in the reproduction of natural phenomena for social benefit, for example, a harvest for continued sustenance. Control over this system was influential in the creation of an elite. As a result religion became functional in the perpetuation of social phenomena such as the stratification and control inherent in Mumford’s urban prototype. Wellington was not a settlement motivated by religious ideology, as opposed to both Christchurch and Dunedin, but religious institutions were represented in the settlement’s cultural landscape and have been interpreted in this research as functioning within the ideological system. While the motivating ideology of Wellington had no place for an established religion, it functioned in the same way that religious ideology did in Mumford’s urban prototype, providing a systemic framework and the means to control and perpetuate that framework.

Idealism is apparent in the relationship between ideology and urban form. Mumford accredited this connection between idealism and urbanism to the city’s origins as an imagined perfection connected with spirituality:

‘Beginning as a representation of the cosmos, a means of bringing heaven down to earth, the city became a symbol of the possible. Utopia was an integral part of its original constitution, and precisely because it first took form as an ideal projection, it brought into existence realities that might have remained latent for an indefinite time in more soberly governed small communities, pitched to lower expectations and unwilling to make exertions that transcended both their workaday habits and their mundane hopes.’ (Mumford 1961: 31).

Idealism was identified in the expression of ideology in the Wellington colony. In fact, the ideological system constructed for the colonisation of Wellington relied heavily on concepts of the utopian colony produced through ideal means. This idealism was expressed through urban features that were considered important to the urban environment according to the letter of systematic colonisation. Utopianism was also strongly expressed through features of personal improvement. These features convinced potential immigrants to believe in the possibility of this ideal and represented a means by which it could be achieved.

The archetypal elements of urbanism can be understood as dynamic in their relationship to each other and their influence upon urban communities throughout time and space. Therefore,
different aspects were emphasised in different manifestations of urbanism:

‘To define the city one must look for its organizing nucleus…While the city brought together and welded into a visible unity village, shrine, stronghold, workplace and market, its character altered from region to region, from age to age, as one or another component dominated and colored the rest. But always, as a living cell, the organizing nucleus was essential to direct the growth and the organic differentiation of the whole.’ (Mumford 1961: 93).

If this structure is adopted the organising nucleus of the Wellington colony was undoubtedly the market, due to the influence of the ideology of capitalism on the colonial process. The development and extension of capitalism ‘introduced the modes of the marketplace into every quarter of the city’ (Mumford 1961: 411) through the replacement of the tangible medieval establishment by an abstract institution. As part of this process land became a commodity associated with private possession as opposed to communal stewardship (Mumford 1961: 416). By the time 19th century colonies such as Wellington were established the market formed the basis upon which the urban cultural landscape was developed through the capitalist land tenure system. The abstraction of the marketplace allowed the magnification and expansion of capitalism into an ideology that, by the 19th century, motivated and informed the colonial process.

Mumford (1961: 447) argued that the atomic individual formed the basis of the capitalist ideology, and the duty of the government became the protection of the individual’s rights, property, freedom of choice and enterprise. However, socially the system actually depended on corporate organisation and administration - control by co-operation. The colonisation of Wellington epitomises the ideological contradiction outlined by Mumford in regard to urban form. The function of ideology, concealment and reproduction, rendered the rights of the individual an ideal identified in features associated with utopianism and categorisation in Wellington’s cultural landscape. While the colonial process was controlled co-operatively the ideology of capitalism and its emphasis on the individual was used to enforce this control.

The urban context is evidently unique in its articulation of ideology. This supports the argument made by Mumford that the social core of the city is more important than its physicality in its definition. The city is ‘not alone a concentration of power, but a polarization of culture.’ (Mumford 1961: 85). As previously discussed, ideology heightens aspects of culture just as the urban centre intensifies them. This could suggest that ideological influence is more easily recognised within an urban context. This may be even truer in relation to 19th century capitalism. Capitalism developed into an ideology that motivated urban development. By the time of settlement experiments such as Wellington in the 19th century, urban
settlement had become intentional and pre-designed under capitalism’s influence. Urbanism and ideology can therefore be understood to have an intimate causal relationship. In the example of Wellington, capitalism facilitates the perception of the urban centre as an artefact of ideology. The design intention evident in Wellington’s urban form echoes the production process of commodities typical of 19th century industrialism, providing an analogy for the relationship between ideology and the city.

