

Stonehenge visitor-facilities would be considered a 'national disgrace' only 30 years after they were built? Protection of the site against damage by visitors and their facilities will also be jeopardised if, as is promised, free access to the Stones is allowed.

Such issues are not new to us: they were discussed by Christopher Chippindale (1994) and, more recently, for Avebury (Pomeroy 1998). Similar concerns were addressed in *Antiquity* (1996) by Dr Geoffrey Wainwright who argued firmly for the long bored tunnel at Stonehenge, saying

This will bring the issue of the price we put on the most important parts of our heritage into the public arena.

The many acres around the Henge now threatened by cut-and-cover were bought by public subscription and given to the National Trust for permanent safekeeping. Will the Trust abandon its commitment? And why hasn't the debate on costs been brought into the public arena?

As far as financial costs are concerned, no up-to-date figure has been sought for the road solution abandoned as too expensive, but the sum is estimated to be in the region of £300 million — less than half the price of the Millennium Dome. The Government has pledged to raise £125 million for the cut-and-cover scheme — almost half of what may be needed for a long bored tunnel. Surely, before agreeing to wholesale destruction at this world-famous site, every effort should be made to seek the shortfall elsewhere — perhaps from European or International organisations?

Meanwhile, in view of our responsibilities under the World Heritage Convention, let us return to the production of a properly consulted Management Plan, unconstrained by precipitate announcements. Successive abortive exercises in finding a solution to roads and a visitor-centre have, through the field-walking, topsoil stripping and test-trenching of archaeological evaluation, added substantially to the loss of fragile primary evidence from a precious finite resource; they have also raised questions about heritage management, ethics in archaeology, and credibility. A measured approach is needed: building on the logical consensus of 1994 to 1996, the aim would be for sustainable solutions even if some of these might only be achievable through phased development.

Stonehenge, abiding symbol of our national heritage, has been standing for three or more millennia; we must not be beguiled into condemning its environs to further unnecessary damage by spurious 'last chance' threats.

References

- CHIPPINDALE, C. 1994. *Stonehenge complete*. London: Thames & Hudson. Revised 1983 edition.
 ENGLISH HERITAGE. 1998. *Stonehenge The Master Plan 22 September 1998*. London: English Heritage.
 POMEROY, M. 1998. *Avebury World Heritage Site Management Plan*. London: English Heritage.
 STIRLING, A. 1994. The view from the road — option one: a tunnel, in *Stonehenge: The Great Debate*. Proceedings of a conference held in July 1994. London: English Heritage and the National Trust.
 WAINWRIGHT, G.J. 1996. Stonehenge saved?, *Antiquity* 70: 9–12.

LORD KENNET* writes:

It may be in order to try to discern what is going on in Whitehall about the Stonehenge Road. This is not easy, but attentive following for some years through Parliament, as a former minister responsible for the national heritage, as Chairman of the York University Conference on World Heritage Site status which led in due course to the new Local Authorities Forum, and as President of the Avebury Society in the same World Heritage Site as Stonehenge, leads me to these conclusions.

Dr Chris Smith, the Secretary of State for Culture, the Media and Sport, has repeatedly been misadvised about Stonehenge. Twice already he has had to change his mind about where the new Visitors' Centre should go; now, sensibly enough, after revisiting two sites carefully considered and abandoned years ago, he has returned to the consensus first achieved in 1994: the Visitors' Centre should be outside the World Heritage Site, at Countess Roundabout, and visitors in their hundreds of thousands should not be spilled straight into this highly vulnerable landscape.

Ha was also 'advised' that the equally agreed twin-bore tunnel was bound to be too expensive and need not be considered, even though tunneling is becoming steadily cheaper. (There is a 3.2 kilometre single bore, two-track rail tunnel being driven through the North Downs for £80 million.)

So along with the welcome return to Countess comes a quite unacceptable cut-and-cover tunnel, portals all within the WHS, which in-

* House of Lords, London SW1A 0PW, England.

volves not only the destruction of some acres of World Heritage Site land that is inalienable National Trust property, destruction of or damage to several scheduled monuments, and a long permanent scar on the landscape, but also a brand-new rearrangement of the ground in Stonehenge Bottom.

The drawings shown at Amesbury on September 22 appeared to show the level in the Bottom raised by as much as 15 metres so as to cover up the tunnel where gradient requirements would otherwise keep it above ground. Spoil from the cut-and-cover would be used.

This would mean an alteration of the view of the Stones from the East from what it has been for four thousand odd years, and this cannot be right. Alteration of the lie of the WHS landscape has not been suggested before, for obvious reasons, and my understanding is that it has hardly if at all been discussed with even the official archaeologists. It is rather like proposing a rearrangement of the stones — as the *Wiltshire Times* (I imagine wrongly) reported HMG now intended. There have still to be all the usual public consultations, enquiries, etc. of course, and this new proposal will certainly be severely criticised.

What next? Here are some suggestions:

- 1., get a realistic, rather than a high and self-serving, estimate by putting the bored tunnel out to tender with experienced firms: in Switzerland and Italy tunnels are constantly being bored as part of ordinary road-building;
 - 2., get the Management Plan going, with comprehensive proposals for this half of the World Heritage Site, as has already been done for the other half at Avebury;
- and
- 3., mount a campaign to raise the extra money, nationally and internationally, for what is a global icon if ever there was one. Readers of the *International Herald Tribune* all over the world have had the pleasure throughout the summer of seeing on its back page Stonehenge, regularly featured in the huge advertisements of Messrs AT&T over the rubric, 'take in a rock show'.

