

Editorial

In the last analysis there is nothing to touch the enthusiasm of a head of state or prime minister for getting support for archaeology and heritage. We well remember being present at the Royal Irish Academy one evening when Charles Haughey came to look at the Derrynaflan Chalice. He was visibly moved by this beautiful object, and we wistfully compared this reaction with the predictable attitude of the then British Prime Minister, who would doubtless have conceived the idea of privatizing archaeological survey and handing it over the treasure hunters.

It was Charles Haughey who as Taoiseach in May 1991 launched the visionary Discovery Programme, which has been designed to enhance knowledge of Ireland's prehistoric and early historic past through an integrated programme of archaeological research. A panel was set up to identify the aims and strategy of the Programme under the chairmanship of Professor George Eogan of University College, Dublin, and including, in addition to leading Irish archaeologists from the whole of Hibernia, two distinguished foreign members, the ubiquitous Barry Cunliffe and Jean l'Helgouach from Brittany. The panel was assisted in its work by the National Heritage Council and the Royal Irish Academy.

The main practical aspect of the Programme, as set out in its general strategy, is 'to identify those major research questions which can most rewardingly be addressed by co-ordinated programmes of research'. The work will operate at two levels: major multidisciplinary projects will spearhead the work, but at the same time longer-term research programmes relating to other periods will be initiated.

The Late Bronze Age and Iron Age has been accepted as the initial core period, since it is felt that this period and the various transitions and intrusions that took place within it should be better understood, in particular the emergence of a complex Celtic Society. Accordingly four major projects got under way during 1992. They are spread around the country and will include studies of such notable areas as the Hill of Tara, the North Munster area (south Clare and north

Limerick), the stone forts of the Aran Islands in Galway Bay and the Ballyhoura region of north Cork and south Limerick. Directors have been appointed for these projects and support staff recruited. Work is in progress preparatory to starting campaigns of field survey and excavation in 1993.

Much stress is rightly laid in the general strategy on publication and presentation of results. In addition to high-level academic reports, it is intended that the general public will be kept fully informed of the results of the Discovery Programme. Schools will be involved, and there will be on-site facilities at excavations for both children and the general public in the form of guided tours, reconstructions and displays. Irish museums will collaborate in the mounting of special exhibitions and the academic reports will be complemented by 'popular' publications.

This remarkable initiative comes at a time when integrated archaeological research is wasting away in Europe. The impact of democracy in the former communist countries of central Europe has undermined the co-ordination of archaeological effort in these countries, usually under the aegis of the Academies of Sciences, as contributors to the Special Section in our March 1993 number will gloomily demonstrate. In France the resignation *en bloc* by the Conseil Supérieur de la Recherche Archéologique earlier this year was a protest against the stagnation in archaeological research in that country. It is clear from the latest issue of *Nouvelles de l'Archéologie* that the galloping 'privatization' of rescue archaeology in France has cut off this substantial activity from archaeological research. The same situation can be paralleled in many other countries to varying degrees. This makes the bold and enlightened Irish initiative all the more remarkable.

Irish awareness of the island's rich heritage has also been marked this year by the ratification by the Government of the Republic of the 1972 World Heritage Convention. There are

strong indications that one or more of the great Boyne Valley prehistoric monuments will be nominated to the World Heritage List in 1993. No one would seriously challenge their 'outstanding universal value', as the Convention has it. However, we shall be interested to learn of the reactions of the World Heritage Committee, which lays such stress on authenticity, when confronted with the reconstruction of Newgrange. The 1993 meeting of the World Heritage Committee in Colombia promises to be a fascinating one, since Japan has also just ratified the Convention and will be certain to nominate the archaeological site at Nara. Our interpretation of the reconstructions illustrated in the admirable new book, *The Historic City of Nara: An archaeological approach* by Tsuboi Kiyotari and Tanaka Migaku (1991. Paris: UNESCO; ISBN 9-231026-27-5), is that this nomination will provoke a major (and much needed) debate on the philosophical and technical aspects of reconstruction.

TAs we mentioned above, French archaeology is going through one of its periodical crises at the present time. On 19 June there was a *Journée d'action intersyndicale* when French professional archaeologists protested against what is described in a joint statement as *une tentative de privatisation rampante*. The State was accused of transferring responsibility for rescue excavations to developers, retaining only the right to authorize and monitor those excavations. In the view of the authors of this statement, 'Not the USA, not Japan, not even the England of Mrs Thatcher have gone so far.' This is a ringing assertion, but it does not stand up to scrutiny. In the USA state intervention is restricted to Federally owned lands or financed projects, whilst in Japan local government authorities have a supervisory function in respect of developer-funded rescue excavations. It is arguable whether the England of Mrs Thatcher and her successors has exceeded the proposed French situation or not.