5.7. Urbanism and Archaeology

The rural origin of New Zealand’s colonial culture is a prevalent mythology in the nation’s historical narrative. In the past, popular history has emphasised the ‘disappointment’ of the colony’s urban environments, perceiving them as ugly, unsophisticated and inhospitable. This description is evocative, and probably true to some extent. But it misses the point in the case of colonial Wellington, instead suggesting a confused and ad hoc development. The importance of an intentionally constructed urban environment initiated at the beginning of systematised European colonisation of New Zealand should be recognised in New Zealand’s urban history. This was, in fact, the primary characteristic of urbanism during the 1850s, with the exception of Auckland, due to the New Zealand Company’s role in the proliferation of urban settlements (Whanganui, Nelson, New Plymouth, Dunedin and Christchurch). This reality seems to have been overshadowed by the ‘shanty town’ associated with the gold rushes of the next decade. Urbanism was a major ideological component of systematic colonisation with specific functions and meanings and is therefore an important aspect of New Zealand’s colonial narrative. Archaeology provides a means of challenging and reassessing this perception of New Zealand’s urban history.

The GIS project compiled for this research demonstrates the extent of urban archaeology in Wellington to date within the defined spatial and temporal parameter. The project also provides an indication of the nature of that archaeology and the issues inherent within the archaeological investigation of urban contexts. The archaeology is sporadic, dispersed, and reliant on urban development which has potential to negatively impact on the archaeological record.

Two general characteristics of the archaeological data can be identified. The first is location. Archaeological activity has been concentrated around ‘the Beach’ between Pipitea and Willis Streets, and the area intersected by Cuba, Willis and Vivian Streets and the Wellington Urban Motorway. These concentrations of activity represent modern redevelopment activity over the
last few decades. However, they also reflect the areas of concentrated settlement in the early years of the Wellington colony. More dispersed archaeological activity is evident from the collection of archaeological recording, but evidence relevant to the spatial and temporal parameters found in this information was clustered in the two identified areas. Archaeological recording also highlighted the effect urban redevelopment has had on archaeological material relevant to the spatial and temporal parameters, in that evidence of early occupation was cleared by ground levelling during the later 19th century on several sites. Considering these limitations to the archaeological record the number of archaeological sites identified as relevant to this research is considered remarkable.

The second characteristic of the archaeological data demonstrated by the GIS project is context. The archaeology is primarily associated with residential, industrial or commercial contexts. A portion is also associated with the reclamation activity that was undertaken at the Wellington waterfront in the 19th century. These contexts emphasise several important elements of early Wellington settlement, that is, the concentration of commercial activity along Lambton Beach, the spatial characteristics of residential settlement in the first years of colonisation, the importance of flat land, and the effect of seismic activity. However, a noticeable lack of archaeological detail regarding other contexts important to the colonial urban environment is missing from the archaeological record. Features associated with contexts such as government administration and control were primarily identified from the cartographic material. This highlights the value of historical archaeology methodology where integration of material sources can provide a more detailed illustration of historical circumstances.

The combination of archaeological and cartographic evidence was sufficient for an interpretation of a complex cultural landscape. Complexity and differentiation have been identified as constants of urbanism (Trigg 1972; Grove 1972) as was the function of the urban unit in providing specialised services to the surrounding hinterland. These components have been interpreted as a continuum (Tringham 1972; Smith 1972) occurring at varying levels in relation to each other but all considered definitive to the urban unit. Colonial Wellington may not have been a particularly sophisticated urban environment in comparison to international metropolises but from its founding it was intended to possess the characteristics and perform the functions generally agreed upon as definitive of urbanism. For example, Wellington was a provider of both practical and abstract service to a hinterland made up of delineated rural sections and beyond them a wilderness of ‘wasteland’ designated
for future improvement. As the centre of commercial activity and trade, and as a symbol of civilisation, it supplied both the practical and ideological tools of improvement.