What we should all have learned by now is that Stonehenge cannot be protected on the cheap. It is our duty to do it properly.

 The recent EAA (European Association of Archaeologists) conference in Göteborg took place in a week of contested political elections

— Swedish, Slovak and German — giving focus to the fact that archaeology has a strong political component and to the changing and varied attitudes towards Europe. This theme was reflected in the strong emphasis on Cultural Resource Management and the increasing and diverse expositions of theory in the conference sessions. Although the language of discussion was English, the national origin of more than 500 registered delegates from 34 European countries underlined the simultaneous diversity and strength of this expanding European movement, whose membership exceeded 1000 for the first time. Nevertheless, some countries, notably France and Spain — even allowing for the meeting's northern location — remained under-represented. Oxbow Bookshops (<http://www.oxbowbooks.com>) have revealed to us that landscape studies (and the authors Richard Bradley and Christopher Tilley) headed the best-seller lists to European archaeologists at the meeting.

At the same conference BAR (under varied publishers' names) celebrated their 1000th volume since inception. Three of these volumes contain the Proceedings of the preceding EAA conference held in Ravenna, which were published in time for the Göteborg meeting.

 As part of our continuing occasional commissioned series, we present a **Celebration of 1848** from two sides of the Atlantic. The most famous work published in 1848, and commented on in this issue of *Antiquity* (and also on our web page with three earlier comments on Marxism and archaeology; see <http://intarch.ac.uk/antiquity/hp/1848intro.html>) is the *Communist manifesto*, a work that Marx & Engels might never have published if the current plans to charge for admission to the British Museum (now British) library had already been implemented. It was also the year of publication of at least three other works of archaeological importance: *Mounds of the Mississippi valley* by Squier & Davis, *Cities and cemeteries of Etruria* by Dennis and *Nineveh and its remains* by Layard, and we have also invited perspectives on these works. A further achievement was the foundation of the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge which is currently celebrating the role of Viscount Fitzwilliam and other benefactors. 1848 was not only a year of (failed) political revolution, but successful archaeological



'March 6th was passed in opening a cairn or tumulus of stone in a plantation near the Parcelly Hay wharf of the Cromford and high Peak Railway. We found the primary interment beneath the middle of the barrow, in a small oval excavation in the rock below the natural surface of the land, about three feet in depth, and not exceeding the same in its greatest diameter, consequently the body had been placed upright in a sitting or crouching posture, as was abundantly evident from the order in which the bones were found. The grave was roughly covered in with large flat slabs of limestone, which had prevented the materials of the tumulus from quite filling it up; a good deal of earth had, however, been washed in, which had the effect of pre-serving the bones in unusual perfection.'

BATEMAN 1861: 22–3

achievement in a style that looked both backwards and forwards (see our illustration).

One further discovery that looked forward was the unearthing of the Gibraltar skull, then unrecognized as the first Neanderthal to be uncovered. Readers will also have to look forward to March next year to read about the latest finds from the caves where this discovery was made.

1998 is also the 50th anniversary of the UN Declaration of Human Rights. We had not anticipated recording this anniversary until we recently visited the National Museum of Denmark in Copenhagen where individual exhibits have been linked to the Development of Human Rights. One such such creative link was placed outside a Neolithic passage tomb and we reproduce the

citation in full and leave the reader to consider: 'Stone Age peoples were first and foremost members of a group. Neolithic Stone Age peoples buried their dead without any individual marking of the burial place. Such mass burial is a symbol of a society in which the group took precedence over the individual. Even though the group was of primary importance, Stone Age peoples still valued the individual. Traces of offerings and burial rights [sic] reveal that each individual was bid farewell, and that for the journey to the realm of the dead their needs were provided for. But once the journey had begun, the individual ceased to exist, entering instead the host of ancestors. It is often claimed that the UN Declaration of Human Rights represents a modern western view of the individual, lacking any concept of group solidarity. Minority groups such as Australian Aborigines and South American Indians, often claim that their need for a collective right to land outweighs the need for individual freedom of expression. They are fighting for survival as a people.'

In this issue we also present a special section on the **Domestication of rice in China** (<http://intarch.ac.uk/antiquity/riceintro.html>). Last year an important conference in Nanchang provided the springboard for the contributions that we publish here. We are delighted to include both overview papers and detailed site reports, from colleagues located around the world. Domestication of staple cereals has long been an important issue, and with new genetic work, modern environmental techniques and international discussion, rice is now fully on the agenda. We hope that the papers here provide a taste of the current work. The topicality is shown by a recent article in *Nature* where genetic, linguistic and archaeological data are combined to provide an 'origins' of the Chinese people (Piazza 1998).

References

- BAHN, P. 1998. Neanderthals emancipated, *Nature* 394: 719–21.
- BATEMAN, T. 1861. *Ten years' diggings in Celtic and Saxon Grave Hills in the counties of Derby, Stafford, and York from 1848 to 1858, with some notices of some former discoveries, hitherto unpublished and remarks on the crania and pottery from the mounds*. Derby: Bemrose & Sons.
- GAUTHEROT, F. (ed.). 1996. *30 ans d'archéologie en Saône-et-Loire*. Dijon: Comité départemental de la recherche archéologique de Saône-et-Loire.
- MELLARS, P. 1998. The face of the Neanderthals, *Nature* 395: 539–40.
- PIAZZA, A. 1998. Towards a genetic history of China, *Nature* 395: 637–9.
- ZUBROW, E. & M. FRACHETTI. 1998. Changing world-view of prehistoric populations, *KVHAA Konferenser* 40: 27–63.