One basic difference between Great Britain and France is that in the former no authorization is needed to carry out archaeological excavations anywhere save on protected (scheduled) sites and monuments. If the UK Government is to ratify the recent European Convention for the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (see ANTIQUITY 66: 287–8), of

course, it will have to accept an obligation 'to apply procedures for the authorisation and supervision of excavation and other archaeological activities . . .' (Article 3; our italics) – the 'permit to dig' that has been the bogey of 'independent' archaeologists in Britain for decades.

However, leaving aside this lacuna in UK legislation which fills professional archaeologists from other countries with horror when they heard of it, Britain certainly scores over France (and many other countries) by the close integration of its heritage protection policies with town and country planning. Article 5 of the European Convention, 'Integrated conservation of the archaeological heritage', might well serve as a description of the situation in England and Wales following the promulgation of *Policy Planning Guidance: Archaeology and Planning* (better known as PPG 16) in November 1990. This seminal document guides local planning authorities as to how they should deal with archaeology within the comprehensive UK planning process. Much of the thrust of the document is towards avoiding or minimizing the impact of development on sensitive archaeological sites through the use of prior consultation and impact assessment and application of conditions.

An independent report prepared by consultants on the operation of PPG16 in England has recently been published by English Heritage (*An evaluation of the impact of PPG 16 on archaeology and planning*, obtainable on application to Dr G J Wainwright at English Heritage) has recently been published. Its general conclusion, based on discussions with archaeologists, planners, and developers, is that PPG 16 has begun to produce a more consistent approach to archaeology in the planning process. In the case of larger developments, the principles of early consultation and the insistence by local planning authorities on archaeological assessment in advance of determining planning applications have been accepted and implemented.

The report has some reservations, particularly with regard to smaller developers, who are less aware of PPG 16 than the big operators. Attention needs to be given to the increased workload on those who provide advice on archaeological aspects of planning, a point made to us by a number of county archaeologists. There is also a need for improved briefs

and specifications to ensure fair competition between contractors bidding for archaeological work. However, the prognosis for PPG 16 is good, a view shared by all parties to the process. In sum, it looks as though Britain has produced the best response to the creeping Thatcherization which is a source of disquiet for much of the European archaeological community.

¶ One of the megaliths of English historical studies is also under threat from the effects of current government policies. The Victoria County History, which was begun in 1899 and named with her permission after Queen Victoria, represents to the highest degree the solidity and aspirations of the 19th century. It was conceived as an encyclopaedic history of the counties of England, each county to be covered in a set of volumes covering both 'general' and 'topographical' chapters, the former dealing with subjects such as prehistory and ecclesiastical and economic history (and much besides) and latter containing a comprehensive and fully referenced account of each city, town and village in the county. The aim is to produce three volumes each year. Over the past 93 years 14 county sets have been completed, and at the present time work is in progress on 12 further counties, so the task is roughly half-completed.

Since 1933 work on the VCH (as it is known to every scholar working on English history or prehistory) has been managed by the Institute of Historical Research of the University of London, greatly helped since 1947 by sponsorship from local authorities. Increasingly stringent cuts and restrictions on both university and local authority spending imposed by the present Government since 1979 threaten the future of this monumental project; as Philip Howard wrote in *The Times* recently, 'You cannot apply market forces to a long-term work of scholarship such as the VCH because most of its market is not born yet.' Nearly a million pounds is needed to get the VCH afloat, a growing proportion of which must be sought from charitable foundations and private enterprise, but both sources are being hard-pressed for funding from many comparable research and scholarly projects. British archaeologists and historians are mounting a campaign to ensure the continuance of VCH, but there are many scholars from outside Britain for whom it is a basic research tool. If you are among that

group, please do what you can to help, by identifying new sources of funding that might be tapped and sending the information to Christopher Elrington, General Editor, Victoria History of England, Institute of Historical Research, University of London, Senate House, London WC1E 7HU.