Mayne and Murry (2001: 2) have lamented a general lack of intellectual framework and academic research in the field of urban archaeology. Their study of Little Lonsdale worked outwards from a household focus to the neighbourhood, city and urban contexts around the world (Mayne and Lawrence 1998; 1999; Mayne, Murray and Lawrence 2000). The Wellington Inner City Bypass project had many similarities to Little Lonsdale in that it was motivated by urban development on a similar scale. While this project successfully contextualised the archaeology with broader historical information it remained on a restricted thematic scale. The bulk of the interpretation was undertaken on a household basis with some circumstantial connections to neighbourhood and the growth of the city. Both projects investigated sites that were unusually large for urban contexts but remained entrenched in the microanalysis required by cultural heritage management protocols. The projects focused on the archaeological and historical detail of these sites, such as the minutiae of land transfer, occupation and material consumption. This microanalysis is a necessity of archaeological investigation motivated by urban redevelopment where limitation of time and resources can make it difficult to move beyond the immediate requirements of archaeological recording and contextualising to focus on broader interpretation.

In the historical archaeology of urban contexts there has been an emphasis on the urban slum context. This may be due to the heightened development such areas have undergone in cities around the world in recent decades. Areas that were once slums become gentrified as the city grows and the value of central real estate rises. Areas once marginalised become desirable. As a result, it is possible that there is a bias towards such contexts in historical archaeology because these areas are more commonly available for archaeological investigation. Despite these circumstances, the work derived from these contexts has fostered an interest in the importance of the cultural landscape of urbanism even if this interest is exclusive to the cultural landscape of the working class. For instance, Malan and van Heyningan (2001) and Bedford (2001) emphasise a contrast between official and subverted use of space by the working class as observed in this research. As in work focusing on ‘ideologies of resistance’, this work tends to explore the viewpoint of one primary agency group while the motivations and symbolism of another are only considered indirectly through a discussion of the first.

In contrast, this research considers the motivations and processes of all aspects of the colonial
group involved in the development of Wellington as an urban centre. Archaeological theory has been used to extrapolate meaning from information gained from archaeological practice and supplemented with historical sources. Construction of a theoretical framework has mitigated the absence of detail commonly derived from archaeological excavation and has facilitated a much broader focus of examination and interpretation. Archaeological theory has been applied to this wider evidence base while simultaneously retaining a uniquely archaeological perspective in considering the questions asked of this material. This has provided insight into a particular historical context for which existing archaeological evidence, and the potential for further evidence through traditional archaeological means, is restricted.
6. Conclusion

There is a certain romance that characterises the current narrative of New Zealand’s early colonial history. It is filled with evocative themes of the comedy and tragedy of culture contact, the rascals of early Russell, the doughty pioneers of the bush and the intrepid miners seeking gold and glory. This romanticism is underscored by the available sources for this period which primarily consist of notes from early explorers recorded in faded ink, pencil sketches, dreamy watercolours and blurry black and white photography. Such a notion of this period of European colonisation in New Zealand has become bound up in the country’s mythology. It contrasts with treatment of the later 19th century which tends be sharper in focus, reflecting the explosion of recorded data – photographs, literature, newspapers, government reports etc. – that accompanied this period. The ideas of ‘urbanism’ on one hand and ‘New Zealand’ on the other seem to be far more congruent in the latter context than they are in the former, both resulting from and reinforcing an understanding of developing urban civilisation from disparate and rustic beginnings.

Archaeological investigation in New Zealand has probably added to this mythology, however unintentionally, through the nature of the investigation of the colonial period. Such investigation has tended to emphasise archaeological contexts removed from the urban landscape. Cultural heritage management work, developed in the late 20th century, has been the main source of archaeological information regarding urban history in New Zealand. However such information has tended towards later 19th century contexts due to the nature of urban development. Furthermore, most cultural heritage management work has been motivated by private enterprise and the results tend towards the homogenous. This can be understood as resulting from both the increased mass-production and globalisation of the Victorian era and the limitations of archaeological investigation motivated by private enterprise. Such homogeneity is reflected in the material culture recovered, but also in less tangible aspects such as architectural style and use of space. This is not to say that the catalysts for such increased uniformity are uninteresting or unimportant to an understanding of recent history; the subject is well worth the examination it has been treated to in the archaeological literature to date.

The development of New Zealand’s historical narrative is important for many reasons, not least of which is the provision of a means by which the New Zealand public can engage with their national history. By extension it heightens interest in and enthusiasm for this history and
those aspects of tangible heritage that survive. It is not intended that this research contradict or detract from the value of this narrative. Rather it is hoped it will be enhanced by emphasising a neglected aspect of the early colonial experience. This research aims to highlight the reality of this experience by illustrating the role of urbanism in the origins of colonial settlement in this country. While such an inclusion may appear more ambiguous and untidy than a simplified mythology, it will encourage a more dynamic understanding of the past.

There has been a tendency to generalise the New Zealand Company’s role in the colonisation of New Zealand within the country’s historical narrative. This emphasises notions of unscrupulous hypocrites or deluded idealists, both motivated by capitalist expansion and personal gain. This motivation has been coloured as rather base with the benefit of hindsight. Such an illustration does not acknowledge the complexity of the Company’s experience, and does not account the many thousands of those outside the direct context of the Company who also participated in their colonial experiment. Consideration of the nature of early colonial urbanism beyond its stereotype provides further dimension to the historical narrative and potentially renders it more effective in connecting with the public, who are more likely to engage with the narrative if this complex story is somewhat humanised.

This research has discussed the way in which aspects of culture, such as historical narrative, can be streamlined and heightened to serve an ideological purpose – primarily the perpetuation of a system that is supported by such a narrative. A historical mythology can play an important role in this process through fostering emotional attachment in the subject. New Zealand’s mythology has arguably played such a role in the development of the country’s identity. However, this research also emphasises the flexibility inherent in the way ideology operates. A focal shift in the historical narrative, or merely an emphasis on further dimension or complexity, could very likely be adapted to serve an ideological purpose. The importance in such a shift is not in any potential it provides for derailing the ideological process, but in the opportunity that arises for encouraging recognition of the process itself and challenging its neutrality.

This research was initiated with three primary aims. The first, and most basic, was to examine an instance of early colonial urbanism in New Zealand through the application of archaeological method and theory. Early colonial urbanism is an aspect of New Zealand history that has been little explored archaeologically due to the difficulties inherent in
investigating this context. This was performed by assessing the causal relationship between ideology and urban form motivated by the strong association between New Zealand’s colonisation by Europeans and a sophisticated ideology. Urbanism in New Zealand is unique in that many early examples were motivated by systematic colonisation theory and were therefore considered ‘experiments’ of colonialism. Examination of the relationship between this ideology and the urbanism it engendered seemed likely to extend beyond mere description of colonial urban form to encourage a distinct interpretation of the meaning inherent in that form. Wellington, being the first settlement undertaken in New Zealand under the auspices of systematic colonisation, was selected as a suitable case study.

Secondly, in determining to examine the relationship between ideology and colonial urbanism in New Zealand this research aimed to construct a means of investigation that mitigated the difficulties of investigating early colonial urbanism archaeologically. This prompted the use of both archaeological and cartographic material, a method commonly adopted in archaeology of the historic period. The archaeological information pertaining to the context under examination was limited due to the investigative restraints, and the inclusion of cartographic material supplemented the data and amplified the information extrapolated. Furthermore, a study of urbanism necessitated a larger spatial context than that typically investigated archaeologically. Spatial analysis was therefore considered the most appropriate form of examination as opposed to traditional means of material culture analysis, and cartographic information was considered the most appropriate documentary material for such an approach. This information was integrated in a geographic information system which was considered the most appropriate tool for creating a digital palimpsest of historical spatial information.

In examining Wellington as an example of early colonial urbanism, full use was made of a wealth of information not often exploited in academic research – the unpublished ‘grey’ literature resulting from cultural heritage management investigations. Relevant information from this source was supplemented by further information derived from a cultural heritage management context, primarily archaeological information held in ArchSite. This information was synthesised to construct a base of understanding of the archaeology of early colonial Wellington. Such synthesis should be encouraged in academic research. While it does not provide the immediate satisfaction of archaeological excavation – excavation having already occurred – the grey literature represents a bank of archaeological information that due to the various constraints inherent in cultural heritage management could not necessarily be extended or explored to its full advantage at the time of investigation. Moreover, and this
cannot be sufficiently emphasised, it is often the only means of obtaining archaeological information for significant settlement contexts such as urbanism. New Zealand’s archaeology is fortunate to be subject to both heritage legislation and a government agency that in many ways works to protect archaeological data, or at least ensure its recording before destruction. These also ensure that the archaeological information derived from such activity becomes publicly accessible. All materials and tools used in this research are available to the public. The archaeological and cartographic information is available either freely or for a small cost and Quantum GIS is available as a free download.