¶ Another monumental research project in Britain, programmed to last 128 years, is the experimental earthwork on Overton Down in Wiltshire. It owes its origins to discussions by a group of archaeologists and scientists in 1958–60 under the aegis of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. Essentially, it consisted of the construction of an earthwork bank and ditch using prehistoric techniques and tools within which artefacts of various materials were buried at carefully surveyed places and then monitoring it for more than a century – it must be remembered that the 1960s, like the 1890s, were a period of apparently endless prosperity stretching into the far future. Monitoring consists of regular surface inspection combined with meticulous recorded excavations of sections after 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64 and 128 years. A second earthwork was built by the Experimental Earthwork Committee at Wareham, Dorset, in 1963, to study earthwork taphonomy on a different soil type.

1992 saw the 32-year excavation at Overton Down, directed by Martin Bell of St David's University College, Lampeter, and assisted by three of its original builders (Peter Fowler, Peter Jewell and Bruce Proudfoot, who are not optimistic of being able to make much of a contribution to the next section). As an innovation the many scientific experts who advise the Committee were on site this year to lift their specimens and their immediate contexts rather than relying upon sampling by the excavators. They were eager to do so, because the scientific resource represented by the earthwork, its buried materials and the internal dynamics of its floral and faunal populations provide priceless scientific data. For the first time, too, state-of-the-art technology was used for the recording, receipt and storage of both data and materials, with computers, word-processors and photomicrographic equipment in a temporary laboratory.

Most of the materials recovered were in a better state of preservation than had been

anticipated. Preservation was better in the less biologically active chalk environment of the bank than in the turf environment of the core where, for example, textiles had completely disappeared. Surprisingly, hazel billets had survived better than oak ones; the internal structure of those with surface charring was better preserved than those without.

Although the structure itself showed few superficial signs of change since 1976, excavation revealed considerable evidence of reworking by earthworms in the fine sediment making up the bank and ditch deposits; they had also carried humus up into the clean chalk rubble of the bank. Internally, the turf core was greatly compressed, as was much of the original topsoil on which the bank was constructed.

The elegant, simple, and visionary research design of the creators of the project has stood the test of time – and passage of time is, of course, the fundamental premise of the experiment – and over the past 32 years has spawned a host of new research projects using techniques unknown when the earthwork was built. It has justly been given recognition as a Site of Special

Scientific Interest in its own right. It is also, by chance, within the Avebury World Heritage Monument, to which it should be recognized as giving additional lustre.

The civil war in what was Yugoslavia has had a devastating impact on that unhappy country's archaeological and historical heritage. However, the 'brutal and licentious soldiery' are not *ipso facto* inimical to archaeology. The advancement of archaeological knowledge has owed much in the past to military men such as Pitt Rivers, Stoffel and Yadin (not to mention Brigadier Wheeler). The special skills of military engineers have been called upon by archaeologists from Alésia to Angkor Wat to assist in reconstruction and rehabilitation work on monuments. A recent addition to the archaeological battle honours of the British Corps of Royal Engineers is Paphos, where fourteen Sappers from the Field Troop of 62 Cyprus Support Squadron R.E. have worked under archaeological supervision to raise fallen columns at the 4th-century basilica. They carefully set up a Bailey bridge over the mosaics



Newly erected columns alongside the 16th-century church of St Paul by the Pillar, Paphos.

at the east of the site to serve as access for their mobile crane, which then manoeuvred the composite columns in granite and marble back on to their bases. Our photograph shows the newly erected columns, alongside the 16th-century church of St Paul by the Pillar.

The use of soldiers (or for that matter sailors and airmen) on archaeological sites is by no means a new phenomenon: we have the happiest memories of visiting the Brezno site in Czechoslovakia many years ago to find a squad of cheerful but somewhat mesmerized conscripts excavating this complex and delicate site under the stern command of a youthful and stunning Ivana Pleinerova. The military are a source of both technical skill and healthy strength that can make a substantial contribution to work on sites in difficult terrain or where special expertise and equipment are called for. However, they have to be deployed under rigid archaeological supervision: some archaeological obscenities have been perpetrated around the world over the years using soldiers, not least in Communist countries.