Archaeological and cartographic information were subsequently synthesised using GIS to provide a detailed description of colonial spatial use according to the temporal and spatial parameters employed in this research. When this description was considered in light of the simple agency model constructed as a means of organising discussion it was evident that the cartographic material provided evidence of differing agency categories. The archaeological evidence, however, most commonly reflected the engagement of the negotiating group with ideology and the urban environment. This demonstrates the merit of integration between information sources, in that it includes different aspects of the society under investigation. It also highlights the importance of archaeological method and theory in illuminating the substance of daily life in the past which can help to challenge common perceptions and neutral mythologies.

The methodological approach used in this research was deliberately kept simple in an attempt to control the variation in data inevitable for such a large spatial context. Such variation had potential to overwhelm a study of this scope and detract from any meaningful interpretation of the data. An examination of the relationship between urbanism and ideology in Wellington necessitated assessment of the way in which ideology, according to the definition proffered, was expressed through urban form and continued to function. Such subject matter is filled with both ambiguity and possibility and it was considered futile and pointless to attempt to define and interrelate all possible variations that a microanalysis of the information available would produce. Macroanalysis, while ostensibly simplification, provided the flexibility needed to extract a meaningful interpretation. GIS is an incredibly useful tool in archaeology with many applicable attributes. However, use of GIS in this research was again deliberately simple. It was employed purely as the best possible method of data integration and visualisation despite its impressive analytical capabilities. Application of such analytical technique to a subject so ambiguous and ‘human’ as ideology was considered inappropriate,
although it is noted that admirable discourse in such use of GIS in archaeology is developing. The agency group construction was also kept simple. The function of this construction was to streamline analysis and interpretation. Further complexity would have been counterproductive.

The third aim of this research was the construction of a theoretical framework through which the material could be extended beyond description and contextualisation to inform a meaningful interpretation of the past. Consideration of traditional archaeological research foci and of ideological tenets resulted in the adoption of a theoretical approach that understood urban space as material. Such an approach accounted for the way in which ideology influenced colonial perception of such subjects as land, space, and the urban landscape. It therefore provided for the integration of archaeological theory and practice, with its emphasis on material analysis, with systematic colonisation and associated ideological tenets as they are interpreted in this research. The theoretical framework provided a vehicle with which to examine the relationship between these tenets and data derived from a specific example of colonial urbanism.

The theoretical framework employed insight from different academic disciplines, primarily archaeology, history and urban design. Integration of aspects of these disciplines overcame a number of challenges to exploring the relationship between urbanism, archaeology and ideology in New Zealand by providing a connecting theoretical thread. This framework facilitated an interpretive process appropriate to the specific questions asked of the material, rather than relying on habitual archaeological processes that were not necessarily appropriate. These included excavation, identification and quantification of material culture, or the single-section spatial context typical of cultural heritage management archaeology. It was not only data that was synthesised in this research but also different analytical and interpretive techniques.

The material landscape is a key concept for the interpretation of ideology and urbanism in this research. This is largely due to the archaeological context from which these subjects were approached. Often discussions of systematic colonisation in New Zealand have been addressed from the historical discipline and accordingly have emphasised the social and economic consequences of this colonial and ideological process. Focus has tended to be directed towards the tension between the New Zealand Company and the British government in New Zealand, the relationship between colonists and Maori, and the various personalities
involved. These subjects are all worthy of examination but this research developed from an archaeological perspective. Therefore it concentrates on the way in which the process and its consequences were manifested in material evidence. This research argues that space can be considered as material evidence, particularly due to the influence of ideology on the colonial perception of land and landscape. This approach is supported by an emphasis on the cultural landscape of urbanism and on material as symbolic. The archaeological approach can therefore add dimension to a theme of importance to the national narrative.

The perception of landscape as material is key to the ideological influences that the colonisation of Wellington was subject to, both systematic colonisation and the broader ideological tenets of capitalism. This research has discussed the ‘obviousnesses’ of ideology empowered by cultural tradition. In this case, these ‘obviousnesses’ were rooted in the development of British cultural, political, economic and scientific movements. Of major concern to this research were the development of British imperialism and consequent terra nullius colonialism, the process of enclosure, Victorianism and the evolution of the middle class, and scientific empiricism. Systematic colonisation itself was informed primarily by the writings of Edward Gibbon Wakefield and the consequent colonial experiments undertaken by the South Australia Company and the New Zealand Company. Wakefield postulated systematic colonisation theory and emphasised certain aspects such as the disposal of wasteland. However, he was frustratingly lacking in detail with regard to other subjects such as urbanism. It is therefore difficult to ascertain his thoughts on the subject. The closest he comes to articulating them is his rhetoric concerning the combination of labour and the importance of population density for the facilitation of separation of employment and economic growth. However, it is obvious that at some point in the process from ideology to actuality town planting occurred. This leads one to suspect that urbanism was considered an ‘obviousness’ and did not need stipulation, although it is likely that the actual urban planning was a process more associated with the companies that actuated systematic colonisation than its theorist.

Systematic colonisation presented ideology as a streamlined, reified, even logical system contextualised by the strongly positivist tenets of capitalism and terra nullius colonialism. This research proposes that ideology is ambiguous by nature and its inherent flexibility is crucial to its influence. This power in flexibility is demonstrated in the way ideology presents as obvious and logical in order to be persuasive, despite the ambiguity that allows it to influence infinitely variable circumstances. Ideology is difficult to define, the ambiguity of
what it is reflecting the ambiguity in how it operates. The definition for ideology that Burke proffered adopts aspects from Marx’s interpretation. This research, in discussing ideology, capitalism and political economy, has often referenced Marx and emphasised his interpretation of ideology as a mask that conceals contradictions in social and economic systems. It should be noted that this research is not an apology for Marxist theory, but one cannot examine such concepts without acknowledging the strength of his influence. The definition of ideology offered by Burke (1999) was considered the best understanding of ideology when considering it within an archaeological framework. Marxism is far from alien to archaeological interpretation and many historical archaeologists, including Orser (1996) and Leone (1986; 2010), have relied on Marx for contributions to their theoretical approach.

This research has achieved the initial aims outlined here and presented a thorough examination and unique interpretation of the relationship between ideology and urban form particular to early colonial Wellington. Its conclusion, reached by an analysis of spatial data, is that this relationship can be interpreted as causal. However, the ways in which this relationship was played out make for more interesting observation than such a simple absolute, and it is these aspects that this research has endeavored to explore. That the primary ideological influence motivating European colonisation in Wellington was both perpetuated and altered by those who engaged with it has been demonstrated. The urban environment was a theatre that both influenced and collected the material by-products of this engagement.

It should be acknowledged that the interpretation of ideology and urban form offered here is one particular way of understanding the urban environment of Wellington in the first 25 years of colonial settlement. This interpretation does not suggest that ideology was the sole motivating factor behind the presence of particular urban features and the design of urban form in general. Furthermore, urban features were not included simply for the transmission of particular ideological messages, and those engaging with these messages did not necessarily accept them without question. Neither is it clear to what extent those agents responsible for the inclusion of particular features were conscious of the relationship between the ideology associated with Wellington’s settlement and its developing urban form. Obviously there is a very functional justification for the inclusion of many features when cultural context is considered, such as hospitals for the sick and cemeteries to bury the dead. However, the emphasis in this research is to push past the obviousness of urban form and question why such features are considered obvious in the first place. It is in this context where an examination of the role ideology played in colonialism provides some possible answers.
A few issues concerning the material and methodology used in this research have been identified. These were primarily concerned with subjectivity, such as the reliance on second-hand interpretations of archaeology and landscape. These were constructively addressed by a discussion of the benefits of an analytical process that embraced a more phenomenological approach to archaeological analysis. That said, there are three further issues that should be mentioned. The first is the limitation on material type that the scope of this research enforced. It cannot be denied that consideration of as much information as possible regarding the subject matter provides a wider basis of investigation if such material is analysed systematically and its inclusion is justified by its contribution to a final interpretation. Unfortunately this research could not include information derived from written and pictorial sources. However, the methodological and theoretical frameworks have been constructed to benefit from the exclusion of overwhelming descriptive detail and the variation it would induce.