TIn our March 1992 issue (66: 114) we carried a short note entitled 'Making an honest man of Oxford: good news for Mali' by Ray Inskeep of the Pitt Rivers Museum, Oxford. Ricardo J. Elia of Boston University's Office of Public Archaeology, who is Chair of the Archaeological Heritage Management Committee of US ICOMOS, writes:

Oxford University's new policy regarding authentication/dating of terracotta artefacts of West African origin is a welcome response to a problem that has vexed many archaeologists: the apparent willingness of respectable facilities like Oxford's Research Laboratory to support the art market by authenticating – for dealers, private collectors, and museums – antiquities that in all likelihood have been illegally unearthed and smuggled out of their country of origin.

According to the account published in *ANTIQUITY*, the Research Laboratory will henceforth only test West African terracotta artefacts from legal excavations and recognized museums if the artefact is accompanied by the appropriate documentation, including details of the acquisition and verifiable certificate of export from the country of origin. In addition, authentication/dating of West African objects 'will no longer be carried out for private individuals, salerooms, or commercial galleries.'

The new policy is laudable, but it contains two

restrictions, geographical and material: the Oxford Laboratory, as I read the text, will only apply the policy to 'fired clay artefacts of West African origin'. These restrictions suggest that expediency, rather than ethics, may have been behind the adoption of the new policy: one might, in fact, read in the policy a cynical response to the recent bad press Oxford has received for its authentication of antiquities looted from Mali and Ghana (see *ANTIQUITY* 65: 6–8, 904–5).

West Africa is not the only region of the world where archaeological sites are being destroyed to supply the demands of the art market, and fired clay is not the only medium. The Oxford policy would be a truly admirable statement of principle if the restrictions noted above were removed so that all objects of an archaeological or ethnographic nature, regardless of their geographical origin, were included. After all, what's good for Mali is good for everywhere else. At present, the message seems to be not that 'ethics do still count for something in Oxford,' as R.R. Inskeep claims, but that laboratories like Oxford will do something about their complicity in the art trade only after looting in a particular region reaches critical proportions and some threshold of notoriety. Clearly, by then it is too late: cultural heritage has been transformed into a commodity – cultural property.

The Oxford archaeologists who pushed for a change in the Research Laboratory's policies towards authentication/dating deserve to be congratulated for their efforts. And Oxford can take pride in opening the door, if ever so slightly, towards a truly ethical position in the area of analysing objects that may be looted from archaeological sites. Opening that door all the way would require merely the deletion of nine words from Oxford's policy ('fired clay... of West African origin... such West African') and would transform a statement engendered by expediency into a moral principle wholly consistent with the demands of science.

Ray Inskeep writes in reply:

I cannot speak in any official capacity for Oxford. As an Oxford archaeologist and an Africanist I raised the matter with the Chairman of the University's Committee for Archaeology because of my personal concerns, and was subsequently made a member of the working party set up to make recommendations to the Committee. I am in complete sympathy with Ricardo Elia's views. I must, however, tell him that the passage of even this modest reform was not achieved without resistance, on both fiscal and academic grounds. It was argued by at least one scholar that the authentication of some classes of objects, devoid of archaeological association, may be of value because it enables them to be added to the corpus of related objects to the benefit of the art historian. I fear that had the proposal been cast wider it would, for various reasons, almost certainly have been rejected. The West African objects were free from complications that surround certain

other objects of antiquity. What would help matters tremendously would be if the British Government could be persuaded to become a signatory to the 1970 UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export, and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property.

We wholeheartedly applaud Mr Inskeep's final comment: this is a course that we have constantly urged upon HMG in these columns. We feel that we should draw the attention of our Oxford colleagues to the second part of Rule 1.6 of the Code of Conduct of the Institute of Field Archaeologists, which states: 'An archaeologist shall not engage in, and shall seek to discourage, illicit or unethical dealings in antiquities'.

TIt is not ANTIQUITY policy to run a Letters to the Editor section, but we occasionally print correspondence of importance, like that quoted above, in our Editorial columns. We shall not therefore publish the full text of a letter that we received from Mr Norman H. Nail, who admits to being 75 years old and whom we know to be a stalwart amateur archaeologist in the best sense of the term. He has taken violent exception to Whitney Davis' article 'The deconstruction of intentionality in archaeology' (see ANTIQUITY 66: 334–47), which he compares with 'the disputationes of the medieval scholastics on how many angels might alight and dance on the point of a needle'. He is particularly scathing about the author's etymological derivation of the word 'archaeology' as 'the study of the logoi or "words" – more broadly, of the meanings – made by people in the past: the arche logoi', calling upon the *Oxford English Dictionary* to support his contention that this is spurious etymology and that the meaning is nearer 'a discourse . . . on ancient times or things'. On this point we have to confess to the only quality that we share with Shakespeare, that of having 'little Latin and less Greek', but we do side with Mr Nail in this: the briefest acquaintance with the history of the English language confirms that the -logy suffix has long been taken to mean discourses upon or the science of whatever the first element implies.