As a result of these limitations it was also necessary to exclude from consideration alternative perspectives of the subject matter. It was evident, in as much it could be related to individuals, that the material used in this research reflected primarily male perspectives. Both the director and implementer agency groups were exclusively male, as they represented the New Zealand Company and the Company’s surveyors and planners. While the negotiator agency group is less specific with regard to personalities, the information accompanying the archaeological material tended to emphasise male association with space. However, it is this group that has most potential to reflect female perspective and influence even if it is obscured by Victorian mores that highlighted male dominance for posterity. Finally, it is deeply regretted that this research did not have the scope to include consideration of the Maori cultural landscape, the possible ideological influences with which it was affected, and its relationship with implanted colonial urbanism. While this issue has been mentioned early in this research, it required reiteration.

If further research was to be undertaken concerning urbanism and ideology in New Zealand the relationship between Maori and colonial cultural landscapes in the urban context would be an ideal subject matter with which to extend and supplement the interpretation proffered by this research. There are other avenues of enquiry that would also further understanding of the development of urbanism in New Zealand. If Wellington was to remain the urban landscape under examination, an extension of both the temporal and spatial parameters would facilitate an interpretation of change in the urban landscape through time and space. Such an
investigation has the potential to question whether the ideological influence identified in this research continued to be perpetuated as the city developed and grew and to assess the nature of the influence at a later stage such as the turn of the 19th century. It could also assess the way in which spatial expansion and the development of suburbs was influenced by ideology.

An expansion of the parameters of the research and the inclusion of further information sources would be particularly applicable to an urban context with an associated wealth of archaeological and historical data. Since the Canterbury Earthquake of 2011 the city of Christchurch, New Zealand, has been systematically redeveloped. The colonial history of Christchurch has long been the subject of interest, particularly by local historians, and the historical data held by such institutions as the Canterbury Museum and the Christchurch City Council has helped inform the archaeological monitoring of redevelopment in accordance with the Canterbury Earthquake (Historic Places Act) Order 2011. This monitoring is steadily adding to our knowledge of the archaeology of colonial Christchurch in both spatial and material culture information. The new challenge this increase in knowledge presents is the use of this knowledge to furnish a meaningful and accessible interpretation. By producing an analysis comparable to this research, New Zealand’s heritage industry would have done its duty by the archaeology that was destroyed during redevelopment. It is hoped that this research, while much smaller in scope, could provide some inspiration towards developing an understanding of the city of Christchurch’s historic character.

A comparison of examples of urbanism accompanied by their various ideological differences would highlight the power, both effective and relative, of ideology in each instance. For example, a comparison of early Wellington with early Auckland would be revealing. Auckland was not founded by the New Zealand Company but developed by Governor Hobson, who stood in opposition to much of the New Zealand Company’s activity. Such a comparison could elucidate the influence of the particular sophisticated ideology of systematic colonisation compared to that of the broader ideological tradition that was shared by both settlements. Similarly, the method of analysis used in this research could be focused on settlements with further sophisticated ideological influence. For example, both Dunedin and Christchurch were not only influenced by systematic colonisation but also by particular religious ideologies.

To expand on the idea of comparison, it might be informative to assess the similarities and differences between ideological influences on colonial cities globally. For example, the
influence of religious ideology associated with early Puritan settlement in North America compared to later religious settlements such as Dunedin. Or the influence of Georgian order in colonial settlements of North American compared to its influence in established British cities such as Bath. Or the different ways capitalism was perpetuated in colonial settlements established by different European powers from Montreal and Buenos Aires to Sydney and Cape Town.

Ideology is a difficult topic to examine in any discipline due to its ambiguity. However, its relationship with the everyday – the way it neutralises aspects of culture until they become obvious, even mundane – lends itself well to archaeological assessment. Archaeology searches for an understanding of the past in the material debris of everyday life. This material has the potential to possess meaning and so also the potential to provide information on ideological influence in the past. As Burke put it:

‘I am not necessarily saying that every artefact must always be symbolic, but that, depending on how an artefact is used, by whom, and why, it may be. Certainly, in terms of ideology, the potential is there.’ (Burke 1999: 16-17).

The context of this research possessed strong ideological associations. Capitalism and colonialism were easily identified influences. When combined these influences created a pervading perception of land as material, emphasised a relationship between improvement and possession, and promoted an understanding of land, improvement and ownership as success. This perception provided substantiation for an archaeological analysis of larger material units formed from landscape and facilitated an examination of the relationship between urbanism and ideology. This process questioned the common understanding of archaeological evidence and the way we use this evidence to interpret the past. It also challenged the way we perceive the space within which we operate today and blurs the distinction between ‘then’ and now’ by pointing out past ideological manifestations that are recognisable in the urban environment today. The importance of some of these manifestations in the past may seem odd or irrelevant to the modern city, but many continue to be treated with a high degree of neutrality - as the logical, or simply as the most efficient, means of operation. While some aspects of ideological influence may have weakened over time, many are still perpetuated and have contributed much to New Zealand’s evolving identity.
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Appendix 1. Cultural heritage management reports included in the research.


Appendix 2. Geographic information system project for
‘Wrought into being’: An archaeological examination
of colonial ideology in Wellington, 1840-1865’. On
DVD insert at back of thesis.
Appendix 3. SO 14413 (1899) showing sequence of reclamation around the Wellington waterfront. Image: Quickmap.
Appendix 4. User guide for the operation of the GIS project ‘Wrought into being’: An archaeological examination of colonial ideology in Wellington, 1840-1865.

1. **Open the folder labelled Wellington 1840-1865 (GIS)**

   This folder contains the Quantum GIS project file (Wellington 1840-1865 (GIS).qgis) and three folders holding the information sources for that project (‘Archaeological Features’, ‘Cartographic Material’ and ‘Reserves and Reclamations’).

   The folder labeled ‘Cartographic Material’ contains the project’s base layer (the 1840 plan of Wellington created by William Mein Smith) and all the survey plans used in this project in Tiff format. The latter have been modified by the georeferencing process, and their presence in the folder is necessary for their presence in the GIS project. Each survey plan is labelled with its survey office number and date of creation and organised by decade. Those survey plans created between 1840 and 1865 but lacking a specific date are located in a folder labeled 1840-1865.

   The folder labeled ‘Archaeological Features’ contains a shape file that was created in the GIS project, and contains all information concerning the archaeological material used. Its presence in this folder is necessary for its presence in the GIS project.

   The folder labelled ‘Reserves and Reclamations’ contains a shape file that was created in the GIS project, and contains all information concerning the spatial distribution of different reserves and coastal reclamations identified in the cartographic material. Its presence in this folder is necessary for its presence in the GIS project.

2. **Open the Quantum GIS project file (Wellington 1840-1865 (GIS).qgis)**

   The base layer should be apparent in the main window. This plan presents the original distribution of streets and town acres, which are named and numbered respectively. Church Missionary Society, public and native reserves are also designated.

   The base layer, all cartographic layers and the layers containing information regarding archaeological features and reserves and reclamations are listed in the ‘Layers’ panel. If this does not open automatically it can be opened by selecting View/panels/Layers.
To view layers, select the required layer in the ‘Layers’ panel. These will appear overlaid on the base layer.

The survey plan layers are organised within the ‘Cartographic Material’ folder in the ‘Layers’ panel. Selecting the drop-down arrow on the left of this folder reveals four folders that contain survey plans organised by decade or into a general 1840-1865 folder. Each plan can be viewed across the base layer by selecting the relevant drop-down arrow and selecting the required plan.

‘Archaeological Features’ is a single vector layer that manifests as points distributed across the base layer. Each point represents an archaeological feature relevant to the spatial and temporal parameters of this project. Points are distributed according to the town acre associated with the archaeological feature. Information associated with each archaeological feature is held in an attribute table. This can be viewed by right-clicking on the ‘Archaeological Features’ layer and selecting ‘Open Attribute Table’. To view the information for a single feature, select the ‘Identify Features’ tool from the top tool bar, and use this to select the feature.

‘Reserves and Reclamations’ is a single vector layer that manifests as polygons distributed across the base layer. Each polygon represents a reserve or coastal reclamation identified in the cartographic material. Information associated with each reserve or reclamation is held in an attribute table. This can be viewed by right-clicking on the ‘Reserves and Reclamations’ layer and selecting ‘Open Attribute Table’. As some reserves occupy the same space, features have also been labelled by type within the layer itself.

3. Pan and zoom tools can be found on the top tool bar.