But Mr Nail reserves his strongest language for what he describes as 'the airless and lightless back room analysis of deconstructionism', which he castigates as being 'about as relevant to archaeology as von Däniken's space visitors'. He calls us to account for having devoted to it 14

pages of ANTIQUITY which could be used for some more relevant and useful material. We are reminded of the clash in these pages many years ago between the late David Clarke and Jacquetta Hawkes over what was then known as the New Archaeology. We believe, along with our distinguished predecessor in the Editor's chair, that there is room in archaeology for a multitude of approaches to the subject, and that the pages of ANTIQUITY should reflect that diversity. Theoretical archaeology, despite the opacity of much of its jargon, has made and will continue to make important contributions to the advancement of the subject and as such will continue to find a place in these pages.

TMention of our distinguished predecessor reminds us of Glyn's gleeful forays into the thickets of fringe archaeology and fakes. He would have been delighted to read *Frauds, myths, and mysteries: science and pseudoscience in archaeology* by Kenneth L. Feder (1990. Mountain View (CA): Mayfield Publishing Company; ISBN 0-874849-71-3). The idea was created in the mind of the author, who teaches archaeology at Central Connecticut State University, by reading an 'occult' book entitled *The morning of the magicians* which, in his own words, converted him from 'a completely credulous individual, open to all sorts of absolutely absurd ideas, to a scientific rationalist, still open to the possibility of all sorts of absolutely absurd ideas, but demanding rigorous proof that, unfortunately, these all seem to lack'.

In his book Ken Feder takes on many familiar, and some not so familiar, targets, deploying his scientific rationalism to expose, *inter alia*, the Cardiff Giant, the Piltdown forgery, the many daft theories about the earliest settlement of the Americas (including the Moundbuilders), Atlantis, von Däniken's ETs, the dowsers, Noah's Ark, the Turin Shroud and much besides. This is not a primary text for archaeologists – we are familiar with the rebuttal techniques – but it will be invaluable in dealing with those otherwise intelligent members of one's family or classes who have read Barry Fell or John Michell.

TWe have some exotic egg on our editorial face this month! In the paper on the Cosquer Cave by Jean Clottes and his co-workers (ANTIQUITY 66: 583–98) there are several references to

penguins among the representations found in this remarkable cave system. M.D. Smoothy is among those who have written to point out that we mistranslated pingouin as 'penguin' whereas the precise meaning of the word is 'auk'. Referring to our 'invention of a new species called the Large Penguin on page 593', Jill Cook of the British Museum's Quaternary Section points out that this should be identified as the Great Auk (*Alca impennis*) and not the genera of flightless sea-birds restricted to the Southern Hemisphere. Our apologies go to Jean Clottes and his colleagues and to all our readers. Unfortunately, even the most experienced translator can sometimes be caught in this way by a seemingly simple English equivalent.

HENRY CLEERE

Noticeboard

The Yates Professorship of Classical Art and Archaeology was established at University College London in 1885. Following the retirement of the most recent holder of this distinguished chair, Professor Nicholas Coldstream FBA, UCL has decided to merge the Chair with that of the Professor of the Archaeology of the Roman Provinces, created in 1948 at the Institute of Archaeology (now part of UCL) and first occupied by Sir Mortimer Wheeler. John Wilkes FBA, former holder of the Institute Chair, has become the first Yates Professor of Greek and Roman Archaeology.

Conferences

EuroTAG/TAG 92

Southampton (UK), 14–16 December 1992

The Theoretical Archaeology Group conference will be held in Southampton this year. Contact: EuroTAG Organizing Committee, Department of Archaeology, University of Southampton, Southampton SO9 5NH, UK. FAX: (0)703-593939 (mark 'TAG, Department of Archaeology').

Or E-mail: csg@UK.ac.soton.mail

Rescue Conference on 'Rescuing the historic environment'

Leicester (UK), 6–8 January 1993

To address the gap in public perception and in organization approach between the conservation of the 'natural' and of the 'artificial' environment. Contact: Mrs Kate Penny, Professional Development Unit, University of Leicester, University Road, Leicester LE1 7RH, UK. FAX: (0)533-522464.

Symposium on 'Archaeology and standing buildings: techniques and applications'

Chester (UK), 8–10 January 1993

Major issues relating to the techniques and applications of building recording and analysis. Contact: Mrs

Lesley Crombie, Centre for Continuing Education, University of Liverpool, PO Box 147, Liverpool L69 3BX, UK.

Conference on 'The archaeology of London: recent discoveries and their significance'

Oxford (UK), 22–24 January 1993

Main results and new conclusions from recent work by the Museum of London Archaeology Service, setting the archaeology of London in its regional and European context wherever possible.

Contact: Archaeology Course Secretary, OUDCE, 1 Wellington Square, Oxford OX1 2JA, UK.

International Symposium on 'Man and sea in the Mesolithic: coastal settlement above and below present sea level'

Hørsholm (Denmark), 14–18 June 1993

Numbers limited. Apply as soon as possible, with title and abstract of paper. Contact: Anders Fischer, 'Man & Sea', Skov- og Naturstyrelsen, Slotsmarken 13, DK-2970 Hørsholm, Denmark.

International Symposium on 'The origins and evolution of ethnocultural processes in Asia'

Novosibirsk (Russia), 23–31 August 1993

Sessions include: Races, ethnoscapes and archaeological cultures; Autochthonous development, migrations; Continuity of tradition in Stone Age cultures of Central, Middle and North Asia; Asia and the Levallois problem; Problems of conservation and use of historical and cultural landscapes; Microblade industries of the Pacific Basin. Field excursion to open-air and cave sites in the Altai Mountains. Registration by 10 January, abstracts by 1 March 1993. Contact: Academician Anatoly Panteleevich Derevyanko, Institute of Archaeology & Ethnography SD RAS, Acad. Lavrent'yev Avenue 17, Novosibirsk-90, 630090 Russia (RF), USSR. FAX: (007)-383-235-7791.

6th Nordic Conference on 'The application of scientific methods in archaeology'

Esbjerg (Denmark), 19–24 September 1993

To review the latest progress in Analytical methods, Bio-geological methods, Dating methods and Prospection. Paper titles and abstracts before 1 March 1993; oral or poster presentation. Contact: Vagn Mejdahl, The Nordic Laboratory for Luminescence Dating, Risø National Laboratory, DK-4000 Roskilde, Denmark.

Computer package

A new computer package for archaeologists, christened 'Pie-slice', combines the latest theoretical advances with over 30 years' experience in handling and publishing pottery. It will enable researchers to make proper statistical comparisons between assemblages, in terms of the proportions of different types in each assemblage. The package will run on a PC

with an 80386+80387 processor or, better, an 80486. There are no special requirements for RAM or hard disk space, but the more RAM that is available, the larger the dataset that can be studied. The initial version is written to run on X-windows over Unix; a DOS version is being produced.

The package will be disseminated through short (two-day) training courses, each taking no more than six students. At the end of the course, students will be able to take away a copy of the package, together with the skills needed to use it, and with luck at least one solved archaeological problem. External funding is being sought to keep down the cost of the course.

For more information about the package and training course, contact: Clive Orton, University College London Institute of Archaeology, 31–34 Gordon Square, London WC1H 0PY, UK. Telephone: (0)71-387-7050 extension 4749. FAX: (0)71-383-2572.

Or E-mail: c.orton@uk.ac.bcc

Central and Eastern Europe

The Centre for the Archaeology of Central and Eastern

Europe (CACEE), jointly run by the Universities of Durham and Newcastle upon Tyne, has been set up to promote interest in the archaeology of the former socialist bloc – Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, Albania and the various states that were formerly part of Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union. The Centre aims to bring top-ranking scholars from those countries to Britain for short visits and longer stays, to encourage British archaeologists to undertake fieldwork and other projects in the countries, to set up conferences, seminars and lectures, to co-ordinate library holdings and to increase awareness of the archaeology of the region in both students and research workers. The Centre has no independent funds, and will seek funding on a project-by-project basis.

Anyone interested in the prospective work of the Centre should contact: Dr John Chapman, Department of Archaeology, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, Newcastle NE1 7RU, UK, or Professor Anthony Harding, Department of Archaeology, University of Durham, 46 Saddler Street, Durham DH1 3NV, UK.

a Tidy view of archaeology



'Stick to religious bulljumping, kid. The pro circuit is murder!'